



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Kathryn Matayoshi
Superintendent
Hawaii State Department of Education
1390 Miller Street
Honolulu, HI 96813

January 18, 2017

Dear Superintendent Matayoshi:

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

On October 6, 2016, the Department sent a letter to chief State school officers outlining the outcomes for States related to the assessment peer review. I am writing to provide you feedback on your State's recent submission of evidence. External peer reviewers and Department staff evaluated the Hawaii State Department of Education's (HIDOE) 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 (Smarter Balanced). **Substantially meets requirements.**
- Reading/ language arts (R/LA) and mathematics general assessments in high school (Smarter Balanced). **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.

- Reading/ language arts (R/LA) and mathematics alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards (HSA-Alt R/LA and mathematics) in grades 3-8 and 10. **Partially meets requirements.**
- Science general assessments in grades 4 and 8(HSA Science). **Substantially meets requirements.**
- Science general assessments in high school (HSA Science Biology HS end-of-course (EOC)). **Substantially meets requirements.**
- Science alternate assessments on alternate academic achievement standards (HSA-Alt Science) in grades 4, 8 and high school. **Partially meets requirements.**

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

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

The specific list of items required for HIDOE to submit is enclosed with this letter. Because several of the State's components partially meet 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, HIDOE must submit satisfactory evidence to address the items identified in the enclosed list. HIDOE 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 adequate progress is not made, following the peer review of the additional evidence, 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 HIDOE's Federal fiscal year 2017 IDEA Part B grant award.

The Department notes that HIDOE submitted a waiver request for assessing speaking that was approved on August 12, 2016, for the 2016–2017, 2017–2018, and 2018–2019 school years.

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 Tawanda Avery or Deidra Hilliard of my staff at: OSS.Hawaii@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

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

Enclosures

cc: Tom Saka, Director of Assessment

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

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
2.1 – Test Design and Development	<p>For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), HIDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the Smarter Balanced test design aligns the assessments to the full depth and breadth for all of the academic content standards in R/LA (including speaking) and mathematics at each grade level. [NOTE: HIDOE has received a speaking waiver; therefore, the Department does not expect Hawai‘i to submit additional evidence regarding speaking during the period of the waiver.] • Evidence that the item selection procedures for the computer adaptive testing (CAT) online assessment adequately deliver tests that meet test design requirements for the intended depth of knowledge (DOK) of the assessments (also applies to evidence requested for element 2.2). • Evidence that, for cases where an assessment includes off-grade-level content, assessments produce grade-level student achievement scores that are based only on grade-level items. • Evidence that the item pools for all versions of the assessments (i.e., general, American Sign Language, Braille, and Spanish) are sufficient to support the test design requirements.
2.2 – Item Development	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), HIDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See evidence regarding DOK and item pools in Critical Element 2.1 above. <p>For the Science general assessments in grades 4,8, and high school (HSA Science and HSA Biology EOC), HIDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that item development has improved the gaps in DOK within the item pools (as identified in the 2012 independent alignment analysis).
2.3 – Test Administration	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), HIDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a comprehensive contingency plan to address possible technology challenges during test administration.
2.5 – Test Security	<p>For the HSA-Alt assessments in R/LA, mathematics and science, HIDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that describes how irregularities are monitored and detected for the HSA Alt (e.g., a summary of responses to any HSA-Alt test irregularities).
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy	<p>For the entire assessment system, HIDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a rationale for minimum and maximum percentages in reporting of proficiency level categories.
3.1 – Overall Validity,	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), HIDOE must provide:</p>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
including Validity Based on Content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence as noted for all item pools in element 2.1 above. • Evidence that Smarter Balanced assessments that include off-grade-level content conform to the on-grade-level blueprint for the assessment. • Evidence of alignment of sample test forms for grades 3, 4, 6 and 7 in R/LA and mathematics. • Evidence of improved alignment of the tests, based upon the findings of the independent alignment study. <p>For the HSA-Alt assessments in R/LA, mathematics and science, HIDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 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 (e.g., an independent alignment study).
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes	<p>For the HSA-Alt assessments in R/LA, mathematics and science, HIDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all of the alternate assessments are eliciting the intended cognitive processes based on the State standards, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Results of cognitive labs exploring student performance on items that show the items require demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills; OR ○ Reports of expert judgment of items that show the items require demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills; OR ○ Empirical evidence that shows the relationships of items intended to require demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills to other measures that require similar levels of cognitive complexity in the content area (e.g., teacher ratings of student performance, student performance on performance tasks or external assessments of the same knowledge and skills).
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	<p>For the HSA-Alt assessments in R/LA, mathematics, and science HIDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that supports the validity of the internal structure of the tests (e.g., a dimensionality analysis and analysis of overall model fit for the HSA-Alt assessments to support the hierarchical theoretical structure and reporting of scores).
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	<p>For HSA-Alt R/LA, mathematics and science assessments, HIDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of relationships between HSA-Alt scores and scores from similar measures, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Correlations between assessment results and variables related to test takers (e.g., instructional time on content based on grade-level content standards); OR ○ Correlations between proficiency on the high-school assessments and performance in post-secondary education, vocational

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	training or employment.
4.1 – Reliability	<p>For the HSA-Alt assessments in R/LA, mathematics and science, HIDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reliability estimates for all student sub-groups, where feasible to do so given minimum n-size.
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), HIDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of estimated reliability for students receiving accommodations using operational data.
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), HIDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See evidence regarding DOK and item pools in element 2.1 above. <p>For the HSA-Alt assessments in R/LA, mathematics and science, HIDOE must submit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the tests yield valid and reliable scores across the entire performance range for all tested grades for each starting point on the test, specifically grade 3-5 R/LA and grade 4 science.
4.4 – Scoring	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), HIDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Smarter Balanced has clear, unambiguous criteria, including minimum thresholds, to ensure and document inter-rater reliability for States that are conducting hand-scoring of Smarter Balanced performance items. <p>For the HSA-Alt assessments in R/LA, mathematics and science, HIDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that describes how “engagement items” are included in alternate assessment total scores and how these items specifically relate to the state content standards.
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), HIDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the design and development of the item pools used to support multiple versions of the assessments, specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Computer-adaptive in American Sign Language (R/LA listening only, mathematics) ○ Computer-adaptive in Braille (R/LA, mathematics) ○ Computer-based fixed form in Braille (mathematics) ○ Paper in Braille (R/LA, mathematics) ○ Computer-adaptive in Spanish (mathematics) ○ Paper in Spanish (mathematics) • Evidence that item pools for these additional computer adaptive versions can support the adaptive test design.
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	<p>For the HSA-Alt in R/LA, mathematics, and science HIDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of procedures to ensure monitoring, maintaining and improving as needed, the quality of Hawai‘i’s alternate assessment

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses and planned maintenance of the assessments included in the State assessment system.</p>
<p>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</p>	<p>For all HSA and HSA-Alt assessments, HIDOE must submit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of documentation that is used across the State for all assessments, addressing the information for this critical element. • Evidence that parents are provided information about available assessment options, accessibility features, accommodations, and consequences of being assessed on alternate assessments prior to an assessment participation decision. • Evidence of guidance to ensure implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.
<p>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</p>	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), HIDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of guidance regarding selection of the Spanish version of the Smarter Balanced assessments for English learners, and evidence of procedures for communication of this guidance to districts, schools, teachers and parents. <p>For all HSA assessments, HIDOE must submit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of documentation that is used across the State for all assessments, addressing the information for this critical element.
<p>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</p>	<p>For the entire assessment system, HIDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of a consistent process to monitor the alignment among the accommodations in IEP/504 plans, those used in the classroom, and those used on Hawai'i assessments.
<p>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</p>	<p>For the HSA-Alt R/LA and mathematics and assessments in grades 3-8 and 11, and HSA-Alt science assessments in grades 8 and 11, HIDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the involvement of panelists with appropriate experience and expertise in setting its alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable, including a rationale for not involving special education teachers in the standard setting for the upper grade bands of the HSA-Alt.
<p>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</p>	<p>For the HSA science assessments and HSA science biology EOC, HIDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the quality of the academic achievement standards in science and performance level descriptors for science. <p>For the HSA-Alt R/LA, mathematics and science assessments, HIDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State's alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State's grade level academic content standards, such as:

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A description of the process used to develop the alternate academic achievement standards that shows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The State’s grade-level academic content standards or grade-level extended academic content standards were used as a main reference in writing performance level descriptors for the alternate academic achievement standards OR; ▪ The process of setting cut scores used, as a main reference, performance level descriptors linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards OR; ▪ The AA-AAAS cut scores were set and performance level descriptors written to link to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards OR; ▪ A description of steps taken to vertically articulate the alternate academic achievement standards (including cut scores and performance level descriptors) across each grade.

