



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Christina Kishimoto  
Superintendent  
Hawaii State Department of Education  
1390 Miller Street  
Honolulu, HI 96813

January 24, 2019

Dear Superintendent Kishimoto:

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

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

External peer reviewers and Department staff carefully evaluated HIDOE's submission, which included several assessments. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and the Department's analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following in regards to the submitted assessments:

- Reading/ language arts and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (Smarter Balanced). **Substantially meets requirements.**
- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in high school (Smarter Balanced). **Substantially meets requirements.**
- Reading/language arts and mathematics alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards (HSA-Alt) in grades 3-8 and 10. **Substantially meets requirements.**
- Science general assessments in grades 4 and 8 (HSA Science). **Substantially meets requirements.**

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

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

- Science general assessments in high school (HSA Science Biology HS end-of-course (EOC)). **Substantially meets requirements.**
- Science alternate assessments on alternate academic achievement standards (HSA-Alt) in grades 4, 8 and high school. **Substantially meets requirements.**
- Native Hawaiian language assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics in grades 3 and 4 and science in grade 4 (KĀ'EO). **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 component that **partially meets** requirements does not meet a number of the requirements of the statute and regulations and/or 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.

I understand that HIDOE will be implementing new alternate assessments in the 2019-2020 school year. I also understand that HIDOE will be implementing a new science general assessment in the 2019-2020 school year. I want to remind you that each of these new assessments must be submitted for a full peer review after the first operational administration. I hope the feedback here will help you in the development of your new assessments.

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

The specific list of items required for HIDOE to submit is enclosed with this letter. HIDOE must provide to the Department a plan and timeline by which it will submit the additional documentation within 30 days of the receipt of this letter. Resubmission should occur once all necessary evidence is complete (rather than in multiple submissions). The Department expects to conduct two peer review sessions yearly for new assessments and resubmissions; these will generally be held in February and August each year, with resubmissions due around December and June. HIDOE's plan and timeline should propose resubmission according to this schedule (e.g., HIDOE will resubmit evidence in summer 2019).

The Department placed a condition on HIDOE'S Title I, Part A grant award beginning July 1, 2018. This condition will remain in place until such time as HIDOE presents evidence that the State assessments meet all of the requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. If adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action.

Additionally, the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) will monitor progress on matters pertaining to requirements in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) related to the participation of students with disabilities in Title I assessments. Insufficient progress to address such matters may lead OSERS to place a condition on HDOE's Federal fiscal year 2019 IDEA Part B grant award.

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

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 my staff at: [OSS.Hawaii@ed.gov](mailto:OSS.Hawaii@ed.gov).

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank T. Brogan  
Assistant Secretary for  
Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Keith Kameoka, Acting Director, Assessment and Accountability Branch

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

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<b>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</b>	For all assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the same academic content standards are applied to all students in the State, including those taking the KĀ‘EO.</li> </ul>
<b>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</b>	For the State’s science standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State, in developing the challenging science standards, conducted meaningful and timely consultation as specified in section 1111(a)(1)(A) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).</li> </ul> For the KĀ‘EO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the academic content standards contain content that is coherent within and across grades, specifically:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Students who participate in the KĀ‘EO assessments are held to the same challenging academic content standards as all other students in the State.</li> <li>○ Evidence of how the content standards are coherent for students transitioning from grades where the KĀ‘EO assessment is administered to grades where the general State assessment is administered.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b>	For the KĀ‘EO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the test design and test development process aligns the assessments to the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards, specifically:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Science test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of the State’s grade-level science content standards and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results.</li> <li>○ Processes to ensure that the science assessment reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (e.g., that the test blueprints represent the cognitive demand found in the science content standards).</li> <li>○ Evidence that the KĀ‘EO assessments demonstrate sufficient alignment with the State academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>2.2 – Item Development</b>	For the KĀ‘EO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement in terms of content and cognitive process, specifically:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A plan for addressing the gaps in item distribution based on depth of knowledge classification.</li> <li>○ Item difficulty across content areas as identified in the independent alignment study.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<b>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</b>	<p>For the KĀ‘EO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State defines the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups consistent with its approved State plan and with its other statewide assessments.</li> </ul>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b>	<p>For the KĀ‘EO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence the assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the State’s academic content standards that apply to all students in the State in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), balance of content, and cognitive complexity (specifically clarification regarding items on the test connected to various content standards which do not appear to match the test blueprints).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b>	<p>For the HSA-Alt in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards (e.g., results from additional cognitive laboratory study or expert judgments of items or relations between items and teacher ratings of student performance).</li> </ul> <p>For the KĀ‘EO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence the assessments measure the cognitive processes specified in the State’s academic content standards, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the State’s academic content standards that apply to all students in the State in terms of cognitive complexity.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b>	<p>For the KĀ‘EO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based (e.g., a plan for either reducing the overlap between subscale scores or ceasing to report subscale scores).</li> </ul>
<b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b>	<p>For HSA-Alt in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of relationships with measures of the same constructs (e.g., same subject grades) or related variables (e.g., instructional time on content standards, teacher ratings of academic skills on a measure with established reliability and validity evidence).</li> </ul> <p>For the KĀ‘EO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Correlations between total scores for reading/language arts, mathematics, and science; OR</li> <li>○ Correlations with course grades and teacher estimations of academic competence and student test scores.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<b>4.1 – Reliability</b>	<p>For the KĀ‘EO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population, and overall and conditional standard error of measurement, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Overall standard errors of measure (SEMs) for total scores across grades and content areas.</li> <li>○ Estimates by student groups (e.g., gender, free/reduced lunch, race/ethnicity) for reliability as indicated by coefficient alpha, SEMs, and classification accuracy.</li> <li>○ Evidence of improved reliability of subscale scores (particularly where estimates of reliability fell below 0.70).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b>	<p>For HSA-Alt in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students (e.g., evidence of the average number of items taken by each student at the various starting points of the adaptive test design; evidence of actions taken to modify the student placement questionnaire to provide more precise starting points).</li> </ul>
<b>4.4 – Scoring</b>	<p>For reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has monitored the quality and reliability of performance task scoring conducted during its test administration for the Smarter Balanced tests.</li> </ul>
<b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b>	<p>For all assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instructions to IEP teams that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.</li> </ul>
<b>5.2 – Procedures for Including ELs</b>	<p>For the KĀ‘EO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of procedures to ensure the inclusion of all students in a Hawaiian language immersion programs in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and that Hawaii State Department of Education (HIDOE) clearly communicates this information to schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Procedures for determining whether a student enrolled in a Hawaiian language immersion program should be assessed with accommodation(s).</li> <li>○ Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for students enrolled in a Hawaiian language immersion program.</li> <li>○ Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students enrolled in Hawaiian language immersion programs.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>5.3 – Accommodations</b>	<p>For the KĀ‘EO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the accommodations (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting individual students’ needs, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparisons of scores.</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b>	For all assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of a consistent process to monitor the alignment between the accommodations used in the classroom, and those reported in IEP/504 plans and provided on State assessments.</li> </ul>
<b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</b>	For the K̄ĀEO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Specifically, that the achievement standards used for this assessment are the same as those used for all students in the State (except for those taking the HSA-Alt).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b>	For HSA-Alt science assessments in grades 8 and 11: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State 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.</li> </ul> For the K̄ĀEO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards for this assessment;               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Specifically, that the method used to establish achievement standards for this assessment produced standards which are the same as those used for all students in the State (except for those taking the HSA-Alt).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b>	For the HSA-Alt: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. HIDOE should provide this evidence by December 15, 2020.</li> </ul> For the K̄ĀEO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 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.</li> </ul>

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## February 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes

(resubmission of evidence based on 2016 Peer Review)



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

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

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

**Contents**

<b>SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2.2 – Item Development.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2.3 – Test Administration .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>4.4 – Scoring .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>5.3 – Accommodations.....</b>	<b>18</b>

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

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

### **SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

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

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



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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that, for cases where an assessment includes off-grade-level content, assessments produce grade level student achievement scores that are based only on grade-level items.</li> <li>Evidence that the item pools for all versions of the assessments (i.e., general, American Sign Language, Braille and Spanish) are sufficient to support the test design requirements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Evidence #S023</i> – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Race to the Top Grant Proposal (<a href="#">pp. 45-46</a>)</li> <li><a href="#">Evidence #S025 – Smarter Balanced Mathematics Expanded Item Pools</a></li> <li><i>Evidence #S026</i> – Pool Expansion Information Presentation</li> <li><a href="#">Evidence #S027 – 2016-17 Expanded Pool Standards Alignment</a></li> <li><a href="#">Evidence Packet #S010 – Blueprint Fidelity</a></li> <li><i>Evidence Packet #S012</i> – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses</li> <li><i>S013</i></li> </ul>	<p>This requirement is met.</p> <p>Peers would have appreciated a clarification that when expanded pool items are used, that the relevant psychometric considerations are being addressed – e.g., that item parameters used are established for all grades spanned.</p> <p>Peers noted that several items span a relatively large grade range (roughly 20% in MA and 13% in R/LA span 3 or more grades). (Peer calculations based on S027). This seemed high.</p> <p>Peers commend SBAC for producing the gap analyses (S012). Peers believe that steps taken to bridge the gaps as described in S013 should resolve the issues.</p> <p>Peers ask that the program continue to monitor those grades/versions where blueprint fulfillment was less than 100%, as well as those where there had yet to be administrations.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><u>  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Evidence that the Smarter Balanced test design aligns the assessments to the full depth and breadth for all the academic content standards in R/LA and mathematics at each grade level.</li> <li>B. Evidence that the item selection procedures for the computer adaptive test (CAT) online assessment adequately deliver tests that meet test design requirements for the intended depth of knowledge (DOK) of the assessments (also applies to evidence requested for element 2.2).</li> <li>C. Evidence that the item pools for all versions of the assessments (i.e., general, American Sign Language, Braille and Spanish) are sufficient to support the test design requirements. Provide, upon completion of the item development plans, evidence that 100% of test events for students receiving any version of the assessment conform to the test blueprints.</li> </ul>		

