UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Ryan Wise
Director
Iowa Department of Education
400 East 14th Street
Des Moines, IA 50319

January 13, 2017

Dear Director Wise:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) assessment peer review process under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). We appreciate the efforts required to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in June and August 2016. As you know, State assessment systems provide essential information that States, districts, principals, and teachers can use to identify the academic needs of students, target resources and supports toward students who need them most, evaluate school and program effectiveness, and close achievement gaps among students. A high-quality assessment system also provides useful information to parents about their children's advancement against and achievement of grade-level standards. The Department's peer review of State assessment systems is designed to provide feedback to States to support the development and administration of high-quality assessments.

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

- Reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8. **Partially meets requirements.**
- R/LA and mathematics general assessments in high school. **Partially meets requirements**.
- R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school. (DLM-Int). **Substantially meets requirements.**
- Science general assessments in grades 5 and 8. **Partially meets requirements**.
- Science general assessments in high school. **Partially meets requirements.**

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

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

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

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

The Department notes that IA DOE requested and received approval on June 20, 2016 for a waiver from assessing speaking and listening standards for the 2016−2017, 2017−2018, and 2018−2019 school years.

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 Carol Manitaras or Pat Rattler of my staff at: OSS.Iowa@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

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

Enclosures

cc: David Tilley, Deputy Director, Office of Learning and Results

Critical Elements Where Additional Evidence is Needed to Meet the Requirements for Iowa's Assessment System

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
2.1 – Test Design and Development	For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school, and science in grades 5, 8, and high school, IA DOE must provide: • Evidence that the State assesses the State's writing, speaking, and listening components of the R/LA content standards. [NOTE: Iowa has received a speaking and listening waiver; therefore, the Department does not expect Iowa to submit additional evidence regarding speaking and listening during the period of the waiver.] • See evidence related to alignment for R/LA, mathematics, and science in element 3.1. For the R/LA and mathematics DLM-Int AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school, IA DOE must provide: • See evidence requested under elements 3.1 and 4.1.
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration	For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school, and science in grades 5, 8, and high school, IA DOE must provide: • Evidence of annual monitoring implemented across the State to ensure and report on fidelity of test administrations.
2.5 – Test Security	For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school, and science in grades 5, 8, and high school and the R/LA and mathematics DLM-Int AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school, IA DOE must provide: • Evidence of State guidance to districts concerning the detection, investigation, and remediation of test irregularities and issues regarding test security.
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school, and science in grades 5, 8, and high school, IA DOE must provide: • Evidence of improved alignment for the R/LA and mathematics tests. • Evidence of overall alignment for the science tests. For R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-Int), IA DOE must provide: • Evidence of analysis that supports the assumptions of testlet interchangeability across linkage levels used by the tests, including analysis of model fit. • Evidence that provides detailed descriptions of the routing pathways within and across essential elements (content domains).

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school, and science in grades 5, 8, and high school, IA DOE must provide: • Evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of the assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State's academic content standards (e.g., a complete factor analysis study for the current operational form, or other evidence that supports the internal structure of the tests). For R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-Int), IA DOE must provide: • Evidence of consistency and accuracy of classifications resulting from the tests. • Evidence of item-level data (e.g., factor loadings or item-total correlations), or comparable node-level data that support the internal structure of the tests. • Evidence that reliability estimates are based upon known item and testlet parameters.
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	For R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-Int), IA DOE must provide: • Evidence that the assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.
4.1 – Reliability	For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school, and science in grades 5, 8, and high school, IA DOE must provide • Evidence the tests are sufficiently reliable throughout the score range, which will be satisfied by response to element 4.3. For R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-Int), IA DOE must provide: • Evidence regarding reliability estimation, which will be satisfied by response to element 3.3. • Evidence regarding consistency and accuracy of classifications which will be satisfied by the response to element to element 3.3. • Evidence of model fit analysis, which will be satisfied by response to element 3.1.
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility	For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school, and science in grades 5, 8, and high school, IA DOE must provide: • Evidence of differential item functioning (DIF) analysis for additional student groups (economically disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, ELs).

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum	For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school, and science in grades 5, 8, and high school, IA DOE must provide: • Evidence that the tests are sufficiently reliable and precise throughout the entire score range (e.g., complete test item analysis including CSEMs and test information functions).
4.4 – Scoring	For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school, and science in grades 5, 8, and high school, IA DOE must provide: • Evidence that describes the procedures used to construct test scale scores (the Hieronymous scaling procedure); and • Evidence of the quality control procedures used to ensure that accurate machine scoring is implemented. For R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-Int), IA DOE must provide: • Evidence of scoring reliability statistics for writing items based upon test administrator ratings. • Evidence of a detailed description of the calibration used in scoring software (e.g., field test versus operational calibration). • Evidence that distinguishes between option level scoring and item level scoring.
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	For R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-Int), IA DOE must provide: • Evidence of analysis that supports the assumptions of testlet interchangeability, which will be satisfied by response to element 3.1.
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school, and science in grades 5, 8, and high school, IA DOE must provide: • Evidence of the comparability of alternate versions of the assessments. For R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-Int), IA DOE must provide: • Evidence of analysis that supports the assumptions of testlet interchangeability, which will be satisfied by response to element 3.1.
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school, and science in grades 5, 8, and high school, IA DOE must provide: • Evidence that the State monitors, maintains, and documents the technical quality of the assessment program.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
5.1 – Procedures for including Students with Disabilities	For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school, and science in grades 5, 8, and high school and the R/LA and mathematics DLM-Int AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school, IA DOE must provide: • Evidence including guidelines for IEP teams to use in determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment.
5.3 – Accommodations	For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school, and science in grades 5, 8, and high school and the R/LA and mathematics DLM-Int AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school, IA DOE must provide: • Evidence including an evaluation of the appropriateness and efficacy of test accommodations. • Evidence that describes how exceptional requests for accommodations beyond those routinely allowed are requested and handled.

5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school, and science in grades 5, 8, and high school and the R/LA and mathematics DLM-Int AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school, IA DOE must provide:
	• Evidence that the State monitors test administration in districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments and accommodations are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners, including:
	  o Monitoring protocols and observation checklists.
	  o A summary report of findings from the most recent test administration in the State, including action steps to address and remediate findings.