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

August, 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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 HAWAII

Contents

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

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS 9
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 9
2.2 – Item Development..... 10
2.3 – Test Administration 11
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration(Reviewed by Department Staff Only)12
2.5 – Test Security 13
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 14

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 15
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 15
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 16
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure 17
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables 18

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER 19
4.1 – Reliability..... 19
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 20
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... 21
4.4 – Scoring 22
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 23
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment 24
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance..... 25

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS 26
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 26
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 28
5.3 – Accommodations..... 29
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations 31

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 32
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students 32
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 33
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 34
6.4 – Reporting..... 35

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR HAWAII

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>Hi 039 Hi 045 Hi 048</p>	<p>Evidence of state adoption of academic content standards is complete.</p>
<p>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR HAWAII

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>Hi 039 Hi 045 Hi 048</p>	<p>CCSS was adopted in reading and mathematics.</p> <p>The previous peer review indicated Hawaii’s content standards in science were aligned with college- and career-ready expectations for all students.</p> <p>Evidence provided for the extensions is labeled as being tied to an assessment year.</p>
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please provide clarification that the extensions pre-date the assessment and do not shift annually as the assessment changes. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR HAWAII

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>1.3 – 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"> • Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). 	<p>General R/LA – Smarter Balanced, Grades 3-8 and G11 (HI peer review submission form, pdf p12)</p> <p>Alternate State-developed Grades 3-8, and 11</p> <p>General Math - Smarter Balanced, Grades 3-8 and G11 (HI peer review submission form, pdf p12)</p> <p>Alternate State-developed Grades 3-8, and 11</p> <p>General Science assessments – State-developed Grade 4, Grade 8, and Biology. However, Biology is administered in grades 9-12 (HI peer review submission form, pdf p. 9)</p> <p>Alternate Science assessments – State-developed Grade 4, Grade 8, and Grade 11</p>	<p>Requirements met for this element.</p>
<p>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is needed.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR HAWAII

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</p> <p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system; • For English learners (EL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment; ○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years. 	<p>Hawaii Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> ALT-033_HSA-Alt_Memo_Assessment of All Students in Compliance with the NCLB & IDEA_20120620 <input type="checkbox"/> HI-056_BOE Policy 2520 Statewide Assessment Program <input type="checkbox"/> HI-034_Test Administration Manual for ELA and Math, Online, Summative (p. 22) <input type="checkbox"/> HI-042 Required Statewide Assessments and Participation Criteria <input type="checkbox"/> HI-047_Memo_Requirements of ESEA, As Amended, In Regards to the Hawaii Statewide Assessment Program and Accountability <input type="checkbox"/> HI-051_Guide to the 2014-2015 Hawaii State Assessment and Strive HI Performance Index_20150505 (p. 2) <input type="checkbox"/> HI-052_Memo_SY 2014-15 Assessments for Grades 3-4 HLIP Students_20140213 <input type="checkbox"/> HI-055_Memo_Trainings for Smarter Balanced Assessments and Other Statewide Assessments_20141124 <input type="checkbox"/> HI-057_BOE Policy 4550 Stakeholder Inclusion <input type="checkbox"/> HI-101_Memo_Exemption from Smarter Balanced ELA for ELL First Year in US School_20150209 <input type="checkbox"/> HI-102_Memo_Attachment_Procedure for Identifying First Year in a U.S. School ELL Students_20150209 	<p>Documentation provided by HI indicates all students must be included. None of the documentation reviewed specifically indicates students with disabilities publicly placed in privates schools as a means of providing special education and related services included in the assessment system must be included in the assessment system. Recommendation to add this specific language to documentation, if it applies to HI.</p> <p>If native language assessments are administered, the evidence reviewed does not specifically mention a policy that ELs must be assessed in English if enrolled in U.S. schools for three of more consecutive years.</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 HAWAII

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
__x_ No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR HAWAII

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>1.5 – 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>--data disaggregated by student group: ELA/Math/Science</p> <p>--Shows students tested and students enrolled for each breakout</p> <p>--includes grade level tests and AA-AAAS</p> <p># enrolled, # tested, % tested for each group for math all grades, R/LA all grades, science all grades for both general and alternate (HI peer review submission form, pdf p23-30)</p> <p>Pages 23-27</p> <p>The number of students who have completed the assessment, as documented in the assessment reporting system, serves as the numerator and the enrollment data from ESIS serves as the denominator for all state and school-level participation rate calculations. There is also a check of all graduating seniors to verify their completion of the Biology EOC. At the time of graduation, any senior who has not completed the EOC is considered as not participating and is added to the denominator for participation calculations at the state and school-levels for that school year. (HI peer review submission form, pdf p23-27)</p>	<p>Requirement met</p>
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u> </u>x_ No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR HAWAII

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.1 – Test Design and Development</p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; • Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Alt 18 Sci 001</p> <p>Hi 100 Alt 015 Sci 007</p> <p>Hi 100 Alt 015 Sci 005</p> <p>Alt 18 Sci 011 001</p>	<p>See the SBAC review for general assessments in ELA and mathematics.</p> <p>The purposes are stated in various locations under various headings in the technical manuals.</p> <p>Alt blueprints exist but no discussion is included of difficulty or DOK for tasks.</p> <p>Sci 007 has blueprints but they have no discussion of the DOK levels per area of the assessment.</p> <p>Alt process is to align tasks to student communication level and ensure that each student receives at least one item form each domain.</p> <p>For science some deficiencies existed in the study; there is no documented response to these deficiencies.</p> <p>The HSA-Alt is not adaptive so pool depth is not an issue; DOK is missing.</p> <p>Science item pools are lacking DOK or any other parameter that demonstrates range of difficulty</p> <p>Peers found that the state was not assessing speaking</p>
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> <u> </u> X <u> </u> No additional evidence is required or</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR HAWAII

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> <p>Sci 005 Alt 018 Alt 038</p>	<p>See the SBAC review for general assessments in ELA and mathematics.</p> <p>Evidence for this element is thorough and complete. The State used reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items.</p> <p>Items were from Oregon but were vetted by AIR; Some new items were written by AIR.</p>
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow up report on how the issue of insufficient numbers of items at certain DOK levels, identified in the 2012 independent alignment analysis, has been addressed. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR HAWAII

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Hi 012 Alt 011 Sci 002, 022</p> <p>Hi 097</p> <p>Hi 034, 015</p>	<p>See the SBAC review for general assessments in ELA and mathematics.</p> <p>Evidence of standardized procedures is sufficient for general and alternate assessments.</p> <p>The state requires training to gain access to the portal but is lacking a policy requiring training to administer the general and alternate assessments.</p> <p>Hi 34 has discussion for networks and Hi 15 has discussion of allowed devices. This evidence applies to ELA, mathematics, and science.</p> <p>The HSA-Alt is not a CAT.</p>
<p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement indicating that training must have been completed in order to administer the general and alternate assessments. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR HAWAII

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</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><u>HI</u>'s policies and procedures apply to all grade-level and AA-AAAS in all subjects Hawaii Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> HI-075_HSAP HelpDesk Log_20150515 <input type="checkbox"/> HI-077_HSAP Site Visits_20150528 <input type="checkbox"/> HI-078_Protocol for Assessment Monitoring Site Visits_20150526 <input type="checkbox"/> HI-079_Testing Environment and Security Checklist <input type="checkbox"/> HI-080_HSAP Testing Incidents Log - BREACH status_20150528 <input type="checkbox"/> HI-083_Hawaii DOE Web Patrol Log_20150518 <input type="checkbox"/> HI-084_HI DOE Data Forensics Report_20150709 	
Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR HAWAII