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY**

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

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b> (stemming from 2016 peer review)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence as noted for all item pools in element 2.1 above.</li> <li>Evidence of a summary report that the CAT administered test forms matched test blueprints.</li> <li>Evidence that Smarter Balanced assessments that include off-grade level content conform to the on-grade level blueprint for the assessment.</li> <li>Evidence of alignment of sample test forms for grades 3, 4, 6 and 7 in R/LA and mathematics.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">Evidence #S005 – Hawaii Smarter Balanced Technical Report, 2014-2015</a> (pp. 42-46)</li> <li><a href="#">Evidence #S006 – South Dakota Technical Report 2014-2015</a> (pp. 44-49)</li> <li><a href="#">Evidence Packet #S010 – Blueprint Fidelity</a></li> <li><a href="#">Evidence Packet #012 – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses</a></li> <li><a href="#">Evidence Packet #S010 – Blueprint Fidelity</a></li> <li><a href="#">Evidence #S011 – Smarter Balanced Technical Report, 2015-2016</a> (pp. 6-6 through 6-9)</li> <li><a href="#">Evidence Packet #S010 – Blueprint Fidelity</a></li> <li><a href="#">Evidence #S030 – WestEd Alignment Study Proposal</a></li> <li><a href="#">Evidence #S032 – WestEd Alignment Study</a></li> <li><a href="#">Evidence #104 – Fordham Institute – Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation Assessments</a> (p. 18)</li> <li><a href="#">Evidence #S008 – Smarter Balanced Math Summative CAT and Interim Assessment Item</a></li> </ul>	<p>See Comments in 2.1.</p> <p>See Comments in 2.1, bullets 2 and 4. The evidence was provided but it does not support the claim that the CAT administered test forms matched the test blueprints in every case.</p> <p>This evidence has been provided. See Comment in 2.1, bullet 3.</p> <p>The WestEd alignment study (S032) assessed the extent to which each item in the noted grades matched its targeted CCSS standard. However, for DoK (cognitive complexity), the study did not assess the extent to which each item matched the cognitive complexity implied by its targeted standard. Rather, it documented experts’ judgments of the level of cognitive complexity at which the item appears to be assessing the standard. The study’s design can furnish appropriate evidence to support (or refute) a claim concerning the degree of content alignment between items and standards, but it cannot provide appropriate evidence for a claim about the match between the cognitive complexity of a test and the cognitive complexity of the standards to which the test is written.</p> <p>Peers felt that the study does not address the question “Does the item match the DoK of the standard?”</p> <p>The measures taken to improve alignment are entirely appropriate. However, evidence of <i>improved</i> alignment was not provided. Peers expected to see a before-after comparison.</p>

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

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

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

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b>                      (stemming from 2016 peer review-States may address this with State-level data)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that supports the internal structure of the Smarter Balanced assessments using operational data from the summative assessments (e.g., a correlational analysis of subscores and total scores).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Evidence #S004</i> - Assessing the Dimensionality of Smarter Balanced Summative Tests (pp. 2-4).</li> </ul>	<p>S004 provides the evidence requested.</p> <p>Recommendation: Peers recognize the challenge of assessing dimensionality using item scores in a CAT context; SBAC could contribute meaningfully to the literature on this topic by taking it on as a special research study.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

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

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

# STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii General and Alternate Resubmission

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

February 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii General and Alternate  
Resubmission

Contents

<b>SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS .</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS .....</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	4
2.2 – Item Development.....	5
2.3 – Test Administration .....	6
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration.....	7
2.5 – Test Security .....	7
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....	9
<b>SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....</b>	<b>10</b>
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	11
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	13
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure .....	15
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables.....	16
<b>SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER .....</b>	<b>18</b>
4.1 – Reliability.....	18
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	19
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	20
4.4 – Scoring .....	21
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms .....	22
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment .....	22
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance.....	23
<b>SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS .....</b>	<b>24</b>
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities .....	25
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	29
5.3 – Accommodations.....	31
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations.....	31
<b>SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .</b>	<b>33</b>
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students .....	33
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....	34
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards .....	36
6.4 – Reporting.....	37

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

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

Elements 1.1 through 1.5 Previously met for these 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 General and Alternate Resubmission**

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.1 – Test Design and Development		
<b>Section 2.1- Smarter Balanced (2016)—see smarter balanced peer notes</b>		
<b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b>		
see smarter balanced peer notes, February 2018		

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>2.2 – Item Development</b></p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p>General Assessment – Science</p> <p>SCI-034_Response to Alignment DOK</p> <p>SCI-035_SY2015-16 HSA Science Bio Tech Report (pp. 7-9, 67-68)</p>	<p><b>General Assessment - Science:</b></p> <p>The State responded to gaps in the alignment report by systematically developing new items. Neither an external nor an internal review has been performed on the new pool of items.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grades 4 and 8: 55% of the items on each of the four assessment forms had a DOK level that was the same or higher than the DOK level of the assigned benchmark.</li> <li>• Evidence shows that additional items were developed to improve DOK, especially for HS Biology.</li> </ul> <p>The State claims to have developed a plan to add items to correct the issues identified.</p> <p>The State does not assert, however, that upon completion of this item development the 2016-17 assessments met design specifications.</p>
<p><b>2.2-smarter balanced (2016) –see smarter balanced notes</b></p>		
<p><b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement (Smarter Balanced)</b></p>		
<p>see smarter balanced peer notes, February 2018</p>		
<p><b>Stemming from 2016 review (General Science Assessment)</b></p>		
<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"> <li>• Evidence that item development has improved the gaps in DOK within the item pools (as identified in the 2012 independent alignment analysis).</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement for General Science Assessment</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An alignment review (items-to-standards) of the set of items now including the new items, demonstrating that the bank can now fulfill the DOK requirements of the blueprint appropriately.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii General and Alternate Resubmission**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>• Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments;</li> <li>• If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>	<p>General Assessment – ELA/Literacy and Mathematics</p> <p>HI-126_Assessment Section Technology Contingency Plan</p>	<p><b>General Assessment - ELA/Mathematics:</b></p> <p>A contingency plan was developed to address possible technology challenges during test administration. The plan describes the variety of data inputs and outputs related to testing and the transmission and storage of testing information. It also includes vendor contingency plans.</p> <p>The contingency plan exists but does not mention possible resolutions to the most common issues.</p>
<p><b>Stemming from 2016 Smarter Balanced—see smarter balanced notes, but State may also contribute</b></p>		
<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"> <li>• Evidence of a comprehensive contingency plan to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement for General Assessment - ELA/Mathematics</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a comprehensive contingency plan to address possible technology challenges during test administration. For example, the actions to take if a computer freezes or if internet access is lost should be specified.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii General and Alternate Resubmission**

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
<b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b>		
<b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requirement previously met</li> </ul>		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>2.5 – Test Security</b></p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> </ul>	<p>Alternate Assessments – ELA/Literacy, Mathematics, and Science</p> <p>HI-136_Hawaii DOE Test Security Handbook_2017-18 (pp. 32-39)</p> <p>ALT-085_SY2015-16 HSA-Alt Monitoring Results</p> <p>ALT-097_HSA-Alt TAM_2017-18 (pp. 17-22)</p>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – ELA/Literacy, Mathematics, and Science</b></p> <p>The State describes the process of monitoring and detection in detail, and provides evidence of monitoring results.</p> <p>Evidence was provided that shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The process for monitoring testing irregularities during the administration.</li> <li>• Instructions for reporting testing irregularities when they occur.</li> <li>• Test Security Guidelines that include instructions for the correct storage, handling, and return or disposal of all secure testing materials.</li> <li>• Ongoing test administration monitoring and support provided to the test administrators.</li> </ul> <p>State asserts no irregularities occurred during administrations of the alternate assessment, so no followup has been documented.</p>
<b>Stemming from 2016 review:</b>		
For the HSA-Alt assessments in R/LA, mathematics and science, HIDOE must provide:		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that describes how irregularities are monitored and detected for the HSA Alt (e.g., a summary of responses to any HSA-Alt test irregularities).</li> </ul>		
<b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii General and Alternate Resubmission**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</b></p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results;</li> <li>• To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> <li>• To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.</li> </ul>	<p>General Assessment – ELA/Literacy and Mathematics</p> <p>HI-127_Hawaii ESSA Plan 09.21.2017</p> <p>HI-131_Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy (p. 2)</p>	<p><b>General Assessment - ELA/Mathematics:</b></p> <p>HIDOE stated that the minimum and maximum reportable percentages, set at 5% and 95%, are appropriate for both accuracy in reporting and protecting privacy. No rationale was provided to support this claim.</p> <p>Using the cell size of 10 and the 95% cut off, the State still reports that one student is non-proficient (i.e., 90% proficiency in a cell of 10) in the ethnic category in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade.</p> <p>Thus, the rules do not protect student privacy appropriately.</p>
<p><b>Stemming from 2016 peer review</b></p>		
<p>For the entire assessment system, HIDOE must provide:</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a rationale for minimum and maximum percentages in reporting of proficiency level categories.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement for General Assessment - ELA/Mathematics:</b></p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raise the minimum cell size for reporting average to 20.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii General and Alternate Resubmission