6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students	For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school, and science in grades 5, 8, and high school, IA DOE must provide: • Evidence of formal adoption of grade-level academic achievement standards and cut scores.
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting	For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school, and science in grades 5, 8, and high school, IA DOE must provide: • 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 to ensure they are valid and reliable.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school, and science in grades 5, 8, and high school, IA DOE must provide: • Evidence that its academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State 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.

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

August, 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes

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

Contents

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

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS 9
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 9
2.2 – Item Development..... 10
2.3 – Test Administration 11
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)12
2.5 – Test Security 15
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 16

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

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

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS 28
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 28
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 30
5.3 – Accommodations..... 31
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations 32

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 33
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students 33
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 35
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.

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State.	Evaluate for all subjects General assessment: Evidence 1.1a (math/reading) and 1.1e (science) reflect formal adoption of academic content standards by the State Board. Alternate assessment: Peers could not locate evidence of formal adoption of Essential Elements in reading, math, or science.	General assessment: No additional evidence required. Alternate assessment: Evidence of formal adoption of Essential Elements in reading, math, and science required.
Section 1.1 Summary Statement		
_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • Evidence of formal adoption of Essential Elements needs to be provided for reading, math, and science.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards The State's academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science specify what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school to succeed in college and the workforce; contain content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.	Evaluate for all three subjects General assessment: Evidence 1.2.e and 1.2.f Alternate assessment: Essential Elements math, ELA, science (which show a side-by-side comparison with the Common Core)	General assessment: There is evidence of broad stakeholder involvement prior to the adoption of the academic content standards in reading, math, and science, including educators, business people, and parents. Although the rigor of the Common Core and NGSS standards is assumed, the State could have also provided documentation to support such rigor for this element. Alternate assessment: The Essential Elements documents provide sufficient evidence of stakeholder involvement and rigor.
Section 1.2 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required		

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

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
1.3 – Required Assessments The State's assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments (based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate academic achievement standards-AAAS) in: • Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12).	Evaluate for grade/subject combinations listed in left column Evidence: 1.3a 2014-2015 NCLB update – David Tilly p. 6 Evidence: 1.3b Iowa 14-15 Alternate Assessment website Evidence: 1.3c Iowa 15-16 DLM website	The state of Iowa provided adequate evidence that Iowa Assessments include general assessments in Reading and Mathematics for students in grades 3-8 and 11 and in Science for students in grades 5, 8, and 11. While the state did not submit evidence pertaining to participation in their science alternate assessment in 2014-15, ED staff independently corroborated the fact that IA had administered a science alternate assessment to 800 students during this school year. Iowa administered the Dynamic Learning Maps alternate assessments to students in grade 3-8, 10 & 11 with significant cognitive disabilities. These assessments measure student performance ELA and mathematics. IA intends to administer the DLM alternate assessment in the future. With regard to Science, the following statement appears on page 9 of their memo: "On August 6, 2015, the Iowa State Board of Education adopted the Iowa Core Science Standards. The new standards replaced the Iowa Core Essential Concepts and Skills for Science with the performance expectations of the Next Generation Science Standards. While this action is after the 14-15 school year, it is evidence of the direction Iowa's educational system is moving."
Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
_X__ No additional evidence is required		

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

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY

1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments
 	
The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.
• For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system;
• For English learners (EL):
  ○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment;
  ○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years.
	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column-SWD and EL
	
	Evidence: 1.4a 2014-2015 NCLB update – David Tilly p. 6-7
	
	State guidance for inclusion of SWDs is located in the AEA (Area Education Agency) special education procedures manual.
	
	Evidence: 1.4b AEA special education procedures – July 1, 2015, p. 109, 131-134
	
	Evidence: 1.4c Iowa ELL guidelines
	
	For English Language Learners, see Iowa's NCLB Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook, Element 5.4,
	
	Evidence: 1.4a 2014-2015 NCLB update – David Tilly p. 9
	
	Evidence: 1.4d Iowa Code - Inclusion of ELL - IAC 281--60.3(3)
		Iowa provided adequate evidence of policies for inclusion of all students with disabilities and English learners in general and alternate assessments of ELA, mathematics, and Science.

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

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

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

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
1.5 – Participation Data The State's participation data show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State's assessment system. In addition, if the State administers end-of-course assessments for high school students, the State has procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates on each required assessment and provides the corresponding data.	Prompts for Reviewers: --data disaggregated by student group: ELA/Math/Science --Shows students tested and students enrolled for each breakout --for end-of-course HS, procedures to ensure each student is tested and counted in participation rate along with data --includes grade level tests and AA-AAAS Evidence: 1.5a CSPR participation rates 2014-2015 • Reading • Math • Science Evidence: 1.5b DLM participation rates 2014-2015 • Reading • Math The state does not administer end of course assessments.	The state provided adequate evidence of high participation rates (well over 95%) across all student subgroups and subjects. The state did not submit evidence of administering a science alternate assessment in 2014-15, however this information was located by ED staff in the most recent CSPR submission.
Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
__X_ No additional evidence is required		

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

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.1 – Test Design and Development The State's test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State's academic content standards, and includes: • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State's grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; • Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State's academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet General assessment: Regarding the full range of the State's academic content standards, peers noted that although there are writing, speaking, and listening standards (Common Core) assessments do not measure those areas. • Evidence 2.1.d and the first paragraph of evidence 3.1c.ii (pg. 2) document the purposes, interpretations, and uses of the results. • Evidence 2.1.e.i, 2.1.e.ii, and 2.1.e.iii • Evidence 2.1.h indicates significant weaknesses in content coverage and categorical concurrence in math particularly. Although results for ELA were much stronger, range of knowledge could be improved for a number of grades for both math and ELA. Missing information for science. • N/A Alternate assessment: See DLM peer review notes.	General assessment: • There appears to be sufficient evidence that this portion of the critical element has been met. • Evidence provided appears to meet the requirements of this portion of the critical element. • There appears to be some evidence of alignment to challenging content in ELA and math; however, evidence cited indicates some deficiencies. Peers recommend that the State create a plan to address those documented gaps. Peers also request similar evidence for science. Peers question the source and timing of the study presented in evidence 2.1.i. It appears that the study in 2.1.h was conducted first (on all forms) and that 2.1.i might have followed and been done internally on Form F only. Peers suggest that this be clarified and that 2.1.i be checked for completeness. • N/A Alternate assessment: See DLM peer review notes.