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.5 – Test Security</p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS</p> <p>Hi 069 Alt 029</p>	<p>Evidence for this element is thorough and almost complete. Plans are provided for prevention, detection, investigation, and remediation of any assessment irregularities.</p>
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of data, interpretation, and response to any findings from the online survey tool of HSA-Alt test irregularities; this evidence would indicate whether any irregularities were detected and addressed 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR HAWAII

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS</p> <p>Hi 091</p> <p>Hi 126</p>	<p>See the SBAC review for general assessments in ELA and mathematics.</p> <p>Minimum public cell size is 30.</p> <p>No mention of percent cuts for reporting proficiency level categories.</p>
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please consider and provide a rationale for minimum and maximum percentages for reporting of proficiency level categories. If choosing not to use minimum and maximum percentages, please explain the rationale, since students’ proficiency levels would be revealed in the case of 100% being in any given category. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR HAWAII

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Sci 001</p>	<p>See the SBAC review for general assessments in ELA and mathematics.</p> <p>Evidence for the science general achievement is indicated in previous peer review.</p> <p>Forms from the science general assessment align to blueprint.</p> <p>No cognitive labs were conducted, nor was any equivalent evidence collected.</p> <p>HSA-ALT is lacking any direction to find evidence of cognitive processes. HSA-Alt is explicit about starting point based on communication level; the test is not explicit about the DOK required for items.</p>
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide evidence that all the alternate assessments are now eliciting the intended cognitive processes based on the state standards. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR HAWAII

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Sci 001</p> <p>Alt 083</p>	<p>See the SBAC review for general assessments in ELA and mathematics.</p> <p>Evidence for the science general achievement is indicated in previous peer review.</p> <p>The science general assessment assumes single trait and uses correlations. It uses no other evidence.</p> <p>Subscales have low correlations, and the meaning is unclear.</p> <p>Evidence for HSA-Alt mathematics 6-8 and 11 suggest unidimensionality is in question. This is based on the disattenuated correlations which should be closer to 1.00.</p> <p>Overall the correlational evidence is not strong enough and is not consistent with current practice.</p>
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dimensionality analysis (e.g., confirmatory factor analysis) and overall model fit for the HSA-Alt to support the hierarchical theoretical structure and reporting of scores. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR HAWAII

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Alt 018</p>	<p>Evidence for the science general achievement is indicated in previous peer review.</p> <p>See the SBAC review for general assessments in ELA and mathematics.</p> <p>The HSA-Alt lacks evidence in this area.</p> <p>Relations among HSA-Alt scores of various content areas were reported and ranged from .75 to .86. These magnitudes are pretty high for measures of different content areas, although separation can be hard to attain on alternate assessments.</p>
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Studies of relations between HSA-Alt scores and scores from measures of like content areas collected during the same year. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR HAWAII

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>Alt 018, p. 46</p>	<p>Evidence for the science general achievement is indicated in previous peer review.</p> <p>See the SBAC review for general assessments in ELA and mathematics.</p> <p>The evidence for this element indicates that reasonable and appropriate steps have been taken. An independent review of fairness and an independent review of accessibility, both addressing the tests in their final forms, would provide additional evidence.</p> <p>The HSA-Alt entry process based on communication rather than cognitive level may be problematic.</p>
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR HAWAII

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Sci 001 Alt 018</p>	<p>See the SBAC review for general assessments in ELA and mathematics.</p> <p>Item difficulty and CSEM are provided.</p> <p>The identified science evidence does not demonstrate that the test produces valid scores across the continuum. Requesting that item writers identify the DOK of each item does not ensure this.</p> <p>No attempt is made to provide evidence that scores are valid across the range for the HSA-Alt</p> <p>For the HSA-Alt, students at start point 6 for grades three through five in reading appear from the documentation to automatically score in the proficient range.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence that the alternate assessment yields valid and reliable scores for students with various disabilities, as well as with communication skills at various levels. • Provide documentation of the DOK of items presented to students from the CAT engine for science general assessment. • Provide documentation demonstrating that students can receive non-proficient scores on the HSA-Alt regardless of starting point. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR HAWAII

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Hi 001</p> <p>Sci 001</p> <p>Alt 018</p>	<p>See the SBAC review for general assessments in ELA and mathematics.</p> <p>Evidence for the science general achievement is indicated in previous peer review.</p> <p>On the human scored items of the HSA-Alt, agreement is high.</p> <p>The HSA-Alt includes training to ensure hand scoring is aligned, and it is mostly machine scored. The impact of off grade level items on the total score is unclear.</p> <p>Scoring is well documented in terms of calculations.</p> <p>The method for calculating total score using maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) relies on parameters estimated using joint maximum likelihood estimation (JMLE) which is outdated. The peers feel that with the current state of the science, these parameters will cause inaccurate scores.</p>
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide an explanation of the inclusion of off grade level items in the total score for alternate assessments. • Provide an analysis of the change in scores using <u>marginal</u> maximum likelihood for calibration of item parameters instead of JMLE. • Explanation of the calculation of scores for paper and pencil native language and braille versions • Provide an explanation of how “engagement items” are included in the HSA-Alt total score, as well as how these items specifically relate to the state standards. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR HAWAII

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Alt 018</p>	<p>See the SBAC review for general assessments in ELA and mathematics.</p> <p>Evidence for the science general achievement is indicated in previous peer review.</p> <p>Evidence longitudinal data on performance is needed to evaluate the year to year assessment relationship.</p> <p>The impact of engagement scores on the total score is unclear. SBAC does not include engagement so the comparability of SBAC to alternate scores is unclear. (Since the state does not use extensions for the HSA-Alt, the HSA-Alt should align to SBAC achievement standards.)</p> <p>Because there are multiple starting points, peer reviewers feel that the HSA-Alt has multiple forms, even though it is described as single form in Alt 018.</p>
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide year to year student performance results for alternate assessments. • Provide reports of correlations and categorical agreement between scores attained in consecutive administrations, by the same students, on tests in the same content area. For example, please provide the correlation and categorical agreement between 4th grade one year and 5th grade the next. Reports should be generated for the HSA-Alt for all content areas. • Provide analysis demonstrating that the cognitive demands of the HSA-Alt are the same regardless of starting point. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR HAWAII

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Sci 001</p>	<p>See the SBAC review for general assessments in ELA and mathematics.</p> <p>Paper and pencil, braille, and native language versions exist.</p> <p>Very small numbers of students complete the paper and pencil versions of the science general assessment (0 in 2014-15) and of the HSA-Alt assessment (11 in 2014-2015).</p> <p>Evidence of the comparability of the science general assessment in computer and paper and pencil forms is presented. The evidence seems sufficient.</p> <p>Sci paper and pencil uses the same blueprint but there is no indication that paper and pencil has same item difficulties as CAT. It is also unclear whether there are off grade level items on the CAT.</p>
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide details (e.g., alignment study between tests) including analysis to support that pencil and paper versions (as well as native language assessments) are equivalent to the primary assessment. • Provide an analysis demonstrating that the user experience of the CAT is similar enough on the CAT across different devices as to not to impact student scores. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR HAWAII

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Sci 109 Alt 079</p>	<p>Evidence for the science general achievement is indicated in previous peer review.</p> <p>See the SBAC review for general assessments in ELA and mathematics.</p> <p>HSA-Alt evidence only shows what has been planned in the past with no discussion or plan for the future</p>
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please provide for HSA-Alt the ongoing maintenance plan for this assessment moving forward. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR HAWAII

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards; • States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs; • Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment; • Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities; • Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities; • Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS</p> <p>Hi 042</p> <p>Hi 042, Hi 038</p> <p>Hi 042, Hi 038</p> <p>Hi 038</p> <p>Hi 038</p>	<p>See the SBAC review for general assessments in ELA and mathematics.</p> <p>Information for the science general assessment is frequently redirected to the Smarter Balanced Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines.</p> <p>The Universal Tools, Designated Supports, and Accommodations Crosswalk does not clearly indicate the differences for science general assessments in these areas. The term science is rarely used and instead the crosswalk is between “New Smarter Balanced Assessments” and “Previous Hawaii State Assessments.”</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR HAWAII