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii General and Alternate Resubmission**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> <li>• If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul>	<p>Alternate Assessments – ELA/Literacy, Mathematics, and Science</p> <p>ALT-086_HSA Alt 2017 Phase 1 2 Align Study Report.</p>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – ELA/Literacy, Mathematics, and Science</b></p> <p>Alignment review was independent by Dillard Research Associates.</p> <p>All items demonstrated adequate linkage to standards. DOK matched expectations. Reduction in depth, breadth, and complexity (RDBC) was appropriate. The majority of items were deemed accessible (85%-100%) and bias free (86%-100%).</p> <p>Recommended steps were (1) address mathematics items that received low linkage and RDBC ratings, relative to other content areas, and (2) address items across content areas that had comments or rater disagreement.</p> <p>It is unclear whether the State is committing to following the recommended steps, although given linkage was at least adequate across content areas, next steps may not be required.</p> <p>An independent two-phase alignment study was conducted in 2017. Findings from the study indicate that all 2016 HSA-Alt items demonstrated adequate linkage to grade level content standards and matching of DOK ratings to content specification performance expectations.</p> <p>The study on page 22 discusses the bloom level of items but then reports the DOK alignment.</p> <p>The alignment study is not the typical study common at this time.</p>
<p><b>See smarter balanced (2016) and notes from 2018 review</b></p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii General and Alternate Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Stemming from 2016 review:</b>		
For the HSA-Alt assessments in R/LA, mathematics and science, HIDOE must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>		
<b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement For the HSA-Alt assessments in R/LA, mathematics and science</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii General and Alternate Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>Alternate Assessments – ELA/Literacy, Mathematics, and Science</p> <p>ALT-086_HSA Alt 2017 Phase 1 2 Align Study Report</p> <p>ALT-087_HSA-Alt Cognitive Laboratory Report</p>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – ELA/Literacy, Mathematics, and Science</b></p> <p>The cognitive laboratory study was well conceived and well conducted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cognitive labs were conducted in 2017 to determine the student performance on items designed for the HSA-Alt. The lab results show the HSA-Alt items required demonstration and application of knowledge and skills. However, only 11 students participated. This sample was small.</li> <li>• Alignment Study conducted in 2017 found that all 2016 HSA-Alt items demonstrated adequate linkage to grade level content standards and exhibited DOK ratings aligned to the performance expectations.</li> <li>• Empirical evidence that shows the relationships of items to other measures that require similar levels of cognitive complexity in the content area was not found in the submission.</li> </ul> <p>No mention of alignment between skills and content standards is mentioned in the cognitive lab study presented.</p> <p>No evidence is presented that the items validly measure the content of the AAAS.</p>
<p><b>Stemming from 2016 peer review</b></p>		
<p>For the HSA-Alt assessments in R/LA, mathematics and science, HIDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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"> <li>○ Results of cognitive labs exploring student performance on items that show the items require demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills; OR</li> <li>○ Reports of expert judgment of items that show the items require demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills; OR</li> <li>○ Empirical evidence that shows the relationships of items intended to require demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills to other measures</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii General and Alternate Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
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).		
<b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement For the HSA-Alt assessments in R/LA, mathematics and science</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional evidence of validity based on cognitive processes (e.g., results from additional cognitive laboratory study suggested by AIR in mathematics, Alt 087, p. 26) OR</li> <li>• Other previous suggestions such as expert judgments of items or relations between items and teacher ratings of student performance.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii General and Alternate Resubmission**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p>Alternate Assessments – ELA/Literacy, Mathematics and Science</p> <p>ALT-088_HSA-Alt Tech Report_2015-16_Addendum (pp. 171-185).</p>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – ELA/Literacy, Mathematics and Science</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall model fit analysis was conducted to evaluate the infit and outfit of items from the 2016 forms for reading, mathematics, and science. Range of item infits and outfits was 0.5 to 2 and States claimed the range is acceptable but did not provide rationale for this claim.</li> <li>• Dimensionality analysis indicated the presence of a dominant factor in each of the item pools.</li> </ul> <p>The following issues may require continuous monitoring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The score distribution is non-normal.</li> <li>• Beta values are negatively skewed (p. 152 of HSA-Alt 088).</li> <li>• Internals show some issues with mathematics, possibly due to sample size, which could indicate systemic issues</li> </ul>
<p><b>Stemming from 2016 peer review</b></p>		
<p>For the HSA-Alt assessments in R/LA, mathematics, and science HIDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement For the HSA-Alt assessments in R/LA, mathematics, and science</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>X_ No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii General and Alternate Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>Alternate Assessments – ELA/Literacy, Mathematics and Science</p> <p>ALT-088_HSA-Alt Tech Report_2015-16_Addendum (pp. 185-188).</p>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – ELA/Literacy, Mathematics and Science</b></p> <p>This evidence on relations to other variables is difficult to interpret. Correlations range from .45 to .62 with single item teacher ratings. It is unclear whether scores based on more items, thus likely to be more internally consistent, are available from the Learner Characteristic Inventory (LCI) or another measure. Per the 2016 review, correlations among HSA-Alt scores from various content areas ranged from .75 to .86; thus <u>correlations within measure across content areas exceed correlations across measures within content area</u>. High within-measure correlations can be common with alternate assessments.</p> <p>The LCI is not an appropriate criterion/external variable for gathering validity evidence for an achievement test, because it is designed to measure learning characteristics rather than achievement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Correlations between test results and variables related to students were conducted for ELA and mathematics, but not science (due to an absence of external measures). Correlation coefficients showed a moderate degree of relation (0.45 to 0.62). HIDOE claimed that the correlations are in a reasonable range. Peers think the correlations are somewhat low.</li> <li>• Correlations between proficiency on HS assessments and performance in post-secondary education, vocational training, or employment were not found.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Stemming from 2016 peer review</b></p>		
<p>For HSA-Alt R/LA, mathematics and science assessments, HIDOE must provide:</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 General and Alternate Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of relationships between HSA-Alt scores and scores from similar measures, such as:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Correlations between assessment results and variables related to test takers (e.g., instructional time on content based on grade-level content standards); OR</li> <li>○ Correlations between proficiency on the high-school assessments and performance in post-secondary education, vocational training or employment.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement for HSA-Alt R/LA, mathematics and science assessments</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of relations with measures of the same constructs (e.g., same subject grades) or related variables such as the aforementioned (e.g., instructional time on content standards, teacher ratings of academic competence - reading, mathematics, and/or science skills- on a measure with established reliability and validity evidence).</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii General and Alternate Resubmission**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.1 – Reliability</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> <li>○ Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>○ Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>○ For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement.</li> </ul>	<p>Alternate Assessments – ELA/Literacy, Mathematics, and Science</p> <p>Alternate Evidence: • ALT-088_HSA-Alt Tech Report_2015-16_Addendum (pp. 188-190)</p>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – ELA/Literacy, Mathematics, and Science</b></p> <p>The State reported reliabilities across subgroups and all exceeded .85.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reliability Estimates are found in Tables H10-H12 for subgroups by Gender, Ethnicity, Primary Disability, Free/Reduced Lunch, and ELL Status.</li> <li>• Reliability coefficients are acceptable.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Stemming from 2016 peer review:</b></p>		
<p>For the HSA-Alt assessments in R/LA, mathematics and science, HIDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reliability estimates for all student sub-groups, where feasible to do so given minimum n-size.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement for the HSA-Alt assessments in R/LA, mathematics and science</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>X_ No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii General and Alternate Resubmission**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</b></p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>		
<p><b>See smarter balanced (2016) notes—State may also contribute:</b></p>		
<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"> <li>• Evidence of estimated reliability for students receiving accommodations using operational data.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement for smarter balanced</b></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Feb. 2018 smarter balanced review notes.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii General and Alternate Resubmission**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b></p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>HSA-Alt assessments in R/LA, mathematics and science</p> <p>ALT-088_HSA-Alt Tech Report_2015-16_Addendum (pp. 191-193)</p>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – ELA/Literacy, Mathematics, and Science:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CSEM values as shown on p. 193 are acceptable.</li> <li>• The validity of scores across the entire performance range was not found.</li> </ul> <p>The evidence provided is insufficient.</p> <p>The explanation on page 20 of the response document, regarding students being placed at incorrect starting points, raises additional concerns about validity. It is unclear how misplacement at the start of the examination systematically affects the precision of a computer adaptive test.</p>
<p><b>See smarter balanced (2016)</b></p>		
<p><b>Stemming from 2016 review</b></p>		
<p>For the HSA-Alt assessments in R/LA, mathematics and science, HIDOE must submit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement for the HSA-Alt assessments in R/LA, mathematics and science</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the range of number of items taken by each student, along with an indication of the starting point. This evidence will illuminate the degree of impact being placed at a suboptimal starting point has on a student’s performance and the accuracy of measurement for such an individual.</li> <li>• Specify the actions taken to modify the student placement questionnaire (designed by the State to lead to more accurate starting points). Provision of these details will help determine whether student initial placement has been improved through the State’s revisions.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii General and Alternate Resubmission**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>Alternate Assessments – ELA/Literacy, Mathematics, and Science</p> <p>ALT-092_HSA-Alt Scoring Specifications_2016-17</p> <p>ALT-088_HSA-Alt Tech Report_2015-16_Addendum, Section 3.1 (pp. 9-11)</p>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – ELA/Literacy, Mathematics, and Science:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engagement Items for the HSA-Alt were originally scored and included as part of a student’s test score.</li> <li>• Since spring 2016, scores of those items are not included in the test score. However, they are still used to prepare students with significant cognitive disabilities for the upcoming task.</li> </ul>
<p><b>See smarter balanced (2016) and Feb. 2018 smarter balanced review notes.</b></p>		
<p><b>Stemming from 2016 peer review</b></p>		
<p>For the HSA-Alt assessments in R/LA, mathematics and science, HIDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that describes how “engagement items” are included in alternate assessment total scores and how these items specifically relate to the State content standards.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement for the HSA-Alt assessments in R/LA, mathematics and science</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii General and Alternate Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</b> Requirement previously met		
<b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b>		
Requirement previously met		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b></p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>		
<b>See smarter balanced (2016)</b>		
<b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement for smarter balanced</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Feb. 2018 smarter balanced review notes</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii General and Alternate Resubmission**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b></p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p>Alternate Assessments – ELA/Literacy, Mathematics, and Science</p> <p>ALT-088_HSA-Alt Technical Report 2015-16 Addendum (pp. 194-198)</p> <p>ALT-093_HSA-Alt Maintenance Plan</p>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – ELA/Literacy, Mathematics, and Science:</b></p> <p>Both documents provide a clear and detailed plan for monitoring, maintaining, and improving the quality of the State’s alternate assessment system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A plan for monitoring, maintaining, and improving the HSA-Alt has been developed and presented in the submitted documents.</li> </ul> <p>The plan appears standard and appropriate</p>
<p><b>Stemming from 2016 peer review</b></p>		
<p>For the HSA-Alt in R/LA, mathematics, and science HIDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of procedures to ensure monitoring, maintaining and improving as needed, the quality of Hawai‘i’s alternate assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses and planned maintenance of the assessments included in the State assessment system.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement HSA-Alt in R/LA, mathematics, and science</b></p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii General and Alternate Resubmission**

**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
------------------	--	--

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		Within the SBAC framework there appears to be an effort to include all students and provide appropriate construct irrelevant accommodations.
<b>Stemming from 2016 peer reviews</b>		
<p>For all HSA and HSA-Alt assessments, HIDOE must submit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of documentation that is used across the State for all assessments, addressing the information for this critical element.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>		
<b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:            Instructions to IEP teams that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA.</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 General and Alternate Resubmission**