Section 2.1 Summary Statement

_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
For the general assessment:

- Provide a complete alignment study for Form F, ELA, Math and Science, including a statement outlining improvements in Form over Form E.
- Evidence of alignment to challenging content in science should be provided, paralleling what was provided for math and ELA.
- Evidence that writing, speaking, and listening standards are either being assessed or that the State has a waiver should be provided.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.2 – Item Development The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State's academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet General assessment: Evidence 2.2.a seems to thoroughly cover item development specs. Evidence 2.2.b.i, 2.2.b.ii, 2.2.b.iii discuss coverage of content standards in terms of cognitive process but the alignment study identified weaknesses that need to be addressed (referenced in section 2.1 above). Alternate assessment: See DLM peer review notes.	General assessment: Evidence provided appears to meet the requirements of this critical element. Alternate assessment: See DLM peer review notes.
Section 2.2 Summary Statement		
_X_ No additional evidence is required or		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.3 – Test Administration The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State: • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State's general and alternate assessments receive training on the State's established procedures for the administration of its assessments; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet General assessment: • Evidence 2.3.a • Evidence 2.3.b • N/A Alternate assessment: See DLM peer review notes.	General assessment: • The evidence provided appears to meet the requirements of this portion of the critical element. • The evidence provided appears to meet the requirements of this portion of the critical element. • The evidence provided appears to meet the requirements of this portion of the critical element. Alternate assessment: See DLM peer review notes.
Section 2.3 Summary Statement		
_X_ No additional evidence is required.		

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

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.	General assessment monitoring evidence: Evidence 2.4a-NCLB update and assurances Evidence 2.4b Code of professional conduct Evidence 2.4c Iowa assessments implementation guide. DLM Monitoring The State of Iowa monitored DLM test administration through (1) DLM consortium staff test administrations observations, (2) use of data and other resources communicated to Significant Disabilities State Leadership Team Members and Districts, and (3) ensuring students participate in the correct grade level assessments (no out of level testing), and (4) planning for continuous improvement. DLM Consortium staff administered fourteen test administration observations of operational assessments during the 2014-2015 school year. Evidence: 2.4a_DLM Test_Administration_Observation_Protocol Evidence: 2.4b Test Administration_Observation_Guidance_for_Local Observers Evidence: 2.4c Training video for using the DLM Test Administration Protocol – no .pdf of training, video only Evidence: 2.4d DLM TAO short form showing poor fidelity	The state submitted observation protocols and training for monitoring conducted in conjunction with the alternate assessment only. ED staff could not locate written documentation of the State's procedures for monitoring and reporting results of general assessment administrations across the State.

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

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
	Evidence: 2.4e DLM TAO short form instruction for local observers Evidence: 2.4.f DLM Test Administration Observations in Iowa in 2015 The State of Iowa's Alternate Assessment disseminated participation data and other resources to the Significant Disabilities State Leadership Team Members. The District Communication Delivery Chain was utilized to disseminate communications regarding test administration monitoring. Evidence: 2.4g Significant Disabilities State Leadership Team Monitoring Update Email 12/1/14 Evidence: 2.4h District Communication Email re: DLM monitoring webinar 2/12/15 Evidence: 2.4i District Communication Email re: monitoring participation 2/14/15 Evidence: 2.4.j Use the DLM Test Administration Monitoring Extract to Tract Student Testing Email The DLM Consortium provided member states data on students who participated in testing outside of their grade level. One Iowa student was identified as being tested out of grade level- one grade level above. The State of Iowa's policy allows for students to be tested above but not below grade level to count for accountability purposes. Evidence: 2.4.k DLM Grade Mismatch Guidance	

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

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
	Evidence: 2.4.l DLM Reset Testlet Procedures Evidence: 2.4.m DLM Operation Brief Email The State of Iowa incorporated DLM Staff feedback and TAO reports to identify continuous improvement activities. Future plans include: Partnership between Iowa Public Television, State of Iowa, and DLM to videotape test administration observations in order to enhance current DLM TAO training. Random selection (10% sample on all students tested) test administration observations throughout the year. AEA and UEN Significant Disabilities Team members and District Instructional Coaches trained to administer test administration observations.	
Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • Iowa needs to submit an approach to annual monitoring across the State to ensure and report on fidelity of test administrations for the general assessments..		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.5 – Test Security The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through: • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State's assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS General assessment: • Evidence 2.5.a (pg. 15-16), 2.5.b, and 2.5.c • Although some information is provided in the State's narrative, no evidence was cited. • Although some information is provided in the State's narrative, no evidence was cited. • Although some information is provided in the State's narrative, no evidence was cited. Alternate assessment: Apart from some narrative in their submission, the State did not document any additional test security/remediation procedures beyond those of DLM. See DLM peer notes.	General assessment: • Evidence could be more specific about how training is disseminated, and how security breaches are handled. • Evidence about detection of test irregularities was not located. • Evidence about remediation of test irregularities was not located. • Evidence about investigation of test irregularities was not located. Alternate assessment: See DLM peer notes. No additional State-specific evidence relevant to this critical element was located.

Section 2.5 Summary Statement

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

- State must provide evidence (e.g., guidance) about detection, investigation and remediation of test irregularities, rather than just narrative.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically: • To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS General assessment: All evidence submitted for this section Alternate assessment: Evidence 2.6e and 2.6f are additional State-specific documents related to this critical element.	General assessment: Evidence provided for this critical element appears to be sufficient. Alternate assessment: Evidence provided for this critical element appears to be sufficient.
Section 2.6 Summary Statement		
_X_ No additional evidence is required.		

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

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State's validity evidence includes evidence that the State's assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State's academic content standards, including: • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State's assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State's academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State's academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet General assessment: • Evidence 3.1.a, 3.1.b, 3.1.c.ii Alternate assessment: See DLM peer review notes.	General assessment: • Evidence demonstrates issues with Form E, which was intended to be parallel to Form F, which would imply similar issues could potentially exist with Form F. The State should provide additional evidence (beyond what is in evidence 3.1.c.ii) as to the technical quality and alignment of Form F. Alternate assessment: See DLM peer review notes.