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments); The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum. 	<p>Hi 042</p> <p>Hi 032, Hi 057, Hi 074</p>	<p>Sufficient information about the AA-AAAS is provided to parents only after the decision about assessment placement is made.</p> <p>Procedures for this issue were not apparent to the peers.</p>
<p>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide a single document (applying to students with disabilities, ELLs, and 504 plans) used across the state for all assessments with the information for this critical element. The document should include all combinations of students and tests (e.g., ELLs taking the HSA-Alt). This will make it easier for practitioners to access information on various assessments, on accessibility, and on accommodations. Provide evidence that parents are provided information about available assessment options, about accessibility, about accommodations, and about the consequences of being assessed on alternate assessments, prior to the placement decision being made. Provide documentation of procedures that are providing instructional guidance, in order to support the following statement: “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.” 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR HAWAII

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS</p> <p>Hi 038, Hi 042</p> <p>Hi 038</p> <p>Hi 038</p>	<p>See the SBAC review for general assessments in ELA and mathematics.</p> <p>Information for the science general assessment is frequently redirected to the Smarter Balanced Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines.</p> <p>The Universal Tools, Designated Supports, and Accommodations Crosswalk does not clearly indicate the differences for science general assessments in these areas. The term science is rarely used and instead the crosswalk is between “New Smarter Balanced Assessments” and “Previous Hawaii State Assessments.”</p> <p>Documents cited do not discuss options for second year ELL participation in science general achievement nor in HSA-Alt beyond requiring their participation. This is problematic because second year ELL students may need accommodations but they are not included in the documentation provided.</p> <p>Accommodations for ELLs on the HSA-Alt were not described at all.</p>
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a single document (applying to students with disabilities, ELLs, and 504 plans) used across the state for all assessments with the information for this critical element. The document should include all combinations of students and tests (e.g., ELLs taking the HSA-Alt). This will make it easier for practitioners to access information on various assessments, on accessibility, and on accommodations. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR HAWAII

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities (SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS;</p> <p>Hi 038</p> <p>Sci 002 031</p> <p>Alt 011, 021</p>	<p>See the SBAC review for general assessments in ELA and mathematics.</p> <p>Students with disabilities accommodations laid out well for general science.</p> <p>Accommodations for ELLs on the HSA-Alt were not described at all.</p> <p>Hi 072 provides no discussion of ELL</p> <p>Evidence of accommodation impact not included.</p> <p>The state does not explain special accommodations beyond the SBAC rules.</p> <p>Science general assessment allows special accommodations if needed through outlined process.</p> <p>Science general assessment has ELL accommodations and research-based documentation.</p> <p>HSA-Alt has outline for accommodations but no evidence of impact, and ELL is unclear.</p> <p>Information for the science general assessment is frequently redirected to the Smarter Balanced Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines.</p> <p>The Universal Tools, Designated Supports, and Accommodations Crosswalk does not clearly indicate</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 HAWAII

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		the differences for science general assessments in these areas. The term science is rarely used and instead the crosswalk is between “New Smarter Balanced Assessments” and “Previous Hawaii State Assessments.”
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide a single document (applying to students with disabilities, ELLs, and 504 plans) used across the state for all assessments with the information for this critical element. The document should include all combinations of students and tests (e.g., ELLs taking the HSA-Alt). This will make it easier for practitioners to access information on various assessments, on accessibility, and on accommodations. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR HAWAII

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS;</p> <p>Hi 077</p> <p>Hi 038</p> <p>Hi 038</p> <p>Hi 038</p> <p>Hi 077, Hi 078</p>	<p>See the SBAC review for general assessments in ELA and mathematics.</p> <p>The evidence provided primarily ensured that selected accommodations are consistent with state policies and student needs, as well as that selected accommodations are administered with fidelity.</p> <p>The ISAAP web tool is used for general assessments to record accommodations that are selected from the IEP and accommodations that are used during assessment with each student. Evidence was not provided indicating concurrence between IEP accommodations and accommodations loaded into the ISAAP.</p> <p>Assessment department staff viewed test administration to 30 students at a wide range of schools to monitor use of allowable accommodations, as well as administration fidelity.</p> <p>Hi 077 observations do not include a variety of accommodations nor is there evidence the state monitors to ensure students are given the accommodations in their IEP or ELL plans.</p> <p>The same issues apply to the science general assessment and to HSA-Alt.</p>
<p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence that there is a consistent process to ensure alignment between the accommodations in the IEP/504 plans, those used in the classroom, and those used in state assessment. This may be an expansion of the existing accommodation tracking system (ISAAP). 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR HAWAII

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; • The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Hi 110, Alt 068</p> <p>Hi 110</p> <p>Alt 068, Alt 075</p>	<p>See the SBAC review for general assessments in ELA and mathematics.</p> <p>Evidence for the science general achievement is indicated in previous peer review.</p> <p>Hi 110 indicates that academic achievement standards will be formally adopted. Evidence of formal adoption is not provided.</p> <p>Hi 128 indicates that the superintendent approved of SBAC’s adoption of cut scores.</p>
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of formal adoption of academic achievement standards for the general ELA and mathematics assessments. This must be evidence that Hawaii has adopted these achievement standards as a state, above evidence already submitted indicating approval of cut scores as an SBAC member. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR HAWAII

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Sci 025</p> <p>Hi 047</p> <p>Alt 075, pg. c-1</p>	<p>See the SBAC review for general assessments in ELA and mathematics.</p> <p>Evidence for the science general achievement is indicated in previous peer review.</p> <p>The Bookmark procedure was used for the science general assessment.</p> <p>The ID Matching procedure (which appears to be the same as the bookmark procedure) was used for the HSA-Alt.</p> <p>Hi 047 listed for the alternate assessment is off topic.</p> <p>It is unusual that with the exception reading third through fifth grade and science fourth grade no special education teachers were included on the panels.</p> <p>Also because the panels were grade band (rather than per grade level) the validity of the cut scores for HS-Alt are questionable; it appears they were attained by span rather than by grade level.</p>
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please provide a rationale for not including special education teachers in the standard setting for upper grade bands of the HSA-Alt. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR HAWAII

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Sci 026</p> <p>Alt 065, Alt 075</p>	<p>See the SBAC review for general assessments in ELA and mathematics (although this evidence is contingent on meeting the evidence requirements in 6.1 showing state adoption of SBAC achievement standards).</p> <p>The evidence focused on the process used to develop challenging and aligned standards.</p> <p>Independent review of the science general achievement standards in their final form, perhaps by representatives from an institute of higher learning, would strengthen this evidence.</p> <p>For HSA-Alt no extensions are in policy for the state. A study is necessary indicating that the HSA-Alt aligns to the base standards.</p>
<p>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of formal adoption of academic achievement standards for the general ELA and mathematics assessments. • Independent review of the HSA-Alt achievement standards in their final form by persons with expertise in significant cognitive disabilities. • Please provide the PLDs for the science general achievement. • Please provide the results from the review described in Sci 026, regarding the quality of the academic achievement standards in science. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR HAWAII

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.4 – Reporting</p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration; • The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results; • The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement; ○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors); ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; ○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Hi 014 pg. 39</p> <p>Hi 118, Alt 074, Alt 077</p> <p>Hi 118, Alt 074, Alt 077</p>	<p>See the SBAC review for general assessments in ELA and mathematics.</p> <p>Evidence for the science general achievement is indicated in previous peer review.</p> <p>The online individual student reports include claims. It is unclear whether the claims are customized by student.</p> <p>Hi 118 is paper mailed to parents.</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 HAWAII

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand; • The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.	Hi 121	
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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

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

June, 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes Smarter Balanced Consortium Evidence



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Contents

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS	3
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	3
2.2 – Item Development.....	9
2.3 – Test Administration	11
2.5 – Test Security	14
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....	16
SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....	18
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	18
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	21
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	22
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	24
SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER	25
4.1 – Reliability.....	25
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	27
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	28
4.4 – Scoring	29
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	30
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	31
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance.....	33
SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS	34
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	34
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	37
5.3 – Accommodations.....	38
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	40
SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .	41
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students	41
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....	42
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	43
6.4 – Reporting.....	44