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> <li>• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;</li> <li>• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>	<p>HI-132a_Parent Information Booklet_2017-18_English</p> <p>HI-132b_Parent Information Booklet_2017-18_Spanish</p> <p>HI-133_2017-18 Smarter Balanced HSA Science Parent Letters English</p> <p>HI-134_Guidelines for Read Aloud in Spanish_Test Reader</p> <p>HI-128_Crosswalk of Accessibility Features Across State Assessments in Hawaii</p> <p>HI-129_CCSSO-HIDOE Accessibility Manual</p>	<p>Information is provided on the read aloud Spanish test reader accommodation.</p> <p>Provides guidance for selecting the appropriate universal tools and accommodations for ELLs. (pp. 29-32)</p> <p>Indicates educators familiar with students make decisions about designated supports (p. 10), and IEP teams and 504 leaders make decisions about accommodations (p. 16).</p> <p>Indicates “ELLs are assessed in listening, speaking, reading, and writing.” (p. 29)</p> <p>Information about determining eligibility is not provided in this document.</p> <p>Provides information on accessibility tools available to students.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information about accessibility supports (e.g., available accommodations, letter to parents, procedure for determining whether accommodation is needed) was included.</li> <li>• Instruction for selecting appropriate</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii General and Alternate Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		accommodations for English learners was included.  The documentation now appears sufficient.
<b>See smarter balanced (2016)</b>		
<b>Stemming from 2016 peer review</b>		
For all HSA assessments, HIDOE must submit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of documentation that is used across the State for all assessments, addressing the information for this critical element.</li> </ul>		
<b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii General and Alternate Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>5.3 – Accommodations</b></p> <p>requirement previously met</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>		
<b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b>		
requirement previously met		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b></p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul>	<p>HI-130_HSAP Accommodations Monitoring Plan</p>	<p>The Accommodations Verification Form (Appendix B) supports alignment between the IEP/504 plan and the test.</p> <p>Verification of alignment between the classroom and the IEP/504 plan, or between the classroom and the test, remains unclear.</p> <p>There is sufficient evidence the State monitors the number of students reported as requesting specific accommodations, but no data is provided to demonstrate the State monitors that students who have accommodations in their IEP, 504, or EL plans are actually provided these accommodations.</p>
<b>Stemming from 2016 peer review</b>		
<p>For the entire assessment system, HIDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii General and Alternate Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Documentation of a consistent process to monitor the alignment between the accommodations used in the classroom and reported in IEP/504 plans.</li> <li>○ Documentation of a consistent process to monitor the alignment between the accommodations used in the classroom and provided on State assessments.</li> <li>○ Evidence indicating the percentage of students who are eligible via IEP or 504 plan for accommodations actually received these accommodations on their assessments.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii General and Alternate Resubmission**

**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
<b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</b> requirement previously met •		
<b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b>		
requirement previously met		

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii General and Alternate Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b></p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p>ALT-090_HSA-Alt Standard Setting Report_2016-17</p>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – ELA/Literacy, Mathematics, and Science:</b></p> <p>An appropriate and thorough standard setting was conducted with AIR using the Bookmark Method.</p> <p>Appendix B indicates appropriate representation from special education teachers for the entire panel.</p> <p>An additional standard setting was conducted on June 2017 for ELA and mathematics, involving panelists with appropriate expertise and experience (e.g., general education teachers, special education teachers, content experts in all grade bands).</p> <p>The table on page C-1 (p.78 in the browser window), ALT-090_HSA-Alt Standard Setting Report_2016-17 is not complete:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under the column “frequency,” all cells related to race/ethnicity and position are empty.</li> <li>• All cells in rows “teacher” &amp; “specialists” are empty.</li> </ul> <p>Among the high school team of four (appendix C), only special education teacher is included for each content area. The same comment applies for higher education participation.</p> <p>No teachers and no general educators were used for grades three through five.</p>
<p><b>Stemming from 2016 peer review</b></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"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii General and Alternate Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement 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</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regarding the makeup of the standard setting panel (Alt 90, p. C-1), please clarify the meaning of the term “General Education.” Indicate whether these are general education teachers. The distribution of special education vs. general education teachers across grade bands is uneven; please provide an explanation of the strategy used for assignment to panels.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii General and Alternate Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p>General Science</p> <p>SCI-036 Hawaii Standard Setting Technical Report Spring 2010 for CAT_FINAL</p> <p>ALT-090_HSA-Alt Standard Setting Report_2016-17</p> <p>ALT-075_HSA-Alt_Standard Setting Report_spr2013</p>	<p><b>General Assessment - Science:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The quality of academic achievement standards and ALDs in science was documented in submitted documents. The high school standards were linked to PISA benchmarks (HSA scores are expressed on the PISA scale). PISA was used to provide the international benchmarks for the HSA.</li> </ul> <p>The State describes the standard setting procedure for science but also claims the standards are linked to PISA. From the description in the main document, it appears the State uses PISA standards but the standard setting information conflicts with this assertion.</p> <p><b>HSA-Alt:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence was found that shows the State’s alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the grade level academic content standards, including linkage of the alternate ELA and mathematics cut scores to the Hawai’i Common Core grade level standards through the PLDs, as well as linkage of alternate science cut scores to the Hawai’s Content and Performance Standards III in science through the PLDs.</li> <li>The process of standard setting for alternate assessment was documented in submitted documents, including the process of determining PLDs, the procedure for determining the cut scores, and the use of the Bookmark method. Evidence of steps taken to perform vertical articulation across grade levels were not found.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Stemming from 2016 peer review</b></p>		
<p>For the HSA science assessments and HSA science biology EOC, HIDOE must provide:</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 General and Alternate Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the quality of the academic achievement standards in science and performance level descriptors for science.</li> </ul> <p>For the HSA-Alt R/LA, mathematics and science assessments, HIDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State’s alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade level academic content standards, such as:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A description of the process used to develop the alternate academic achievement standards that shows:                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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;</li> <li>▪ 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;</li> <li>▪ 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;</li> <li>▪ A description of steps taken to vertically articulate the alternate academic achievement standards (including cut scores and performance level descriptors) across each grade.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p> <p>requirement previously met</p>		
<p><b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• requirement previously met</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii KĀ ‘ EO Native Language  
Assessment**

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
**Peer Review of State Assessment Systems**

February 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii KĀ ‘ EO Native Language  
Assessment**

**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)..... 7

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS ..... 8**

    2.1 – Test Design and Development ..... 8

    2.2 – Item Development..... 10

    2.3 – Test Administration ..... 11

    2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 13

    2.5 – Test Security ..... 14

    2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy ..... 16

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 17**

    3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 18

    3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes ..... 20

    3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure..... 21

    3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables ..... 22

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER ..... 24**

    4.1 – Reliability ..... 24

    4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 25

    4.3 – Full Performance Continuum ..... 26

    4.4 – Scoring..... 27

    4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms ..... 28

    4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment ..... 29

    4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance ..... 30

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS..... 31**

    5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities ..... 31

    5.2 – Procedures for including ELs ..... 34

    5.3 – Accommodations..... 35

    5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations ..... 37

**SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING ..... 39**

    6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students ..... 39

    6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting ..... 41

    6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards ..... 42

    6.4 – Reporting ..... 43

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

**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><b>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</b></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>KĀ‘EO-001a HI Peer Review Decision Letter                      KĀ‘EO-001b Final Peer Review Notes January 13, 2017                      KĀ‘EO-002 HIDOE Policy 105-8                      KĀ‘EO-003a Hawaii Board of Education Approval of Kaiapuni Language Arts Standards                      KĀ‘EO-003b Preliminary Approval of Kaiapuni Science Standards                      KĀ‘EO-007 Double Testing Waiver Request, 2015                      KĀ‘EO-008 Double Testing Waiver Approval, 2015                      KĀ‘EO-009 Double Testing Waiver Renewal Request, 2016                      KĀ‘EO-010 Double Testing Waiver Renewal Approval, 2016                      KĀ‘EO-011 Testing Requirements Memo to Kaiapuni Principals, 2015                      KĀ‘EO-012 HLA and Mathematics Testing Requirements Memo to Kaiapuni Principals, 2016                      KĀ‘EO-052 2017 Testing Requirements Memo                      KĀ‘EO-090 KĀ‘EO Congressional Support Letter</p>	<p>Adequate evidence was provided that shows State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>formally adopted challenging academic content standards for Kaiapuni students in HLA, mathematics, and science.</li> <li>applied those standards to the target population (Kaiapuni students)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required for KĀ‘EO</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 KĀ ‘EO Native Language Assessment**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</b></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>KĀ‘EO-001a HI Peer Review Decision Letter            KĀ‘EO-001b Final Peer Review Notes January 13, 2017            KĀ‘EO-002 HIDOE Policy 105-8            KĀ‘EO-014 HIDOE/UH Memorandum of Agreement            KĀ‘EO-016a-d Kaiapuni Standards Development Meeting Agendas            KĀ‘EO-017 Kaiapuni Standards Alignment Study Report            KĀ‘EO-018 Kaiapuni Standards Endorsement Report, 2016            KĀ‘EO-043 Kaiapuni Alignment Study Technical Report, 2016            KĀ‘EO-073 KĀ‘EO Technical Report, 2017</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence was found that KĀ‘EO academic content standards in HLA, mathematics, and science:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ are coherent and rigorous;</li> <li>○ encourage the teaching of advanced skills;</li> <li>○ were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Being a separate language, language arts alignment is tentative. Breadth alignment was “limited” in language arts per the alignment study. No discussion is included of other grades, such as an explanation of entry into the program and exit into grade 5.</p> <p>KĀ‘EO-017KaiapuniStandardsAlignmentStudy Report :            “Alignment between standards is achieved when there is acceptable content match.”</p>
<p><b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale for KĀ‘EO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan indicating how the State will address “limited” breadth alignment for language arts as indicated in the alignment review.</li> <li>• Plan indicating how students will transfer from fourth to fifth grade.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii KĀ ‘ EO Native Language Assessment**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p align="center"><b>1.3 – Required Assessments</b></p> <p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments (based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate academic achievement standards-AAAS) in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12);</li> <li>• Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12).</li> </ul>	<p>KĀ‘EO-010 Double Testing Waiver Renewal Approval, 2016</p> <p>KĀ‘EO-019 Hawaii Board of Education Policy 2520</p> <p>KĀ‘EO-020 State Assessment Program 2017 Memo</p> <p>KĀ‘EO-089 Consideration for Hawaiian Language Immersion Program Assessments: A Literature Review</p>	<p>requirements met under waiver granted by USED</p>
<p><b>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p>_x_ No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii KĀ ‘ EO Native Language Assessment**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p><b>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</b></p> <p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system;</li> <li>• For English learners (EL):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment;</li> <li>○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>KĀ‘EO-001b Final Peer Review Notes January 13, 2017</p> <p>KĀ‘EO-020 State Assessment Program 2017 Memo</p> <p>KĀ‘EO-052 2017 Testing Requirements Memo</p>	<p>Requirements met from previous peer review plus evidence submitted.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii KĀ ‘EO Native Language Assessment**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p align="center"><b>1.5 – Participation Data</b></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>KĀ‘EO Table 1 2016 Part Rates KĀ‘EO Table 2 2017 Part Rates</p>	<p>part rate data shown—State should note that evidence presents data in subgroups which violate reporting/masking requirements outlined in 2.6 below.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii KĀ ‘ EO Native Language Assessment**