Section 3.1 Summary Statement

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

- The State should provide additional evidence (beyond what is in evidence 3.1.c.ii) as to the technical quality and alignment of Form F, given documented issues with Form E.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State's academic content standards.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet General assessment: Evidence 3.2.c.i, evidence 3.2.c.ii, and evidence 3.2.c.iii include descriptions of the cognitive level difficulty descriptors (Levels 1-3) which parallel DOK levels 1-3. Evidence 3.2.c.ii shows the mix of items in the various content areas at each difficulty. Alternate assessment: See DLM peer review notes.	General assessment: Peers commend the State for having a substantial proportion of items at DOK levels 2 and 3 overall. Alternate assessment: See DLM peer review notes.
Section 3.2 Summary Statement		
_X_ No additional evidence is required .		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State's academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet General assessment: Evidence 3.3a and 3.3b Alternate assessment: See DLM peer review notes.	General assessment: The text in the State's narrative seems to better address this critical element than element 3.3a. Also, it is unclear what the source of 3.3a is and it seems to the Peers that it should be included in 3.3b (tech manual). In addition, results from studies referenced, such as Furgol and Welch, should be included in 3.3b for completeness. Alternate assessment: See DLM peer review notes.
Section 3.3 Summary Statement		
_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • Please clarify the source of evidence 3.3a (which addresses factor structure). • Provide results of a complete factor analysis study for Form F.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State's assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet General assessment: Evidence 3.4.a, 3.4.b, 3.4.c, 3.4.d, 3.4.e.i, 3.4.e.ii, 3.4.f, 3.4.g Alternate assessment: See DLM peer review notes.	General assessment: It appears that sufficient validity evidence has been provided to show that the assessments' scores are related as expected to other variables. Alternate assessment: See DLM peer review notes. (DLM peer reviewers suggested that additional State-specific evidence could be collected in the future, but as of now, none was found.)
Section 3.4 Summary Statement		
_X_ No additional evidence is required.		

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

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.1 – Reliability The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State's student population overall and each student group and, if the State's assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including: • Test reliability of the State's assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State's assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student's achievement.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet General assessment: • Evidence 4.1.a refers to Form E reliability. Evidence 4.1.b does not have a form label but indicates it is for the assessments given in 2014-2015. We assume this is Form F. It is also unclear where this excerpt comes from. • CSEMs appear in Evidence 4.1.b, starting on pg. 13. Again, there is no form label for this excerpt and we question its source but we assume based on the testing date that the data are from Form F. • Evidence in 4.1.b (pg. 17) appears sufficient to meet the requirements of this portion of the critical element, assuming it is for Form • N/A Alternate assessment: See DLM peer review notes.	General assessment: • Evidence appears sufficient to meet the requirements of this portion of the critical element, if the data in evidence 4.1.b are indeed from Form F. Please clarify. • Please clarify that CSEMs are from Form F. The data would be more easily interpretable if they were presented in graph form with cut scores identified clearly. Just looking at the numbers, peers wondered if there was a reversal of the curve where CSEMs were higher in the middle of the distribution when it is expected that they would be higher at the ends of the distribution. Please provide this information. • Please clarify that consistency and accuracy estimates provided are in Form F. • N/A Alternate assessment: See DLM peer review notes.
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • Please clarify the source of evidence 4.1b and that it reflects data from Form F. • Please provide CSEM data in graphical form, with cut points indicated clearly		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet General assessment: Evidence 4.2.a includes DIF analyses for gender and race/ethnicity. Alternate assessment: See DLM peer review notes.	General assessment: Additional analyses should be performed, assuming sufficient numbers in each group, for free/reduced lunch, SWDs, and ELs. Alternate assessment: See DLM peer review notes.
Section 4.2 Summary Statement		
X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • The State should provide DIF analyses for additional student groups (i.e., free/reduced lunch, SWDs, and ELs.)		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet General assessment: Evidence 4.3a provides graphs of raw and scaled scores that show students scoring across the continuum. Alternate assessment: See DLM peer review notes.	General assessment: Although students are scoring across the continuum, peers noted that score distributions are not indicative of precision. For this critical element it would be appropriate to reference such things as CSEMs, test information functions, and item analysis results as well. Alternate assessment: See DLM peer review notes.
Section 4.3 Summary Statement		
_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • Peers identified an interpretive guide for item analysis, so item analysis is certainly done. The State should provide item analysis results, CSEMs, and test information functions for this critical element.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.4 – Scoring The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State's academic achievement standards.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet General assessment: Evidence 4.4.b, 4.4.c, 4.4.d, 4.4.g, 4.4.h are not particularly relevant to this critical element. Evidence 4.4.a does include relevant information about scoring procedures but it is incomplete. Alternate assessment: See DLM peer review notes.	General assessment: A technical manual or similar documentation specific to the Iowa Assessments should be provided. This should include both further description of the Hieronymus scaling procedure and quality control procedures to ensure that accurate machine scoring has taken place. Alternate assessment: See DLM peer review notes.
Section 4.4 Summary Statement		
_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • The State should provide a thorough technical manual for the Iowa Assessments and further description of the Hieronymus procedure used for scaling should be included.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State's academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet	General assessment: Peers do not think this critical element applies to the Iowa Assessments because starting in 2013-2014, only one form (Form F) is being used. Alternate assessment: See DLM peer review notes.
Section 4.5 Summary Statement		
_X_ No additional evidence is required.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State: • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet General assessment: The State's narrative indicated that all but 42 students took the paper version of the test. The 42 took an online version, about which peers could not locate additional information beyond logistics. As the State noted, this small *n* size does not allow for statistical comparisons. Alternate assessments: See DLM peer review notes.	General assessment: Documentation elsewhere acknowledges the existence of alternate forms (e.g., Braille). Evidence is needed to confirm the comparability of the processes and results of such alternate versions. Alternate assessment: See DLM peer review notes.