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.1 – Test Design and Development</p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Index p. 2 7 pp. 24-25</p> <p>15a 15b 17 29</p>	<p>Statements of purpose exist and are stated.</p> <p>One purpose statement relates to growth. Is there or will there be evidence to support that the SBAC summative test measures growth?</p> <p>Of note: There is no statement pertaining to the use of the SBAC test for teacher evaluation.</p> <p>The 5th purpose statement of the summative test is to gauge “how instruction can be improved...” Assessment results do not clearly indicate actions to improve instruction. Recommend either restating or deleting this purpose statement.</p> <p>In several places of Evidence 15a and 15b, the range of total items by claim on the test blueprints does not match the range implied by the sums of minimum and maximum numbers of items, respectively, by assessment targets. It is not clear if the range by claim is intended to be a tally of items or an additional constraint.</p> <p>Speaking is not included in the assessments for ELA.</p> <p>Re “measure the full range”: In Evidence 17 p. 31, what makes for sufficiently good alignment is unclear. Evaluation of alignment study results is exacerbated</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>by the statement “low percentages of fully aligned and mostly aligned ratings do not necessarily reflect poor alignment.”</p> <p>The peers recommend including a clear discussion and supporting tables demonstrating the SBAC summative assessments cover the full range of the CCSS standards. The evidence should display the full range of the CCSS standards and indicate which are covered by the SBAC summative assessments. Those standards not assessed should be noted with the reason for their exclusion stated.</p> <p>Although off grade level tests may be administered via the CAT system, the conditions under which off grade level items may be given is not clear. It is not clear to what extent students receiving a test event with off grade level items are receiving and/or being scored on a grade-level test event that complies with the blueprints.</p> <p>It is claimed that off grade level items are realigned to the on grade blueprint, but how this alignment was done and evaluated are not included among the evidence documents.</p> <p>The peers’ understanding is that the decision of proficiency vs. non-proficiency is based only on on-grade level testing. The determination of other measures (levels I and IV, or student growth) may be impacted by the use of off grade level items and states must take this into account when using the assessments for accountability purposes.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design. 	<p>Guidance p. 14 15a 15b 28 § 2.1-2.2</p> <p>Guidance Index 8 15a 15b 27 28 29 p. 8 30</p>	<p>The relative scarcity of DOK 3+ items in the assessments makes it difficult to conclude that they reflect “appropriate inclusion of challenging content” and requires “complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills)”</p> <p>There are notes specifying a minimum number of DOK 3+ items in the blueprints. However, from Evidence 28, it is unclear how DOK requirements are being implemented.</p> <p>The discussion of custom item pools in sections Evidence 28, § 2.1 and 2.2 suggests that some students will receive a test with a different blueprint from other students. The current documentation lends itself to the interpretation that this might occur even for students not receiving accommodations.</p> <p>Evidence 29 page 8 identifies the inadequacy of the item pools in providing assessments to the full range of students. This issue needs to be addressed.</p> <p>In Evidence 27, the number of ELA items developed are short of the order, although the Index claims that deliveries exceeded orders. The rationale for 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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>orders listed in Evidence 27 is not explained. Specifically, how was the pool size and item demand determined?</p> <p>The ELA shortfalls in Evidence 27 are not explained in terms of impact on standards coverage. There needs to be an identification of the DOK of these orders and the shortfalls.</p> <p>Evidence 29 states that not all assessments follow blueprint constraints. Please provide the remediation and the assurance that this is not happening in operation with actual students.</p> <p>Appendix B of Evidence 29 demonstrates that many students taking the Spanish language and Braille versions of the SBAC assessments may be receiving assessments not aligned to the blueprints.</p> <p>It is unclear from Evidence 29 if the algorithm used in the simulation would accurately reflect (or accurately reflected) that used in operational testing.</p> <p>Evidence 30 demonstrates issues meeting constraints for the performance tasks. This needs to be addressed – specifically, how the misalignment was resolved.</p> <p>Evidence 8, p. 6 states that states may use their own delivery engines. The peers agree that states will need to provide evidence either that they are using the SBAC engine or that their chosen delivery engine functions the same as the SBAC engine and conforms to the SBAC blueprints for tests being delivered. If a non-SBAC engine does not conform, then it is incumbent upon the state using it to provide all evidence beyond item development for their program. That is, the program will need to be treated as an assessment other than SBAC (although using the</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		SBAC pool).
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Further justification for Purpose 4. Purpose 4 is related to measuring student growth. Where appropriate (e.g., in § 3), evidence should be provided supporting (1) growth interpretations of assessment results, and (2) specific uses of growth estimates. b. Further justification for Purpose 5. Purpose 5 indicates that the assessment results will provide information about how instruction can be improved. This may be beyond the scope of a summative assessment system, since assessment results do not clearly indicate actions to improve instruction. Peers believe that this purpose should be restated or deleted. Alternatively, evidence can be provided where appropriate to support this interpretation / use of assessment results. <p>2.1.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Clarification concerning whether the range of total items by claim identified in the test blueprints is intended to be a tally across assessment targets, or an additional constraint. b. Documentation concerning the basis for exclusion of speaking in the ELA assessments. c. Documentation concerning the Consortium’s criterion for “sufficient alignment” (see Evidence 17 p. 31) and an explanation of how the results of the alignment study cited meets this definition. If sufficient alignment cannot be demonstrated, a remediation plan to achieve sufficient alignment. d. A clear discussion and supporting tables demonstrating the SBAC summative assessments cover the full range of the CCSS standards. The evidence should display the full range of the CCSS standards and indicate which are covered by the SBAC summative assessments. Those standards not assessed should be noted with the reason for their exclusion stated. e. Documentation supporting adherence to the grade level blueprint of assessments administered to students that include off grade level items. f. Documentation that a suitable methodology was implemented for realigning off grade level items to on grade level content for use in administration of off grade level content. <p>2.1.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Documentation supporting the claim that the DOK range of each assessment reflect “appropriate inclusion of challenging content” and requires “complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills)” b. Clarification regarding how DOK requirements are being implemented, for both CAT and fixed forms. <p>2.1.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Explanation of how the implementation of custom item pools described in § 2.1 and 2.2 of Evidence 28 cannot result in test events that are inconsistent with the test blueprints. If they can result in such test events, then a plan for how this will be remedied. b. Documentation with plan addressing the inadequacy of the item pools in providing assessments to the full range of students, identified on p. 8 of Evidence 29. c. An explanation of how DOK requirements are being implemented in the test delivery algorithm. d. An explanation of the basis for the item counts in the orders listed in Evidence 27. e. An explanation of the impact, if any, that the ELA shortfalls in Evidence 27 had / have on standards coverage. f. Documentation that all assessments in operation now conform to blueprints. g. Documentation regarding remediation of the issue that many students taking the Spanish language and Braille versions of the SBAC assessments may be 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>receiving forms or test events that do not conform to the blueprints.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> h. Documentation regarding remediation of the issue in meeting constraints for the performance tasks. i. Documentation that SBAC is appropriately guiding and supporting states in using the appropriate algorithm. Clarification that a state using a different algorithm cannot rely on evidence gathered through the SBAC algorithm. 	
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>2.1.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A waiver to use SBAC due to the exclusion of speaking in the assessment. <p>States should note: Educator evaluation is not a listed purpose of this assessment.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