**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 align="center"><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> </ul>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-005 Purpose Statement KĀ ‘ EO 0021 Technical Report</p>	<p>The purpose of the Kaiapuni Assessment of Education Outcomes (KĀ ‘ EO) is to support a fair, valid, and reliable assessment that demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The achievement of Hawaiian language (immersion) schools in Hawaiian language arts, mathematics, and science for the purpose of community accountability as well as state and federal accountability;</li> <li>An appropriate pathway to grow and improve the Hawaiian language immersion program in classroom curriculum, at the school level, in Hawaiian immersion families, and in the broader community;</li> <li>The reliability and validity of building the foundation of an assessment that is informed by Hawaiian knowledge, wisdom, and intelligence.</li> </ul> <p>Evidence for this sub-element was found.</p> <p>No mention is made of a purpose to assess individual students.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results;</li> </ul>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO 0021 Technical Report KĀ ‘ EO 004abc Final Blueprints KĀ ‘ EO 0022 Blueprint Training KĀ ‘ EO 0073 Technical Report 2017 KĀ ‘ EO 0076 Science Alignment Study KĀ ‘ EO 0043 Alignment Studies Technical Report</p>	<p>Blueprints cross-reference the standards by item type and the standards by DOK.</p> <p>The science blueprint appears to be incomplete and does not have numbers of items.</p> <p>Evidence for this sub-element was found:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Test blueprints for HLA and mathematics were developed mainly based on the Smarter Balanced summative assessment blueprints, measuring the full range of the Kaiapuni standards and the range of content within the Hawaii Common Core Standards.</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii KĀ ‘ EO Native Language Assessment**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills);</li> </ul>	KĀ ‘ EO-004a-c KĀ ‘ EO Final Blueprints KĀ ‘ EO-021 KĀ ‘ EO Technical Report, 2015 KĀ ‘ EO-023 KĀ ‘ EO Item Development Manual KĀ ‘ EO-043 Kaiapuni Alignment Studies Technical Report KĀ ‘ EO-054 KĀ ‘ EO Item Writing Workshop Report KĀ ‘ EO-073 KĀ ‘ EO Technical Report, 2017 KĀ ‘ EO-076 KĀ ‘ EO Alignment Studies Technical Report, Science KĀ ‘ EO-078 KĀ ‘ EO Technical Report for Science, 2016	Documents collectively support the process for developing each reading, mathematics, and science test, as well as the constituent item sets: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence was found that shows assessments were uniquely tailored to the skills included in the Kaiapuni standards. Test blueprints describe the weighting of each learning objective, utilizing various item types: selected-response, short-answer, extended-response, and performance tasks. The blueprints also specify the weighting of DOK.</li> </ul>
<b>If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.</b>	The KĀEO is not computer adaptive.	The KĀEO is not computer adaptive.
<b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The blueprint for science completed to the same degree as the HLA and mathematics blueprints (i.e., including numbers of items in appropriate cells, DOK by standard).</li> <li>Revise documents to indicate assessment of individual students is one of the purposes of the assessment.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii KĀ ‘ EO Native Language Assessment**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>2.2 – Item Development</b></p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-004a-c KĀ ‘ EO Final Blueprints                      KĀ ‘ EO-014 HIDEOE-UH Memorandum of Agreement                      KĀ ‘ EO-021 KĀ ‘ EO Technical Report, 2015                      KĀ ‘ EO-023 KĀ ‘ EO Item Development Manual                      KĀ ‘ EO-024 Item Bank Development Spreadsheet                      KĀ ‘ EO-038 KĀ ‘ EO Technical Report, 2016                      KĀ ‘ EO-043 Kaiapuni Alignment Studies Technical Report                      KĀ ‘ EO-054 Item Writing Workshop Report                      KĀ ‘ EO-055a Smarter Balanced ELA Item Specifications                      KĀ ‘ EO-055b Smarter Balanced Mathematics Item Specifications                      KĀ ‘ EO-056 Screenshots of Usability Features                      KĀ ‘ EO-073 KĀ ‘ EO Technical Report, 2017                      KĀ ‘ EO-077a-c Item Inventory and Gap Analysis                      KĀ ‘ EO-078 KĀ ‘ EO Technical Report for Science, 2016</p>	<p>Documents collectively support the process for developing the item sets of the reading, mathematics, and science tests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HLA and mathematics item development relied heavily upon Smarter Balanced resources, whereas science item development drew extensively upon NGSS resources.</li> <li>• The evidence provided contains a clear and fairly detailed account of the item development process, including, but not limited to, developing item development specifications, item writing, item review for content and bias, field testing, and item selection. It also includes an independent item alignment study and continued targeted item development plan.</li> </ul> <p>KĀ ‘ EO-077a-c Item Inventory and Gap Analysis appears to have sufficient items but no discussion of item parameters beyond DOK.</p> <p>P-values and DOK are not widely distributed in any of the three content areas. The State may attend to this in the future because it could affect the measurement of the tests across the population of students.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan for addressing the gaps in item distribution based on DOK and p-values across content areas.</li> <li>• Information on science items at the same level of detail as provided for the other content areas.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii KĀ ‘ EO Native Language Assessment**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> </ul>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-058 KĀ ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017                      KĀ ‘ EO-060 KĀ ‘ EO Help Desk Log Summary 2017</p>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-058 KĀ ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017                      : The manual provides evidence of an acceptable plan for communication.</p> <p>KĀ ‘ EO-060 KĀ ‘ EO Help Desk Log Summary 2017: The log provides evidence communication has occurred.</p> <p>The evidence provided makes clear all of the steps necessary to conduct standardized test administration of KĀ ‘EO tests. The TAM document is well organized and contains numerous screen-shots to support instructions and explanations.</p> <p>Evidence appears sufficient.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments;</li> </ul>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-025 KĀ ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2016                      KĀ ‘ EO-027 Sample Item Screen Shots                      KĀ ‘ EO-058 KĀ ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017                      KĀ ‘ EO-059 Training Webinar Slides, 2017</p>	<p>Test administrators are trained by video:</p> <p>KĀ ‘ EO-025 KĀ ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2016                      KĀ ‘ EO-059 Training Webinar Slides, 2017                      Evidence was found that shows details on training plan for TCs and TAs by means of training videos. All TCs and TAs were required to complete the training video and thoroughly review the TAM prior to administering the assessments. Practice tests were also provided for students to familiarize themselves with the testing format and the usability/accessibility features of the system.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>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</b></li> </ul>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-025 KĀ ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2016                      KĀ ‘ EO-028 HI Online System Requirements for Tests                      KĀ ‘ EO-058 KĀ ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017</p>	<p>State is prepared with information regarding technology needs:</p> <p>KĀ ‘ EO-058 KĀ ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017                      KĀ ‘ EO-028 HI Online System Requirements for Tests</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 KĀ ‘EO Native Language Assessment**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
possible technology challenges during test administration.		The submission includes adequate information on technology requirements. All technology requirements for the KĀ ‘EO are consistent with the technology requirements for the statewide general assessments.
<b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b>		
_X_ No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii KĀ ‘ EO Native Language Assessment**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p align="center"><b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-001a Hawaii Peer Review Decision Letter                      KĀ ‘ EO-001b Final Peer Review Notes January 13, 2017                      KĀ ‘ EO-058 KĀ ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017                      KĀ ‘ EO-029 Assessment Monitoring Protocol</p>	<p>Requirement previously met plus additional evidence for this test.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii KĀ ‘ EO Native Language Assessment**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>2.5 – Test Security</b></p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> </ul>	<p>KĀ ‘EO-001b Final Peer Review Notes January 13, 2017            KĀ ‘ EO-029 Assessment Monitoring Protocol            KĀ ‘ EO-030 Hawaii Test Security Manual v2.1            KĀ ‘ EO-031 Large Scale Assessment Test Security Plan            KĀ ‘ EO-058 KĀ ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017</p>	<p>KĀ ‘EO-001b Final Peer Review Notes January 13, 2017            : Prevention plan for assessment irregularities was acceptable per the 2017 review.</p> <p>KĀ ‘ EO-058 KĀ ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017 Test security plan described.</p> <p>Evidence was found that shows the State has a comprehensive set of processes and protocols to ensure test security for all components of the assessment program. The test security procedures include all necessary steps to prevent, detect, remediate, and investigate potential security issues. Since KĀ ‘EO is a part of the statewide assessment program, all TCs and TAs are expected to comply with all general test security requirements.</p> <p>Various sources of evidence outline procedures for keeping test materials secure at various phases of test development and administration, including but not limited to required security agreements for individuals serving in any related role, and storage of materials.</p> <p>Evidence appears sufficient.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detection of test irregularities;</li> </ul>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-030 Hawaii Test Security Manual v2.1            KĀ ‘ EO-031 Large Scale Assessment Test Security Plan            KĀ ‘ EO-058 KĀ ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017            KĀ ‘ EO-059 Webinar Slides</p>	<p>Plan for detection of irregularities described:            KĀ ‘ EO-030 Hawaii Test Security Manual v2.1            KĀ ‘ EO-031 Large Scale Assessment Test Security Plan            KĀ ‘ EO-058 KĀ ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017            KĀ ‘ EO-059 Webinar Slides</p> <p>Evidence provided shows the State has clear procedures in place for TCs and TAs to report testing incidents. Forensic data analyses were also available</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 Kā ‘ EO Native Language Assessment**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		in the Kā ‘EO delivery system.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> </ul>	Kā ‘ EO-030 Hawaii Test Security Manual v2.1 Kā ‘ EO-058 Kā ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017 Kā ‘ EO-060 HelpDesk Log Summary, 2016	Documents describe a remediation plan following test irregularities: Kā ‘ EO-030 Hawaii Test Security Manual v2.1 Kā ‘ EO-058 Kā ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017 Kā ‘ EO-060 HelpDesk Log Summary, 2016 The Log seemed to address test irregularities but the State has not had any security incidents.  Evidence was found that shows State has a plan for remediation following any test security incidents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</b></li> </ul>	Kā ‘ EO-001b Final Peer Review Notes January 13, 2017 Kā ‘ EO-058 Kā ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017	Kā ‘ EO-001b Final Peer Review Notes January 13, 2017 Kā ‘ EO-058 Kā ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017 Investigation process described.  Evidence was found that shows State has a plan for investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.
<b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii KĀ ‘ EO Native Language Assessment**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</b></p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results;</li> </ul>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-037 External Data Request Guidelines            KĀ ‘ EO-043 Kaiapuni Alignment Studies Technical Report, 2016            KĀ ‘ EO-061 SSL Server Test Results            KĀ ‘ EO-073 KĀ ‘ EO Technical Report, 2017</p>	<p>Documents collectively indicate a plan to protect the privacy of test materials:            KĀ ‘ EO-037 External Data Request Guidelines            KĀ ‘ EO-061 SSL Server Test Results</p> <p>Evidence provided shows that State has procedures in place to protect the integrity of testing materials and data in test development stage, test administration, material storage, and use of results.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> </ul>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-014 HODOE/UH Memorandum of Agreement            KĀ ‘ EO-058 KĀ ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017</p>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-058 KĀ ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017 Describes use of student identifiers to ensure confidentiality.</p> <p>Evidence is adequate for this sub-element.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.</li> </ul>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-032 BOE Policy 4610 Student Information and Confidential Records            KĀ ‘ EO-033 General Confidentiality Expectations            KĀ ‘ EO-034 FERPA Poster            KĀ ‘ EO-035 DOE Memo FERPA Guidelines            KĀ ‘ EO-036 Information Security Training            KĀ ‘ EO-037 External Data Request Guidelines            KĀ ‘ EO-050 Minimum cell size requirements            KĀ ‘ EO-058 KĀ ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017</p>	<p>Collectively detail plan for protecting personally identifiable information:</p> <p>KĀ ‘ EO-032 BOE Policy 4610 Student Information and Confidential Records            KĀ ‘ EO-033 General Confidentiality Expectations            KĀ ‘ EO-037 External Data Request Guidelines            KĀ ‘ EO-050 Minimum cell size requirements            KĀ ‘ EO-058 KĀ ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017</p> <p>Average score will not be displayed if cell size is fewer than 10. This was also an issue with the general assessment.</p>
<b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Raise minimum cell size for reporting average to 20, consistent with the English language assessment.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii KĀ ‘ EO Native Language Assessment