Section 4.6 Summary Statement

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

- A plan and timeline for gathering evidence to confirm the comparability of the processes and results of alternate versions of the assessments.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet General assessment: The State did not provide any evidence apart from its narrative about this process. Alternate assessment: See DLM peer review notes.	General assessment: A TAC could help with identifying and providing guidance on issues related to technical quality, analysis and ongoing maintenance (e.g., ambiguities about form-specific results, State-specific results like factor analysis, detailed scaling procedures). Peers recommend that the State consider consulting with technical advisors separate from the ITP staff, although this would be a departure from their stated process. Alternate assessment: See DLM peer review notes.

Section 4.7 Summary Statement

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

- A plan and timeline to address deficiencies in monitoring, maintaining, and documenting technical quality of the assessment program.

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

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State's assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that: • Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student's education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards; • States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student's IEP Team based on each student's individual needs; • Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment; • Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities; • Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS General assessment: • A clear explanation of the differences between assessments was not located in the evidence provided. • Evidence 5.1d • The State cited what appears to be an excerpt of a Statute as evidence: "In order to determine assessment participation in either the general or alternate assessment, the team must consider the characteristics of the student, the nature and purpose of the assessment, and the participation option that is most appropriate." [41.320(1)"g"] • Evidence 5.1d • Evidence 5.1c (Appendix C) and 5.1d • Appendix C.16 submitted to DLM peer review and evidence 5.1c • Evidence 5.1k (Iowa DLM submission) • Evidence 5.1n-5.1q Alternate assessment: • A clear explanation of the differences between assessments was not located in the evidence provided. • Evidence 5.1b (pg. 131-132) and evidence 5.1c • See DLM peer review notes. • See DLM peer review notes. • See DLM peer review notes.	General and alternate assessment: • An overview of the assessment program that indicates a list of the assessments offered (alternate and general) should be provided in a manner accessible to all stakeholders. • This appears to be sufficient to meet this requirement. • Rather than including this information solely in the narrative, the State must provide either the entire Statute or alternative documentation to this effect. • This evidence appears to meet the requirements of this portion of the critical element. • This evidence appears to meet the requirements of this portion of the critical element. • See comment from DLM peer reviewers. State peer reviewers concur. • State-provided evidence appears to meet the requirements of this portion of the critical element. • State provided evidence that the DLM promotes access to the general curriculum.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
disabilities; • Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA; • Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student's achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State's general assessments); • The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.	• See DLM peer review notes. • State-specific evidence provided was evidence 5.1k, which has FAQs for parents and other stakeholders • See DLM peer review notes.	

Section 5.1 Summary Statement

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

- An overview of the assessment program that indicates a list of the assessments offered (alternate and general) should be provided in a manner accessible to all stakeholders.
- The State must provide either the entire Statute or alternative documentation to document 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.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State's assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum: • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS General assessment: Evidence 5.2b Alternate assessment: See DLM peer review notes.	General assessment: The evidence provided appears to meet the requirements of this critical element. Peers noted that the guidance appears particularly easy for classroom teachers to use (see checklist beginning on pg. 33 of the pdf for evidence 5.2b). Alternate assessment: See DLM peer review notes.

Section 5.2 Summary Statement
_X_ No additional evidence is required.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.3 – Accommodations The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State: • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student's need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS; General assessment: Evidence 5.3a-5.3f Alternate assessment: • See DLM peer review notes. • See DLM peer review notes. • See DLM peer review notes. • No additional State-specific evidence was located.	Evidence 5.1c (pg. 96) indicates that out-of-level testing is a possibility. This is contradicted elsewhere in the documentation and must be removed, as it is in violation of federal law. General assessment: • Evidence provided appears to meet the requirements of this portion of the critical element. • Evidence provided appears to meet the requirements of this portion of the critical element. • We encourage the State to use accommodation efficacy data to determine the effectiveness and appropriateness of its allowable accommodations. Some of this may already exist in the form of the English Language Learner Success Plan. • The State's narrative indicates that a process exists, but documentation of the process was not found. Alternate assessment: • See DLM peer review notes. • See DLM peer review notes. • See DLM peer review notes. • No additional State-specific evidence was located. The State's narrative indicates that a process exists, but documentation of the process was not found.

Section 5.3 Summary Statement

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

- Evaluation of the appropriateness and efficacy of accommodations.
- Documentation of how exceptional requests for accommodations beyond those routinely allowed are requested and handled (for both the general and alternate assessments.),

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are: • Consistent with the State's policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student's disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student's IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS; General assessment: The State indicates in its narrative, "we do not collect data regarding whether or not [students] received those accommodations [on assessments]. Because of that, we are also not able to determine the effectiveness of such accommodations on student performance." Alternate assessment: See DLM peer review notes.	General assessment: The State needs to develop a monitoring plan and timeline for implementation to be able to address this critical element. Alternate assessment: See DLM peer review notes.

Section 5.4 Summary Statement

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

- The State needs to develop a monitoring plan and timeline for implementation to be able to address this critical element.

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

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically: • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; • The State's academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet General assessment: • Evidence that the State did <u>not</u> adopt the cut scores was found in the narrative for section 6.2: "As part of a larger contract, Data Recognition Corporation conducted a Standard Setting study involving panelists in 2013. This resulted in recommended cut scores for reading, mathematics, and science. Because the study proposed cut scores that were inconsistent with the historical nature of academic achievement standards in Iowa, the academic achievement standards proposed in the DRC report were not adopted." The State reverted back to their 2005 cut scores, about which we have no direct information. It is unclear whether there were 2 or 3 levels, since some documentation refers to 2 (evidence 4.4g) and some refers to 3 (evidence 4.4ii-44vii and evidence 6.2d). • Because of the statement above, it is unclear what grade-level academic achievement standards are being used. • Evidence for this portion of the critical element was not found. Alternate assessment: • State-specific evidence provided (evidence 6.1d and State Board minutes in 6.1e) indicate de facto approval. • State-specific evidence 6.1a	General assessment: The State needs to adopt academic achievement standards and cut scores in compliance with this critical element (i.e., with "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.") Peers see in evidence 6.2d that there may be three performance levels (NP, P, A) but this needs to be explained and the other documentation provided. Alternate assessment: • No additional evidence required. • No additional evidence required. • No additional evidence required.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	• State-specific evidence provided (evidence 6.1e and 6.1f) substantiate the narrative written by the State to address this portion of the critical element: "By virtue of Iowa's participation in the DLM consortium, we subscribe to the resulting achievement levels that arose for DLM standard setting activities. These achievement levels were presented to the State Board on September 15, 2015. The State Board did not act to decline."	