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> <p>7 15a 15b 53</p>	<p>The documentation states revision based on the results of the cognitive labs, but does not specify what revisions were done or what changes were made to address issues identified (i.e. use of equation editor).</p> <p>There does not appear to be a specific statement about the mode of delivery for review of items. Since this is an electronic assessment, the items should have been reviewed on screen. The Consortium needs to specify the review mode in addition to the thorough documentation already provided.</p> <p>Page 3 of evidence 53 states that the ethnic make-up of the reviews reflects the diversity of the governing states, however the make-up of those states is not listed and the make-up of the math review panel is different from the ELA. While the peers are sensitive to the issues of recruitment, increased transparency would be helpful and support the positive outcome of the review. For example, listing the targets for ethnic make-up of panels and the efforts to recruit. If there were no targets for diversity, instead of claiming the panels matched the diversity of the governing states, simply state that this is the make-up based on the recruitment.</p> <p>The blueprints have a scarcity of items at DOK 3+. This leads the reviewers to question the level of inclusion of higher order skills.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 2.2 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>2.2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Documentation regarding how usability issues discovered during the cognitive labs (e.g., student difficulties using the equation editor) have been addressed. b. Documentation showing that the mode of delivery during item review was the same as that for test administration – in other words, that reviewers reviewed items exactly as they would have been seen by students. c. Documentation regarding the targets for ethnic make-up of panels and the efforts to recruit panels consistent with those targets or, if there were no targets for diversity, a statement to the effect. d. Documentation as per Summary Statement 2.1.3.a. 		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>None.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>11a p. 4 11b 65a 66 67 p. 24 68 pp. 36-41 69b 69c 69d 69e 77a 77b 76</p>	<p>The graphic on p. 4 of Evidence 11a is extremely helpful.</p> <p>Evidence 65a contains links that are important, however many are dead (the link to the collaboration site is not available to the reviewers).</p> <p>Since many documents are supplied as templates, the state will need to provide evidence that they are communicating clearly, effectively and accurately to its educators. These should include state-specific communications on the following issues: usability and accessibility guidelines, on-line test administration procedures, assessment technology requirements, test administrator manuals, and state specific procedures. These should include the content from the SBAC manuals as listed: on-line test administrator manual 67, usability accessibility and accommodations guide 68, UAA guidelines 11a 11b, state procedures manual 65a, test administrator users guide 66, paper pencil TAM 77a 77b, iPad guidelines 76, technology requirements training 69b, student interface training 69c, TA interface training modules 69d, ART training module 69e</p> <p>Evidence 67 p. 24: the thirty-minute timer mentioned in the first paragraph discussing the timeout, disagrees with the twenty-minute timer in the second paragraph. Please clarify.</p> <p>The definition of activity for the inactivity timer may be problematic since students can be clicking on 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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments; If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>66</p> <p>65a 66 69 70 p. 4</p>	<p>screen every minute and still time out due to the definition. Typical computer activity conventions just require mouse movement, not specific activity.</p> <p>Evidence 68: The guidance provided for the read-aloud accommodation (table on pp. 36-41) appears to be challenging to implement or to adhere to during a live administration.</p> <p>If modifications are made to the SBAC systems, what process is in place to inform states of the changes?</p> <p>States need to provide evidence of their state training requirements.</p> <p>Contingency plans need to give more details and clearer guidance on issues such as how to resume test administration in case of lost internet connectivity. SBAC needs to develop contingency guidelines and procedures to address a broad range of possible technology challenges during test administration, and submit these as evidence.</p> <p>The implementation readiness package was not ready based on the evidence provided. The package modules should have been ready beginning in spring 2015. Please provide evidence that the package is ready and the date when it was ready (Evidence 70 p. 4).</p> <p>Since states may use different administration vendors, each state should provide the customized contingency plans detailed for their state, and in alignment with SBAC’s guidelines.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>States need to provide evidence that test administrators have procedures and access to helpdesk/troubleshooting support.</p> <p>States need to provide evidence that they have determined that schools meet the readiness guidelines prior to operational utilization.</p>
Section 2.3 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>2.3.1</p> <p>a. A clarification to reconcile the disagreement, in Evidence 67 p. 24, between (1) the thirty-minute timer mentioned in the first paragraph discussing the timeout, and (2) the twenty-minute timer referenced in the second paragraph. Provision of the clarification to states.</p> <p>2.3.2</p> <p>a. Documentation of the communication plan (to states) when modifications are made to the SBAC systems.</p> <p>2.3.3</p> <p>a. Contingency plans addressing a broad range of technology challenges, providing more details and clearer guidance on issues such as how to resume test administration in case of lost internet connectivity.</p> <p>b. Documentation that the Implementation Readiness Package has been fully developed and released, together with the release date.</p> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>2.3.3</p> <p>a. A contingency plan detailed for their state, and in alignment with SBAC’s guidelines.</p> <p>b. Documentation that test administrators have technology failure contingency procedures in place and access to helpdesk/troubleshooting support.</p> <p>c. Documentation of school readiness for operational administration of technology-based assessments.</p>		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.5 – Test Security</p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS</p> <p>65a 65b 66 78</p>	<p>The documents appear to defer much of the test security and irregularity detection to the states. However, peers felt that this critical element implied that SBAC should have its own programs of post hoc assessment for irregularities (data forensics) and ongoing test security monitoring including social media monitoring.</p> <p>Information in 65b should be communicated to states</p> <p>SBAC should maintain a security log overall to ensure security of the summative assessment system itself.</p> <p>States need to provide evidence of their security policies and procedures in accordance with the investigation and remediation procedures for SBAC.</p>
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>2.5.1</p> <p>a. Documentation that SBAC has in place security protocols and procedures to protect SBAC items and assessments.</p> <p>2.5.2</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>a. Documentation that information in 65b is communicated to states.</p> <p>2.5.4</p> <p>Documentation of the implementation of the security logging and the remediation plan for incidents that may impact the validity of the assessment (including communications).</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>2.5</p> <p>Documentation of state’s security policies and procedures and the relationship of the state’s policies and procedures to those of SBAC. In other words, a state’s security policies and procedures should reference SBAC’s policies and procedures and demonstrate coherence with these. It should be clear from all available documentation (regardless of source – SBAC or state) that all aspects of critical element 2.5 are addressed.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results; To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS</p> <p>65a 66 134</p> <p>133</p>	<p>SBAC needs to provide evidence that they are monitoring test item exposure and drift to ensure integrity on an ongoing basis. States must provide evidence of this item with respect to administration and use.</p> <p>Please detail what is the low risk item stated in Evidence 133 and explain what is being done about this issue or why the issue is not being addressed.</p> <p>States must provide evidence of this item.</p> <p>For reporting outside the SBAC system, states need to provide evidence of compliance with this item.</p>
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		
<p>2.6.1</p>		
<p>a. Documentation of monitoring of test item exposure and drift done by SBAC to ensure integrity of the assessment system.</p>		
<p>2.6.2</p>		
<p>a. Further explanation of the low risk item in Evidence 133, including any actions being taken to address it or a reason why it is not being addressed.</p>		
<hr/>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p>		
<p>2.6.1</p>		
<p>a. Documentation of compliance with this item with respect to “administration” and “use of test results.”</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.6.2 a. All. 2.6.3		
For states reporting outside of the SBAC system, documentation of compliance with this item.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity; 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Guidance 7 17 104 105 124 pp. 86-89 131</p>	<p>Evidence 104 and 105 are the most direct evidence.</p> <p>How have the low ratings from 104 and 105 been addressed if at all?</p> <p>Evidence 124 achievement level feedback on pp. 86-89 suggests panels not understanding the standard setting process. How has this been addressed?</p> <p>The ELA shortfalls in evidence 27 are not explained in terms of impact on standards coverage. There needs to be an identification of the DOK of these orders and the shortfalls.</p> <p>Evidences 104 and 105 are the only alignment between standards and test items, however these studies do not encompass each grade level. Please provide evidence of alignment between operational tests at each grade level and the CCSS.</p> <p>Since the system allows student tests to include off grade level items, SBAC needs to report the rate at which it occurs and the impact on student scores as well as describe the implications for match to blueprints since presumably the blueprints were developed for on grade level test forms / events.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. 		<p>SBAC needs to demonstrate adherence to the guidance regarding off grade level testing condition #2 on page 14. (Some reviewers felt the guidance means off grade level items cannot be used for any score purpose while others felt the guidance means off grade level items can be used in determining scores but not proficiency) Only on grade level items are used for score production and the on grade level items used cover the full range of the standards at that grade level.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence demonstrating the CAT forms students are scored upon match the blueprints submitted as evidence. Please submit this evidence for operational tests instead of simulations with the plan for monitoring this process.</p> <p>To maintain a valid item bank, SBAC needs to monitor item exposure and run post hoc analyses to ensure the system has the same characteristics as designed and approved.</p> <p>N/A: State responsibility.</p>
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>3.1.1</p> <p>a. Documentation regarding how issues of low ratings in Evidence 104 have been addressed. Examples: Evidence 104, p. 18 shows SBAC has a low rating on</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>“high quality items and variety of item types.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Documentation regarding how the low ratings on panelist comprehension of the standard setting process (Evidence 124, pp. 86-89), was addressed. c. Documentation regarding the ELA item shortfalls in Evidence 27 affected the item pool and how those shortfalls were addressed. d. Evidence of alignment between operational tests and the CCSS for those grade levels not covered in Evidence 104 and Evidence 105. (There must be evidence of alignment for every grade level.) e. Documentation regarding the rate at which off grade level testing occurs, the impact of off grade level testing on student scores, and the implications of off grade level testing for blueprint satisfaction of test events. f. Documentation demonstrating adherence to the Guidance regarding off grade level testing condition #2 on p. 14. (Some reviewers felt the Guidance means off grade level items cannot be used for any score purpose while others felt the Guidance means off grade level items can be used in determining scores but not proficiency.) g. Documentation that the operational CAT test event that students are scored on match the blueprints submitted as evidence. A plan for monitoring the process of evaluating match to blueprint for all test events administered. h. Documentation of plan for monitoring item exposure and conducting post hoc analyses to ensure the system has the same characteristics as designed and approved. 	
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>3.1.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. All. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>7 25 130b</p>	<p>Cognitive labs are compelling and good evidence for this critical element.</p> <p>Documentation states that revisions were made based on the results of the cognitive labs, but does not specify what revisions were done or what changes were made to address issues identified (i.e. use of equation editor).</p>
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>x The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>3.2</p> <p> a. Documentation as per 2.2.a</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>None.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>7 61 130b 130c</p>	<p>The summary of evidence in Evidence 130b p. 8 is not compelling for meeting this critical element.</p> <p>DIF and biserial correlations calculated and used...good.</p> <p>Evidence 61 does not discriminate between interim and summative items. Please provide confirmation that this applies only to the summative items.</p> <p>Evidence 7 p. 166: Good evidence for unidimensionality but again not specific to summative vs other tests - please specify.</p> <p>Evidence 130c p. 5: Bias estimates are unacceptable for 3rd grade in ELA and some other grades. Also for Math claims 2 and 4. Please provide evidence the claim level classifications that are reported are not negatively impacted by the bias.</p> <p>Please provide model fit information based on operational assessment data instead of just pilot data.</p> <p>Please provide clarification that items removed from the dimensionality analysis were removed from the bank as well and not merely removed from the analysis.</p> <p>The item vector dimensionality study could have bene stronger if it included the possibility of more than two dimensions.</p> <p>Not clear if scaling at the claim level was considered.</p>
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Confirmation that Evidence 61 and Evidence 7 p. 166 apply to the summative items. b. Documentation that claim level classifications are not negatively impacted by large bias estimates in 3rd grade ELA, and for Math Claims 2 and 4. c. Model fit information based on operational assessment data. d. Confirmation that items removed from the dimensionality analysis were retired from further operational use. 	
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p>		
3.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen. 	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>7 p. 443 137 139 156</p>	<p>In Evidence 7 there is no clear explanation of how SBAC lines up with PISA or NAEP even though they used embedded items. The purpose appeared to be to ground the standard setting but how they actually helped to inform the process isn’t clear. It isn’t clear how inclusion of these items helped to show that “assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.”</p> <p>Evidence 7 p. 443: Not clear how the ACT benchmarks were projected on to the SBAC scale. Please clarify how this occurred and how this was used to provide the validity evidence relevant to this critical element.</p> <p>Evidence 139: The high pass rate for students who are failing the course does support this critical element.</p> <p>Evidence 137: Peers are not sure this is relevant to this critical element. The importance of the results was not presented.</p>
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>3.4</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Clarification of how inclusion of PISA and NAEP items in the standard setting, and how projection of ACT benchmarks onto the SBAC scale, helped to show that “assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.” b. Discussion of the high pass rates on the Smarter Balanced assessments for students failing the course in the Washington: Linking Course Grades to Smarter Balanced Cut Scores report, with respect to meeting this critical element. <hr/> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>3.4</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