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii KĀ ‘ EO Native Language Assessment**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p>	<p>KĀ‘EO-005 KĀ‘EO Theory of Action and Purpose Statement            KĀ‘EO-038 KĀ‘EO Technical Report, 2016            KĀ‘EO-039 KĀ‘EO Research Agenda            KĀ‘EO-082 KĀ‘EO TAC Agenda and Minutes            KĀ‘EO-073 KĀ‘EO Technical Report, 2017            KĀ‘EO-074 Proposal for Additional Validity Data Collection            (</p>	<p>KĀ‘EO-073 KĀ‘EO Technical Report, 2017:            Evidence supports the overall validity of the KĀ‘EO.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> </ul>	<p>KĀ‘EO-004 a-c KĀ‘EO Final Blueprints            KĀ‘EO-017 Kaiapuni Standards Alignment Study Report            KĀ‘EO-021 KĀ‘EO Technical Report, 2015            KĀ‘EO-023 KĀ‘EO Item Development Manual            KĀ‘EO-038 KĀ‘EO Technical Report, 2016            KĀ‘EO-040 KĀ‘EO Standard Setting Technical Report            KĀ‘EO-043 Kaiapuni Alignment Studies Technical Report, 2016            KĀ‘EO-064 Cognitive Interview 2016 Analysis            KĀ‘EO-073 KĀ‘EO Technical Report, 2017            KĀ‘EO-076 KĀ‘EO Alignment Study Technical Report – Science            KĀ ‘ EO-078 KĀ‘EO Technical Report for Science, 2016            KĀ‘EO-079 KĀ‘EO Science Standard Setting Technical Report</p>	<p>KĀ‘EO-043 Kaiapuni Alignment Studies Technical Report, 2016</p> <p>An external alignment was conducted for grades 3 and 4 in HLA and mathematics. 13 of 64 areas were rated as “not met,” “weak,” or “partially met.”</p> <p>KĀ‘EO-076 KĀ‘EO Alignment Study Technical Report – Science            An external alignment was conducted for grade 4 in science. 3 of 16 areas were rated as “not met” or “partially met.”</p> <p>KĀ‘EO-086a HLA and Mathematics Alignment Response Memo: A plan for addressing weaknesses identified in the HLA and mathematics alignment studies is described.</p> <p>KĀ‘EO-086b Science Alignment Response Memo: A</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii KĀ ‘ EO Native Language Assessment**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	KĀ‘EO-086a HLA and Mathematics Alignment Response Memo KĀ‘EO-086b Science Alignment Response Memo KĀ‘EO-091 Crosswalk for Kaiapuni HLA and Science Standards	plan for addressing weaknesses identified in the science study is described.  Form alignment to the blueprint is listed in the table of contents but not described in detail in the body.  Numbers of items on the actual forms by standard do not always match the numbers specific in the blueprint. The process by which this occurred is unclear.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>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.</b></li> </ul>	KĀ ‘ EO-001b Final Peer Review Notes January 13, 2017	KĀ ‘ EO-001b Final Peer Review Notes January 13, 2017: This portion was met through previous peer review.  Currently, there is no student who would require alternate assessment enrolled in Kaiapuni schools. However, that State has a plan to develop that assessment.
<b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b>		
__X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explanation for the numbers of items on the test connected to various content standards not matching the test blueprints.</li> </ul>		