Section 6.1 Summary Statement

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

- The State needs to adopt grade-level academic achievement standards and cut scores in compliance with this critical element.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet General assessment: State provided evidence of an appropriate standard setting methodology and process (evidence 6.2e) but given that the State then chose not to adopt the recommendations, peers cannot ascertain the technical quality of what was done in the State. Alternate assessment: See DLM peer review notes.	General assessment: Provide evidence of a defensible standard-setting process used to generate the cut scores. Alternate assessment: See DLM peer review notes.

Section 6.2 Summary Statement

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

- Provide evidence of a defensible standard-setting process used to generate the cut scores.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards The State's academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State's academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce. If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State's grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet General assessment: Evidence cited (6.3a-6.3d) would be appropriate if not for the underlying concerns raised in sections 6.1 and 6.2 above. As it is, it is a moot point. Alternate assessment: See DLM peer review notes.	General assessment: Based on comments above in 6.1 and 6.2, peers are unable to ascertain the extent to which the achievement standards are challenging or what the students who score "proficient" can do. Alternate assessment: See DLM peer review notes.

Section 6.3 Summary Statement

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

- Since this critical element is predicated on 6.1 and 6.2, those must be addressed before compliance with this critical element can be ascertained.

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

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

6.4 – Reporting
The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:
• The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;
• The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;
• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that:
  o Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student's achievement;
  o Report the student's achievement in terms of the State's grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);
  o Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;
  o Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to
	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet
	
	General assessment:
	All evidence cited in submission
	
	Alternate assessment:
	See DLM peer review notes.
		General assessment:
		Evidence provided appears to meet the requirements of this critical element. However, the shortcomings identified in 6.1-6.3 prevent these documents from being maximally meaningful.
		
		Peers note that States using CRTs do not have to deal with these issues, many of which are a function of using an NRT for accountability purposes.
		
		Alternate assessment:
		See DLM peer review notes.

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

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

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

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

June 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes DLM Integrated Consortium Evidence

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

Contents

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS 3
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 3
2.2 – Item Development..... 6
2.3 – Test Administration 8
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)12
2.5 – Test Security 14
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 17

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 19
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 19
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 22
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure 25
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables..... 27

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER 28
4.1 – Reliability..... 28
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 31
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... 33
4.4 – Scoring 34
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 36
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment 38
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance..... 40

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS 42
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 42
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 46
5.3 – Accommodations..... 48
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations..... 51

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 53
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students 53
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 54
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 56
6.4 – Reporting..... 58

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

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.1 – Test Design and Development The State's test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State's academic content standards, and includes: • 1. Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet 7) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a) Chapter I: Introduction i) Introduction (p. 1) ii) Theory of Action (pp. 5-7) iii) Claims and Conceptual Areas (pp. 14-17) b) Chapter VII: Assessment Results i) Interpretation Resources (pp. 196-197) c) Chapter IX: Validity Studies i) Evidence Based on Consequences of Testing (pp. 243-252) d) Chapter III: Item and Test Development i) Development of the Essential Elements (pp. 38-41)	Peers noted that DLM is a new and innovative assessment that incorporates a DCM model that is not yet frequently used in large-scale assessments. As such we commend the consortium for the work they have begun on this assessment and hope to offer suggestions that will be helpful in the assessment's continued development and operation. Descriptions in the Technical Manual are very clearly stated for the purpose and intended uses for the target population. Connection to the Essential Elements was very clearly stated. The use studies indicate there is some confusion on the part of students with regards to the use of the score reports.
• 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;	8) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a) Chapter I: Introduction i) Claims and Conceptual Areas (pp. 14-17) ii) Essential Elements (pp. 17-20) iii) Dynamic Learning Maps Alternate Assessment System – Figure 5 (p. 12) iv) Dynamic Learning Maps Alternate Assessment System – Figure 6 (p. 13) v) Background (pp. 1-3) b) Chapter II: Map Development i) Critical Sources (p. 28) c) Chapter III: Item and Test Development	Tech manual included a good example of Grade 7 blueprint. Page 45 of the Technical Manual indicates that certain Essential Elements are excluded from the assessment in math because they are unable to be represented on the computer. This could be

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	i) Mathematics Testlets (p. 56) ii) Development of the Essential Elements (pp. 38-41) iii) Review of the Assessment Structure (pp. 37-38) iv) Test Blueprints (pp. 41-45) v) English Language Arts Reading Testlets (pp. 48-51) vi) Guiding Principles (p. 42-43) English Language Arts Writing Testlets (pp. 52-54) 9) FILE 08 Essential Elements ELA 10) FILE 09 Essential Elements Math 11) FILE 10 Blueprint ELA 12) FILE 11 Blueprint Math	problematic. Peers suggested that these EEs could be assessed by teacher administration rather than computer administration. Peers are not clear on the rationales for omitting certain EEs from the assessment and potential impact of these omissions on measuring the full range of content standards.
• 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);	13) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a) Chapter I: Introduction i) Theory of Action (pp. 5-8) b) Chapter III: Item and Test Development i) Items and Testlets (p. 46) ii) Review of Assessment Structure (pp. 37-38) iii) Essential Element Concept Maps for Testlet Development (pp. 61-65) c) Chapter IV: Test Administration i) Overview of Accessibility Supports (p. 131) 14) FILE 05 Test Administration Manual 2014-15	Peers noted that DLM node-based structure provides a visual display of the pathways that lead to higher order thinking skills. The DLM structure demonstrates how students are assessed on the component skills that build to the higher order thinking skills to which the assessment is aligned.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.	How the Assessment Systems Works (pp. 16-20) **Item Pool and Selection Procedures** 15) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 Chapter III: Item and Test Development a) Operational Assessment Items for 2014-2015 (pp. 103-108) b) Alternate Testlets for Students who are Blind or have Visual Impairments (pp. 60-61) c) The First Contact Survey (pp. 84-86) 16) Chapter IV: Test Administration a) Testlet Selection During Instructionally Embedded Assessment (pp. 115-118) 17) Testlet Assignment During the Spring Window (pp. 118-120)	The documentation describes testlet selection, rather than item selection. The bank has a total of 2,220 testlets across grades and content areas and Peers noted that this number of testlets may not be sufficient to support all of the grades and linkage levels of assessment without overexposure of testlets. Peers noted that the DCM model appears to support the test design and the testlet development from a theoretical perspective. A potential concern is whether the selection of the testlets and number of testlets administered is appropriate in practice, because of the dependence of the system on teacher input and their understanding of the overall assessment system. Teachers must be well trained and well-prepared for this task. Teachers could benefit from a feedback system that would help them develop the skills needed to operationalize this assessment. Peers expressed some concerns regarding assumptions regarding item fungibility and model fit. See sections 3.3 and 4.1 for a discussion of the evidence required to address this issue.