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"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>7 p. 472 130c pp. 14, 17, 22-34, 36-41</p>	<p>There needs to be additional information concerning which states were included in the calculations of reliability and categorical classification decisions. The calculations should include data from all states included in that round. Per follow-up communication, CT, MI, and NH were not included in these calculations.</p> <p>Per ED, this critical element implies a requirement for state-specific reliabilities. These state-specific reliabilities should be either in the submissions of the Consortium or the State.</p> <p>130c: Total score reliabilities are acceptable. Claim reliabilities are low, but impact is likely marginal. Total score reliabilities are low in Decile 1 for grades 7 and 11 in mathematics (p. 14) and 11th grade LEP and IDEA (p. 17).</p> <p>130c: CSEMs high for the low end (pp. 36-41), especially in relation to typical ranges for achievement levels (007: p. 472). Frequently the CSEM is about a 1/3rd of a typical range. This could impact achievement level accuracy for students and may limit the utility of the assessments for measuring student growth.</p> <p>130c: Classification accuracy for distinguishing between level 2 and 3 is low for ELA grades 3-5 (pp. 22-34). Since level 3 is proficient, this has an impact on proficiency designations.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement. 		<p>Consistency estimates are not provided or addressed. The submission should include a statement or rationale for claiming that test procedure produces test forms meeting this requirement, especially in light of potential differences in results for different algorithms.</p> <p>There needs to be evidence that all of the data included in computing the reliability-related estimates are based on the same implementation of the same algorithm.</p>
<p>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>4.1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A statement responding to areas of low reliability and low accuracy (Either SBAC or the relevant state) Test reliability of the assessments estimated for each state separately and each subgroup within state (these estimates will also need to meet adequacy criteria) Estimates of consistency of classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results (these estimates will also need to meet adequacy criteria) 		
<hr/> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>4.1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (Either SBAC or the relevant state) Test reliability of the assessments estimated for each state separately and each subgroup within state (these estimates will also need to meet adequacy criteria) If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