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>KĀ‘EO-021 KĀ‘EO Technical Report, 2015            KĀ‘EO-038 KĀ‘EO Technical Report, 2016            KĀ‘EO-039 KĀ‘EO Research Agenda            KĀ‘EO-073 KĀ‘EO Technical Report, 2017            KĀ‘EO-074 Proposal for Additional Validity Evidence            KĀ‘EO-078 KĀ‘EO Technical Report for Science, 2016</p>	<p>KĀ‘EO-038 KĀ‘EO Technical Report, 2016            The State conducted cognitive interviews and received support from student responses supportive of the DOK of some items. This work is intensive in nature and the State should be commended for collecting this evidence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information provided to item writers contributed to ensuring that test content covered the intended cognitive processes. Subsequently, items were reviewed by Hawaiian language immersion experts during the development process.</li> <li>• The development team also sought input from Kaiapuni students through a cognitive interview study of HLA and mathematics items.</li> <li>• Research agenda is currently underway to obtain empirical evidence demonstrating the relationship of the tests to other measures of similar levels of cognitive complexity in the applicable content areas.</li> </ul> <p>Evidence for mathematics is clear, but evidence for HLA is not.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii KĀ ‘ EO Native Language Assessment**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p>KĀ‘EO-004 a-c KĀ‘EO Final Blueprints            KĀ‘EO-005 KĀ‘EO Theory of Action and Purpose Statement            KĀ‘EO-017 Kaiapuni Standards Alignment Study Report            KĀ‘EO-021 KĀ‘EO Technical Report, 2015            KĀ‘EO-038 KĀ‘EO Technical Report, 2016            KĀ‘EO-043 Kaiapuni Alignment Studies Technical Report, 2016            KĀ ‘ EO-058 KĀ‘EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017            KĀ ‘ EO-064 Cognitive Interview 2016 Analysis            KĀ‘EO-073 KĀ‘EO Technical Report, 2017            KĀ‘EO-078 KĀ‘EO Technical Report for Science, 2016            KĀ‘EO-081 KĀ ‘ EO Report Samples</p>	<p>KĀ‘EO-073 KĀ‘EO Technical Report, 2017            Disattenuated correlations in HLA, mathematics, and science ranged from .78 to 1.21 and may indicate the subscales are measuring the same construct. This is problematic because the State reports subscores as if they are measuring separate constructs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The KĀ‘EO scoring and reporting structure is consistent with the purposes and priorities of the assessment. Student scores are reported as overall scale scores and achievement levels that are directly connected to the Kaiapuni standards to which the test is aligned. In addition, students receive raw scores for each domain with sufficient items (or item responses) to generate such a score.</li> <li>• Classical testing theory and IRT analyses, including item analyses, DIF analyses, and Rasch analyses were conducted to evaluate quality of items and overall assessment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A plan for either reducing the overlap between subscale scores of ceasing to report subscale scores.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii KĀ ‘ EO Native Language Assessment**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>KĀ‘EO-038 KĀ‘EO Technical Report, 2016                      KĀ‘EO-039 KĀ‘EO Research Agenda                      KĀ‘EO-074 Proposal for Additional Validity Evidence</p>	<p>KĀ‘EO-073 KĀ‘EO Technical Report, 2017):                      Reported correlations between subscale scores were too high (<math>r</math>'s = .75 to 1.00) for constructs to be considered independent.</p> <p>Describe plans to correlate scores with course grades or various teacher ratings of academic competence:                      KĀ‘EO-039 KĀ‘EO Research Agenda                      KĀ‘EO-074 Proposal for Additional Validity Evidence                      Correlations of total scores for HLA, mathematics, and science are not reported.</p> <p>No “conventional” evidence was provided for this element due to the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The KĀ‘EO test is unique in its focus on Hawaiian language and culture; therefore, no additional assessments of the Kaiapuni standards exist to establish a comparison to an assessment of similar constructs.</li> <li>• The KĀ‘EO assessment is newly developed and the first operational assessments have just been completed.</li> </ul> <p>However, the State conducted teacher surveys to collect data about students' achievement, factors related to achievement, teachers' perceptions of students' ability to perform cognitively complex tasks. The data was then compared to overall student scores on the assessment, as well as students' performance on complex tasks. The teacher survey will continue.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b></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 Hawaii KĀ ‘ EO Native Language Assessment**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report correlations between total scores for HLA, mathematics, and (for applicable grades) science. This will indicate whether the tests are measuring separate constructs.</li> <li>• Conduct studies described in the Research Agenda and Proposal for Additional Validity Evidence to provide correlations with course grades and teacher estimations of academic competence.</li> <li>• Calculate grade-to-grade performance for students in same content areas.</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii KĀ ‘ EO Native Language Assessment**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.1 – Reliability</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> </ul>	<p>KĀ‘EO-038 KĀ‘EO Technical Report, 2016 KĀ‘EO-073 KĀ‘EO Technical Report, 2017</p>	<p>Alphas range from .84 to .90 for the total scores across grades; these values are acceptable. Alphas for subscales cover a wide range. Eight coefficients that are below .70 should not be interpreted as measuring their intended constructs nor used for important decisions.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments;</li> </ul>	<p>KĀ‘EO-038 KĀ‘EO Technical Report, 2016 KĀ‘EO-073 KĀ‘EO Technical Report, 2017</p>	<p>SEMs ranged between 13 and 20 at the cut points.  Overall SEM was not reported.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results;</li> </ul>	<p>KĀ‘EO-073 KĀ‘EO Technical Report, 2017</p>	<p>Classification accuracy was high (87%-92%) based on proficient vs. non-proficient distinction.  Evidence was provided</p>
<p><b>For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement.</b></p>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-049a and b Approval of KĀ‘EO Cut Scores KĀ‘EO-073 KĀ‘EO Technical Report, 2017</p>	<p>The KĀ‘EO is not computer adaptive.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall SEMs for total scores across grades and content areas.</li> <li>• Estimates by student groups (e.g., gender, free/reduced lunch, race, ethnicity) for reliability as indicated by coefficient alpha, SEMs, and classification accuracy).</li> <li>• A plan for either improving the reliability of those subscale scores whose alphas are below .70, or a plan for ceasing to report such subscale scores.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii KĀ ‘ EO Native Language Assessment**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</b></p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<p>KĀ‘EO-021 KĀ‘EO Technical Report, 2015            KĀ‘EO-058 KĀ‘EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017            KĀ‘EO-038 KĀ‘EO Technical Report, 2016            KĀ‘EO-073 KĀ‘EO Technical Report, 2017            KĀ‘EO-078 KĀ‘EO Technical Report for Science, 2016</p>	<p>KĀ‘EO-058 KĀ‘EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017            Details accessibility tools such as universal tools, test features, and accommodations.</p> <p>KĀ‘EO-073 KĀ‘EO Technical Report, 2017            Details use of bias review board, cognitive interviews, and DIF to address fairness and accessibility issues.</p> <p>Evidence provided shows that State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to meet this requirement for assessment design, item development, item review, test administration, and analysis.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii KĀ ‘ EO Native Language Assessment**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b></p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-021 KĀ ‘ EO Technical Report, 2015                      KĀ ‘ EO-023 KĀ ‘ EO Item Development Manual                      KĀ ‘ EO-038 KĀ ‘ EO Technical Report, 2016                      KĀ ‘ EO-073 KĀ ‘ EO Technical Report, 2017                      KĀ ‘ EO-078 KĀ ‘ EO Technical Report for Science, 2016</p>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-073 KĀ ‘ EO Technical Report, 2017                      Conditional SEMs are acceptable and stable except at the tail ends of the distribution.</p> <p>Evidence provided shows that State has taken reasonable steps to ensure that assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High quality training for item writers, focused on writing items designed to assess students across a wide range of abilities.</li> <li>• Examining item and test level data after field tests to ensure the resulting assessments would provide an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full continuum.</li> <li>• Using CTT analyses and Rasch analyses to review item difficulty and discrimination, as well as the characteristics of student scores across the continuum.</li> <li>• Conducting CTT analyses to reveal a range of difficulty within each test form, and to show that the majority of items discriminate well between high and low performing students.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii KĀ ‘ EO Native Language Assessment**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>KĀ‘EO-038 KĀ‘EO Technical Report, 2016            KĀ‘EO-040 KĀ‘EO Standard Setting Technical Report            KĀ‘EO-058 KĀ‘EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017            KĀ‘EO-073 KĀ‘EO Technical Report, 2017            KĀ‘EO-079 KĀ‘EO Science Standard Setting Report            KĀ‘EO-081 KĀ ‘ EO Report Samples</p>	<p>KĀ‘EO-073 KĀ‘EO Technical Report, 2017: Documents appropriate scoring procedures including rubric development, training and certification, and drift analysis.</p> <p>Evidence provided shows the State employed rigorous and consistent scoring procedures to ensure the results of the KĀ‘EO can be used for the purposes for which the assessment was intended.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii KĀ ‘EO Native Language Assessment**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</b></p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p>KĀ‘EO-073 KĀ‘EO Technical Report, 2017</p>	<p>KĀ‘EO-073 KĀ‘EO Technical Report, 2017 Describes an item selector tool using specific learning objective/claim, DOK, item type, and difficulty. This is for multiple forms in the future.</p> <p>State stated that KĀ‘EO does not currently use multiple forms. In the future the forms will be equated (within year and across years) using a common item-linking procedure. Once done, the State should provide equating results.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required (not applicable at this time)</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 KĀ ‘EO Native Language Assessment**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b></p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>• Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<p>KĀ‘EO-058 KĀ‘EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017</p>	<p>KĀ‘EO-058 KĀ‘EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017 there are not multiple assessments for the Kaiapuni Assessment of Educational Outcomes (KĀ‘EO).”</p>
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii Kā ‘ EO Native Language Assessment**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b></p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p>Kā‘EO-038 Kā‘EO Technical Report, 2016                      Kā‘EO-039 Kā‘EO Research Agenda                      Kā‘EO-044 Kā‘EO Technical Contract Scopes                      Kā‘EO-073 Kā‘EO Technical Report 2017                      Kā‘EO-082 Kā‘EO TAC Agenda and Minutes</p>	<p>Documents collectively describe a plan for technical analysis and ongoing maintenance.</p> <p>Evidence provided shows the State has developed a system for monitoring and maintaining the quality of the assessment through an ongoing relationship with the University of Hawaii and vendors. It has also received guidance from a Project Advisory Group, the Hawaiian Advisory Committee, and the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).</p>
<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii KĀ ‘ EO Native Language Assessment**