Section 2.1 Summary Statement

X___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: See comments above regarding item fungibility and item fit, further described in section 3.3 and 4.1.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.2 – Item Development The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State's academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet 1) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter I: Introduction i. Assessments (p. 20-21) b) Chapter III: Item and Test Development i. Items and Testlets (p. 46) ii. General Testlet Structure and Item Types (pp. 47-48) iii. Review of Assessment Structure (pp. 37-38) iv. Item Writing Process (pp. 70-71) v. Item Writing Resource Materials (p. 70) vi. Item Writer Characteristics (pp. 66-69) vii. Item Writer Training (pp. 69-70) viii. Essential Element Concept Maps for Testlet Development (pp. 61-65) ix. Alternate Testlets for Students who are Blind or Have Visual Impairments (pp. 60-61) x. Student Performance Within and Across Complexity Bands (pp. 87-89) xi. Overview of the Testlet Development Process (pp. 46-47) xii. Overview of the Review Process (pp. 76-77) xiii. Review Assignments and Training (pp. 77-78) xiv. Results of Reviews (p. 82) xv. Educator Survey (pp. 90-94) c) Chapter IV: Test Administration	Peers thought the item development process was clearly described and documented.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	i. Overview of Accessibility Supports (pp. 131-132) Chapter IX: Validity Studies i. Student Cognitive Labs (pp. 224) ii. External Alignment Study (pp. 215-221) 2) FILE 18 Supplemental Evidence Related to Test Development a) Planning a Testlet (pp. 9-10) Accessibility (pp. 11-15) 3) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter III: Item and Test Development i. Decisions and Criteria (p. 78-82) ii. Description of Field Tests (pp. 95-98) iii. Overview of the Testlet Development Process (pp. 46-47) iv. External Reviews (pp. 75-76) v. Field Testing (pp. 94-95) vi. Item Flagging Criteria (p. 99) vii. Operational Assessment Items for 2014- 15 (pp. 103-107) Item Data Review Decisions (pp. 78-82)	
Section 2.2 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.3 – Test Administration The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State: • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet 1) FILE 05 Test Administration Manual 2014-15 a) Checklist (pp. 9-12) b) Educator Portal User Guide for Test Administrators: Manage Student Data (pp. 90-117) c) Educator Portal User Guide for Test Administrators (pp. 78-150) d) KITE User Guide (pp. 150-158) e) Introduction to DLM Testlets: Computer-Delivered Testlets (pp. 23-39) f) Introduction to DLM Testlets: Teacher-Delivered Testlets (pp. 39-51) g) Other Allowable Practices (pp. 50-51) 2) FILE 02 Assessment Coordinator Manual 2014-15 a) Checklist (pp. 7-13) 3) FILE 03 Data Steward Manual 2014-15 a) Checklist (p. 8) 4) FILE 04 Technical Liaison Manual 2014-15 Checklist (pp. 6-7) **Communication** 5) FILE 17 Supplemental Evidence Related to Test Administration a) Sample state landing page from DLM website Test updates – Website and Email Example	Guidelines and procedures were clearly described and documented. These materials also included supplementary supports that students with additional disabilities (e.g., vision, hearing) would need to participate in the assessment. Peers noted that the extensive training modules and quizzes are available to support teachers in their acquisition of knowledge and skills to administer the assessment. Certification through successful completion of the training quizzes ensures a degree of standardization to administration. Peers noted that it will be important for states to have procedures that ensure that the administration protocols are properly implemented by teachers. Peers would have found it helpful to have access to the test administration training videos that were provided to teachers. This would have given peers additional insight into the operation and administration of the test. Peers would have found it helpful to see more example items to get a more detailed picture of the test. In addition, peers wonder if teachers have access to sufficient examples of test items (released items) to become appropriately familiar with the nature and focus of the assessment. The released testlets and testlet statistics would be helpful to teachers. The mention of released testlets is mentioned in the training modules, but there is no mention of the number of released testlets planned or how frequently they are intended for release. Peers suggested that DLM create a plan and timeline for testlet and associated testlet statistic release.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• 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;	**Administration with Accommodations** 6) FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-15 a) Six Steps to Customize DLM Accessibility Features for Students: Step 3- Discuss and Select Appropriate Accessibility Features and Supports (pp. 19-22) b) Six Steps to Customize DLM Accessibility Features for Students: Step 2- Learn about the Accessibility Features and Supports (pp. 15-18) 7) FILE 05 Test Administration Manual 2014-15 a) Accessibility Supports (pp. 33-36) Other Allowable Practices (pp. 37-38) **Training** 8) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter X: Training and Professional Development i) Training Content (pp. 257-260) ii) Facilitated Training and Self-Directed Training (pp. 256-257) iii) Completion of all modules (p. 260) iv) Training for Local Education Agency Staff (pp. 254-255) b) Chapter IV: Test Administration i) Formative Monitoring Techniques (p. 130) 9) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 - Appendices a) Appendix G.1 – Required Test Administration Training b) Appendix C.14 – Monitor Assessments Webinar	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• 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.	10) FILE 16 Facilitator Guide for Required Test Administration Training 2014-15 a) Procedures for Delivering Facilitated Required Training, (p. 5) 11) FILE 02 Assessment Coordinator Manual 2014-15 a) Checklist (pp. 7-13) 12) FILE 03 Data Steward Manual 2014-15 a) Checklist (p. 8) 13) FILE 04 Technical Liaison Manual 2014-15 Checklist (pp. 6-7) **Technology Requirements** 14) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter IV: Test Administration i) The KITE System (pp. 112-114) b) Chapter X: Training and Professional Development i) Training Content (pp. 257-260) 15) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 - Appendices a) Appendix G.1–Required Test Administration Training 16) FILE 04 Technical Liaison Manual 2014-15 a) Educator Portal & KITE (pp. 9-12) b) Whitelist to Access Content (p. 8) 17) FILE 05 Test Administration Manual 2014-15 a) KITE User Guide: KITE Testing Devices	DLM provided extensive evidence for establishing and documenting procedures for training and administration of the assessment.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	(pp. 150) b) Before Beginning Assessments: Practice Activities and Released Testlets (pp.63-65) 18) FILE 02 Assessment Coordinator Manual 2014-15 KITE Testing Devices (p. 54) **Contingency plans for technology-based assessment administration** 19) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter IV: Test Administration i) KITE Client (Test Delivery Engine) (pp. 113-114) ii) Monitoring Assessment Administration (pp. 128-130) iii) Security in the KITE System (pp. 140-141) b) Chapter VII: Assessment Results i) Data Files (pp. 198-200) 20) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 - Appendices a) Appendix C.7-Incident Summaries 21) FILE 04 Technical Liaison Manual 2014-15 a) Checklist (pp. 6-7) b) Local Caching Server (p. 12) FILE 17 Supplemental Evidence Related to Test Administration	DLM has clearly documented the technology requirements of the assessment. The existence of contingency plans was also well-documented.
Section 2.3 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required		