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>11a 30 126</p>	<p>The evidence supports attention in design and development to ensure fairness and accessibility.</p> <p>Only simulation or field test data, showing no DIF or low DIF on the assessment.</p> <p>Peers agreed there should be ongoing tracking of DIF items that have been left in the pool.</p> <p>Accommodations are not tested; there are only lit reviews in Evidence 126.</p> <p>See notes on low IEP and LEP reliabilities.</p> <p>Evidence 11a is not prescriptive and does not provide data validating the use of the accommodations for certain students.</p> <p>Would like to see reliability estimates for students using accommodations, based on operational data.</p>
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>4.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Documentation supporting ongoing tracking of DIF items left in the operational pool, to ensure that any negative impact they have on fairness and accessibility remains minimal. b. Estimated reliability for students using accommodations, based on operational data. <hr/> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>4.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Index pp. 76-77 104 130c pp. 33-35</p>	<p>It is not clear how Evidence 104 addresses this critical element.</p> <p>Evidence 130c: The reported SEMs are large and CSEMs are especially high for certain deciles and grades.</p> <p>The bin analysis in Evidence #130c pp. 33-35 demonstrates a need for more representation at the low end of the scales. The need is very pronounced for mathematics.</p> <p>Comments on earlier critical elements addressing representation across the scale are relevant here as well.</p> <p>Index pp. 76-78 calls attention to lack of items at the low end, impacting the test’s ability to test those students. SBAC should follow through on stated plans to enrich the item bank at the low end.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>4.3 Documentation that Smarter Balanced has enriched the item bank such that the assessments can provide a more precise estimate of student performance for low-achieving students.</p> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>4.3</p> <p> a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>70</p>	<p>Evidence 70: The scoring module was not ready, per this document. We would like evidence that the implementation readiness package was made available and the dates on which each module was released, especially the scoring module.</p> <p>We would like additional evidence of standardized scoring procedures and protocols, specifically with respect to the use of the same CAT algorithm across states. (Scoring and item selection for test forms are interdependent for CATs.)</p>
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>4.4 Evidence of established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols, specifically:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Documentation that the implementation readiness package was made available and the dates on which each module was released, especially the scoring module. A plan to ensure timely future delivery of materials and modules necessary for third party administration vendors. b. Documentation of reliable and accurate scoring for alternate test forms (i.e. paper and pencil, paper braille). <hr/> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>4.4</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>Simulation studies provided evidence regarding adherence to blueprint (and those simulations did not always produce conforming forms).</p> <p>Need evidence that operational forms always produce conforming forms for all students.</p>
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>a. Documentation that the assessment system always produces blueprint conforming forms for all students who took an operational form or test event, regardless of format or accommodation.</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>42 49a 49b 50 51 70 130d 143 145 169</p>	<p>This critical element is largely redundant with the prior one, because of CAT. However, it is relevant to the paper-pencil version, Spanish version, ASL, and Braille versions.</p> <p>Noted systematic reviews for Spanish translations. Expected evidence of analogous reviews for ASL and Braille.</p> <p>We found no empirical evidence of this. For example, there was no analysis comparing descriptive statistics on students taking different versions, and discussion of results to address comparability. Some comparisons, for example adaptive Braille versus paper Braille versus CAT, are especially relevant.</p> <p>(We would expect to see this for operational data, now that it is available.)</p> <p>Has SBAC attended to comparability across devices empirically? Can it? (Is device information collected for test events?)</p>
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>4.6</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation that the Consortium followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments (i.e. evidence of systemic checking the ASL and Braille versions of items.) Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results (i.e. evidence of comparability between standard Smarter Balanced assessments, ASL, Braille, Spanish, and other versions of the assessment using operational data). Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results (i.e. evidence of comparability across the different devices allowed for standard Smarter Balanced assessments.) 		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>4.6</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
a.	If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Index 155</p>	<p>Useful to have advisory groups for different student populations.</p> <p>Evidence 155: Many of the proposed analyses seem standard for a tech report.</p> <p>Index (pp. 97-98): Outline of the review cycle.</p> <p>Unclear to the Peers whether a complete 2014-2015 Technical Report exists. We would like a complete technical report for 2014-2015 or an explanation for why it is still in process.</p> <p>For States using SBAC: 4.7 is covered by the SBAC submission.</p>
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: 4.7</p> <p>a. To support that the Consortium has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, a complete technical report for the operational administration of the Smarter Balanced assessments in 2014-15.</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states: None.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards; • States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs; • Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment; • Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS</p> <p>11a 11b 97 98 128</p>	<p>11a: SBAC should provide guidance when use of the SBAC test is not appropriate. This is not provided. (States also need to provide their specific guidance on this critical element for alternate assessment.)</p> <p>This critical element should be provided in the state-specific submission.</p> <p>126: This is met with respect to accommodations. See first bullet above.</p> <p>97 and 98: Evidence of this is provided. (States need to provide evidence that they have given appropriate guidance to their IEP teams.)</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>students with disabilities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities; • Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA; • Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments); • The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum. 		<p>128: Evidence of this is provided. (States need to provide evidence that they have given appropriate guidance to their IEP teams.) This is provided.</p> <p>Evidence of these last three critical elements should come from the state-specific or alternative assessment submissions.</p>
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u> </u>X_ No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>5.1.1</p> <p> a. States need to provide specific guidance associated with their AA-AAS.</p> <p>5.1.2</p> <p> a. All.</p> <p>5.1.3</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.1.4	a. States need to provide specific guidance associated with their AA-AAS.	
	a. States need to provide evidence of specific guidance provided to IEP teams.	
5.1.5	a. Documentation that the state adheres to the SBAC Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines, or state-specific evidence to address this part of the critical element.	
5.1.6	a. All.	
5.1.7	a. All.	
5.1.8	a. All.	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS</p> <p>11a 11b 97 98 126 128</p>	<p>Evidence 97: Guidance unclear and not helpful. Steps 3 and 4 do not help schools determine whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodations, and if so, which accommodations are appropriate.</p> <p>Evidence 128: Provided as evidence, but does not pertain to ELs</p> <p>Evidence 126: Provides a framework, but needs operationalization to meet this critical element</p>
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>5.2</p> <p>a. Documentation regarding how schools determine whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodations, and if so, which accommodations are appropriate.</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>5.2</p> <p>a. Documentation that the state adheres to the SBAC Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines, or state-specific evidence to address this part of the critical element.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities (SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS;</p> <p>11a 11b 65a 97 98 100a 100b 126 129</p>	<p>If a state excludes some accommodation tools, then the State needs to provide a rationale that it is still meeting this critical element.</p> <p>Points (i) and (ii) are not shown. Claim (iii) is not made or stated. There is no comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations. (And a discussion relevant to comparability in light of findings.)</p> <p>Suggestion: Meeting with the appropriate advisory group with information relevant to this critical element and soliciting their advice re need for follow-up investigation.</p> <p>65a: Consortium has a process, p. 15, which depends on the State having a process. The State needs to provide their process for requesting and reviewing.</p>
<p>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: 5.3.3</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Documentation that the Consortium 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. b. Documentation that the Consortium has determined that the accommodations it provides 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 (e.g., a comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations, and a discussion relevant to comparability in light of findings). 		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p>		
5.3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If the State does not adhere to the SBAC Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines, state-specific evidence to address this critical element. If a state excludes some accommodation tools, then the State needs to provide a rationale that it is still meeting this critical element. 	
5.3.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If the State does not adhere to the SBAC Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines, state-specific evidence to address this critical element. If a state excludes some accommodation tools, then the State needs to provide a rationale that it is still meeting this critical element. 	
5.3.4		
All.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS;</p> <p>96 97 98 99 126</p>	<p>Monitoring compliance with accommodation policies and procedures: State responsibility</p> <p>Monitoring appropriateness of accommodation (that they are continuing to function as intended): Consortium responsibility</p>
<p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>5.4</p> <p>a. Documentation of all aspects of this critical element as it relates to monitoring compliance with accommodation policies and procedures</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 SMARTER BALANCED

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; • The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>49 86 95</p>	<p>States are responsible for first two critical elements.</p> <p>Evidence 86: This critical element is met for SBAC.</p>
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>6.1.1 a. All.</p> <p>6.1.2</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet	<p>Evidence of a technically sound procedure has been provided.</p> <p>Please provide information re what the Consortium was targeting w/r/t panelist ethnicity distribution.</p>

Section 6.2 Summary Statement
<p><u> x </u> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p> <hr/> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>6.2.</p> <p>a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</p> <p>(1) 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>(2) 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>86 106 107</p>	<p>The Consortium provided the evidence that could reasonably be expected of them at this early stage in the program. This critical element should be addressed more fully as the program develops – for example, through additional validity studies.</p> <p>This critical element is not relevant at the SBAC Consortium level. However, this needs to be addressed by states in their state-specific submission or through the submission of the alternate assessment consortium.</p>
<p>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>6.3.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.4 – Reporting</p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration; • The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results; • The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement; ○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors); ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; ○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>Responsibility for meeting this critical element lies principally with the State.</p> <p>There is evidence that SBAC had a plan to develop a tool (with Amplify) for reporting. States need to produce evidence to meet this critical element.</p> <p>The SBAC reporting system appears to meet sub-bullets 1 and 2. However, the states not using the SBAC reporting tools need to provide evidence to meet sub-bullets 1 and 2.</p> <p>All states need to provide evidence showing that sub-bullets 3 and 4 are being met.</p> <p>In regards to sub-bullet 4, the SBAC system provides Spanish and Vietnamese reports upon request.</p> <p>All states need to provide evidence of report delivery.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="padding-left: 40px;">that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. 		States must provide evidence for this critical element.
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p> <hr/> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>6.4.1</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a. All.</p> <p>6.4.2</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">b. All.</p> <p>6.4.3</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a. All documentation under this bullet and sub-bullets as it pertains to delivery of reports.</p> <p>6.4.3.1</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a. All, if the state is not using the Smarter Balanced-hosted reporting system and the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium reporting system user guide.</p> <p>6.4.3.2</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a. All, if the state is not using the Smarter Balanced-hosted reporting system and the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium reporting system user guide.</p> <p>6.4.3.3</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a. All.</p> <p>6.4.3.4</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a. All.</p> <p>6.4.4</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a. All.</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.