**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 align="center"><b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards;</li> </ul>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-001b Final Peer Review Notes January 13, 2017                      KĀ ‘ EO-087 CCSSO/HIDOE Accessibility Manual                      KĀ ‘ EO-046 Crosswalk of Accessibility Features</p>	<p>Clear explanations of the differences between assessments are missing.</p> <p>KĀ ‘ EO-001b Final Peer Review Notes January 13, 2017                      : Evidence for this element was provided as part of Hawaii’s general statewide assessment submission.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs;</li> </ul>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-001b Final Peer Review Notes January 13, 2017                      KĀ ‘ EO-058 KĀ ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017                      KĀ ‘ EO-046 Crosswalk of Accessibility Features</p>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-058 KĀ ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017                      Indicates need for an accommodation must be documented in the IEP.</p> <p>KĀ ‘ EO-046 Crosswalk of Accessibility Features                      Indicates educators familiar with students make decisions about designated supports (p. 10), IEP teams and 504 leaders make decisions about accommodations (p. 16), and students with “documented significant cognitive disabilities and adaptive behavior deficits who require extensive support across multiple settings” are eligible for the alternate assessment (p. 26). Information about determining eligibility is not provided in</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 KĀ ‘ EO Native Language Assessment**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		this document.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment;</li> </ul>	KĀ ‘ EO-001b Final Peer Review Notes January 13, 2017 KĀ ‘ EO-012 LA and Mathematics Testing Requirements Memo to Kaiapuni Principals, 2016 KĀ ‘ EO-020 State Assessment Program Memo 2017 KĀ ‘ EO-058 KĀ ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017	KĀ ‘ EO-001b Final Peer Review Notes January 13, 2017 This portion was met through previous peer review.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities;</li> </ul>	KĀ ‘ EO-046 Crosswalk of Accessibility Features KĀ ‘ EO-058 KĀ ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017 KĀ ‘ EO-059 KĀ ‘ EO Webinar Training Slides, 2017	KĀ ‘ EO-046 Crosswalk of Accessibility Features  Document provides details on universal tools, designated supports, and accommodations.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;</li> </ul>	KĀ ‘ EO-058 KĀ ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017	KĀ ‘ EO-046 Crosswalk of Accessibility Features  Provides guidance on selecting the appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;</li> </ul>	KĀ ‘ EO-001b Final Peer Review Notes January 13, 2017	This portion was met through previous peer review.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate</li> </ul>	KĀ ‘ EO-001b Final Peer Review Notes January 13, 2017	This portion was met through previous peer review.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments);		
<b>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.</b>	KĀ ‘ EO-001b Final Peer Review Notes January 13, 2017	This portion was met through previous peer review.
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
_X_ No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii KĀ ‘ EO Native Language Assessment**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> <li>• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;</li> <li>• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-001b Final Peer Review Notes, January 13, 2017</p> <p>KĀ ‘ EO-082 KĀ’EO TAC Agendas and Minutes</p>	<p>This element may not be relevant for this test because it was developed to be administered in Hawaiian language.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii KĀ ‘ EO Native Language Assessment**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>5.3 – Accommodations</b></p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504;</li> </ul>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-001b Final Peer Review Notes January 13, 2017            KĀ ‘ EO-046 Crosswalk of Accessibility Features            KĀ ‘ EO-058 KĀ ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017</p>	<p>This portion was met through previous peer review.</p> <p>TAM 2017 (pp. 21-24): Provides information on universal tools, embedded supports, and accommodations.</p> <p>Adequate evidence was provided for this sub-element.</p> <p>Evidence for this sub-element was provided in the submission for the general assessment.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);</li> </ul>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-058 KĀ ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017</p>	<p>This sub-element may not relevant.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> </ul>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-001b Final Peer Review Notes January 13, 2017, Section 5.3.3            KĀ ‘ EO-046 Crosswalk of Accessibility Features            KĀ ‘ EO-047 Usability, Accessibility, &amp; Accommodations Guidelines            KĀ ‘ EO-058 KĀ ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017            KĀ ‘ EO-087 CCSO/HIDOE Accessibility Manual</p>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-058 KĀ ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017            Provides information on universal tools, embedded supports, and accommodations.</p> <p>Evidence for this sub-element was provided in the submission for the general assessment.</p> <p>Evidence is missing that accommodations assigned are not undermining the construct being measured, specifically on KĀ ‘EO 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 Hawaii KĀ ‘ EO Native Language Assessment**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</b></p>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-058 KĀ ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017 (p. 51)</p>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-058 KĀ ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017 : An application for accommodations is provided and it is appropriate for accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</p> <p>Adequate evidence was provided for this sub-element.</p> <p>Evidence for this sub-element was provided in the submission for the general assessment.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence is missing that the accommodations assigned are not undermining the construct being measured, specifically on KĀ ‘ EO assessment. Examples could include theoretical explanation, reliability or validity indices disaggregated by accommodation condition, or differential boost studies.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii KĀ ‘ EO Native Language Assessment**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b></p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-029 Assessment Monitoring Protocol KĀ ‘ EO-001b Final Peer Review Notes January 13, 2017</p>	<p>This portion was met through previous peer review.</p> <p>Information on 504 monitoring is lacking.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> </ul>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-001b Final Peer Review Notes January 13, 2017, Section 5.4.1 KĀ ‘ EO-046 Crosswalk of Accessibility Features KĀ ‘ EO-047 Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines KĀ ‘ EO-058 KAEO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017</p>	<p>This portion was met through previous peer review.</p> <p>KĀ‘EO accommodations were aligned to those available for the Hawaii State Assessments.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> </ul>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-058 KĀ ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017 KĀ ‘ EO -059 Webinar Training Slides, 2017</p>	<p>This portion was met through previous peer review.</p> <p>Evidence provided shows guidance on the selection of accommodations based on student needs and preferences, to which states may refer when developing their own plans and standards for monitoring to ensure appropriateness of participation and accommodations.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> </ul>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-058 KĀ ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017</p>	<p>The evidence provided does not indicate how IEP and large scale assessment accommodations are linked to instructional accommodations.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii KĀ ‘ EO Native Language Assessment**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner;</li> </ul>	KĀ ‘ EO-058 KĀ ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017 (Appendix B p. 50)	KĀ ‘ EO-058 KĀ ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017 (Appendix B p. 50) The Accommodations Documentation Form addresses alignment between the IEP/504 accommodations and those used during assessment.  Adequate evidence was provided.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</b></li> </ul>	KĀ ‘ EO-029 Protocol for Assessment Monitoring Site Visits KĀ ‘ EO-058 KĀ ‘ EO Test Administration Manual (TAM), 2017	This portion was met through previous peer review.  The State’s assessment and accountability staff members conducted annual site visits to monitor the appropriate use of accommodations.
<b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documentation of a consistent process to monitor the alignment between the accommodations used in the classroom and reported in IEP/504 plans.</li> <li>Documentation of a consistent process to monitor the alignment between the accommodations used in the classroom and provided on State assessments.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii KĀ ‘ EO Native Language Assessment**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</b></p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities;</li> </ul>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-001b Final Peer Review Notes January 13, 2017</p> <p>KĀ ‘ EO-048 HIDOE State Superintendent Job Description</p> <p>KĀ ‘ EO-049a Approval of KĀ ‘ EO HLA and Mathematics Cut Scores</p> <p>KĀ ‘ EO-049b Approval of KĀ ‘ EO Science Cut Scores</p>	<p>This portion was met through previous peer review.</p> <p>Evidence provided shows the State formally adopted academic achievement standards for KĀ ‘ EO, which is a part of the State’s comprehensive accountability system.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply;</li> </ul>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-001b Final Peer Review Notes January 13, 2017</p>	<p>This portion was met through previous peer review. Evidence provided shows the State has applied academic achievement standards to all students including the Kaianupī population.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>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.</b></li> </ul>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-040 KĀ ‘ EO Standard Setting Technical Report</p> <p>KĀ ‘ EO-051 Achievement Level Descriptors</p> <p>KĀ ‘ EO-079 KĀ ‘ EO Standard Setting Technical Report - Science</p>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-040 KĀ ‘ EO Standard Setting Technical Report</p> <p>Documents four levels for HLA and mathematics.</p> <p>KĀ ‘ EO-079 KĀ ‘ EO Standard Setting Technical Report - Science</p> <p>Documents four levels for science.</p> <p>Adequate evidence was provided.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii KĀ ‘ EO Native Language Assessment**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b>		
_X_ No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii Kā ‘ EO Native Language Assessment**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b></p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p>Kā ‘ EO-040 Kā ‘ EO Standard Setting Technical Report                      Kā ‘ EO-079 Kā ‘ EO Standard Setting Technical Report - Science</p>	<p>Kā ‘ EO-040 Kā ‘ EO Standard Setting Technical Report                      An outside vendor used the Bookmark Standard Setting Procedure to determine achievement levels for HLA and mathematics. Panelists collectively had appropriate expertise (pp. 11-14).</p> <p>Kā ‘ EO-079 Kā ‘ EO Standard Setting Technical Report – Science                      : An outside vendor used the Bookmark Standard Setting Procedure to determine achievement levels for science. Panelists collectively had appropriate expertise (pp. 10-12).</p> <p>Evidence provided shows the Bookmark Standard Setting Procedure (BSSP) was selected as the method for determining academic achievement standards for all Kā ‘EO assessments. This method involved panelists with appropriate expertise and experience for setting achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p> <p>The evidence appears sufficient.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii KĀ ‘ EO Native Language Assessment**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce. 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>KĀ ‘ EO-001b Final Peer Review Notes January 13, 2017, Section 6</p> <p>KĀ ‘ EO-017 Kaiapuni Standards Alignment Study Report</p> <p>KĀ ‘ EO-040 KĀ ‘ EO Standard Setting Technical Report</p> <p>KĀ ‘ EO-043 Kaiapuni Alignment Studies Technical Report</p> <p>KĀ ‘ EO-073 KĀ ‘ EO Technical Report, 2017</p> <p>KĀ ‘ EO-079 KĀ ‘ EO Standard Setting Technical Report - Science</p>	<p>This portion is being addressed through the review of the assessments in English and the HI ALT.</p> <p>Adequate evidence was provided that shows State’s academic standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards.</p> <p>The discussion focusses solely on third and fourth grade rather than the full continuum.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii KĀ ‘ EO Native Language Assessment**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;</li> </ul>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-001b Final Peer Review Notes, January 13, 2017</p> <p>KĀ ‘ EO-049a Approval of KĀ ‘ EO HLA and Mathematics Cut Scores</p> <p>KĀ ‘ EO-049b Approval of KĀ ‘ EO Science Cut Scores</p> <p>KĀ ‘ EO-050 Minimum Cell Size Requirements</p> <p>KĀ ‘ EO-070 HSA Reporting Timeline</p>	<p>This portion was met through previous peer review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Statewide, complex area, and school assessment results, including KĀ ‘EO results, were made publicly available on the HIDOE website.</li> <li>State, complex, and school-level counts and percentage of students scoring at each level on the KĀ ‘EO HLA and mathematics assessments are made available by grade level.</li> <li>The KĀ ‘EO website includes explanations of the scale scores, the achievement levels, the standard errors of measurement, and the domain-level scores.</li> </ul> <p>Because the Kaiapuni student population is small, most subgroups fall below the minimum cell size for reporting.</p> <p>The evidence appears sufficient.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;</li> </ul>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-071 Professional Development Plan for Data Analysis</p> <p>KĀ ‘ EO-081a-c KĀ ‘ EO Report Samples</p>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-071 Professional Development Plan for Data Analysis</p> <p>Includes a schedule of opportunities to learn about interpreting and using results from the KĀ ‘EO.</p> <p>KĀ ‘ EO-081a-c KĀ ‘ EO Report Samples report for communicating findings and informing instructional changes.</p> <p>Sub-scores were reported at the domain level for each content area. Domain scores were reported as a raw number of items answered correctly. KĀ ‘EO provides information to teachers and schools about student performance on overall content according to the performance level descriptors, claims in mathematics (e.g., communicate reasoning),</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 KĀ ‘ EO Native Language Assessment**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;</li> <li>○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;</li> <li>○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-072 Screenshot of ALDs on Kaiapuni Website</p> <p>KĀ ‘ EO-081a KĀ ‘ EO Student Report Sample</p> <p>KĀ ‘ EO-088 KĀ ‘ EO Interpretive Guide</p>	<p>subdomains in HLA (e.g., reading, writing), and the two subdomains in science.</p> <p>KĀ ‘ EO-081a KĀ ‘ EO Student Report Sample Provides the required information.</p> <p>KĀ ‘ EO-088 KĀ ‘ EO Interpretive Guide Provides guidance on interpreting the report.</p> <p>Overall, States provided sufficient evidence to address most aspects of this factor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individual Student Report was produced for each administration of the KĀ ‘ EO.</li> <li>• For each content area, the report included a graphic showing the student’s scale score, the standard error of measurement, and the performance level along the entire continuum of scale scores.</li> <li>• The report’s text included the reporting ALD that describes the content within the student’s performance level.</li> <li>• Content described in the reporting ALDs was directly linked to the Kaiapuni content standards.</li> <li>• In addition, the report provided the average scale score for the student’s school and for all Kaiapuni schools for that grade level and content area.</li> <li>• The report also provided the student’s raw score for each tested domain, along with an indication of the total number of items for that domain. Average scale scores and median domain scores were also provided for the student’s school and for all Kaiapuni schools.</li> <li>• A printed Individual Student Report is provided for each student who has valid results for the KĀ ‘ EO assessments.</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Hawaii KĀ ‘ EO Native Language Assessment**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
		No evidence was found that shows the report was available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request.
<p align="center"><b>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.</b></p>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-049a Approval of KĀ ‘ EO HLA and Mathematics Cut Scores                      KĀ ‘ EO-049b Approval of KĀ ‘ EO Science Cut Scores                      KĀ ‘ EO-081a-c KĀ ‘ EO Report Samples                      KĀ ‘ EO-070 HSA Timeline for reporting</p>	<p>KĀ ‘ EO-081a-c KĀ ‘ EO Report Samples                      The timeline appears to be missing (i.e., the wrong document was included). Since the HSA timeline was already approved through the 2017 review, this is probably acceptable.</p> <p>Adequate evidence was provided.</p>
<b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of Braille and large print forms OR a plan for addressing this need should it arise.</li> </ul>		

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