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

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.	_____ policies and procedures apply to all grade-level and AA-AAAS in all subjects 1) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter IV: Test Administration i) Monitoring Assessment Administration (pp. 128-130) ii) Consortium Test Administration Observation Protocol (pp. 128-130) iii) Formative Monitoring Techniques (p. 130) iv) Monitoring Testlet Delivery (pp. 130-131) b) Chapter IX: Validity Studies i) Evaluation of Test Administration (pp. 230-236) 2) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 - Appendices a) Appendix C.12: DLM Test Administration Observation Research Protocol b) Appendix C.13: Guide to Test Administration Observations: Guidance for Local Observers: Guide for Local Observers c) Appendix C.14: Monitoring webinar for local staff **THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC MONITORING PROCEDURES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.**	

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

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
	Test administration monitoring 3) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter IX: Validity Studies i) Observations of Test Administration (pp. 230-234) b) Chapter IV: Test Administration i) Administration Errors (pp. 148-149) c) Chapter VII: Assessment Results i) Data Files (pp. 198-200) **THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC MONITORING RESULTS IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.**	
Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
n/a State Specific		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.5 – Test Security The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through: • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State's assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS **Evidence of Prevention of Irregularities** 1) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter III: Item and Test Development i) Overview of the Testlet Development Process (pp. 46-47) ii) Item Writer Training (pp. 69-70) iii) Item Writing Process (pp. 70-71) iv) Overview of Review Process (pp. 76-77) v) Reviewer Responsibilities (p. 78) b) Chapter IV: Test Administration i) Training and Certification (pp. 138-139) ii) Secure Test Content (p. 141) iii) Maintaining Security During Test Administration (pp. 139-140) iv) State Specific Policies and Practices (pp. 141-142) c) Chapter X: Training and Professional Development i) Test Security in the Dynamic Learning Maps Alternate Assessment (p. 258) 2) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 - Appendices Appendix B.3: Item Writer Security and Confidentiality Statement b) Appendix C.3 Sample State Summary Sheet 3) FILE 05 Test Administration Manual 2014-15	DLM provided manuals, webinars, and other resources to support test security issues and handling of irregularities. Plans for detection of irregularities are well documented, but monitoring by states will be critical in ensuring the maintenance of test security over time. The item/testlet pool is not very deep and also considering the heavy involvement of teachers magnifies the potential risk of item/testlet overexposure over time. Because teachers select the essential elements, there is a risk that teachers will select the same essential element repeatedly over time for which there may be a limited number of testlets available. It is unclear to what degree will this be monitored over time?

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	a) Retrieve Testlet Information Page (p. 122-125) 4) FILE 02 Assessment Coordinator Manual 2014-15 a) Complete Security Agreement (p. 36) **THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC PREVENTION MEASURES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.** **Evidence of Detection of Irregularities** 5) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter IV: Test Administration i) Forensic Analysis Plans (pp. 142-143) 6) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 - Appendices a) Appendix C.15: DLM TAC Meeting Minutes 1/13/2016 **THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC DETECTION EFFORTS IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.** **Evidence of Investigation of Remediation Following Incidents** 7) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter IV: Test Administration i) Maintaining Security During Test Administration (pp. 139-140) Data Security (p. 141) 8) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 - Appendices a) Appendix C.5: DLM Consortium Procedures for Data Security Breaches b) Appendix C.6: State Breach Response	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Communication Plan REMEDIATION **THIS PORTION OF THE CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.**	
Section 2.5 Summary Statement		
__X_ No additional evidence is required		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically: • To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS **Security and Integrity of Test Materials** 1) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a) Chapter IV: Test Administration i) Security in the KITE System (pp. 140-141) ii) Data Security (p. 141) **THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE- SPECIFIC SYSTEMS IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.** **Security of Student Data** 2) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a) Chapter IV: Test Administration i) Security of the KITE System (pp. 140-141) ii) State-Specific Policies and Practices (pp. 141-142) Data Security (p. 141) 3) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 - Appendices a) Appendix C.4: PII Data Use Agreement b) Appendix C.5: DLM Consortium Procedures for Data Security Breaches c) Appendix C.6 State Breach Response Communication Plan **THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE- SPECIFIC SYSTEMS IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.**	Documentation was provided to support integrity and privacy of data. Peers noted that data security is dependent on the proper operation of the KITE system.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• 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.	**PII Protection in Reporting** 4) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a) Chapter IV: Test Administration i) Data Security (p. 141) b) Chapter VII: Assessment Results i) Subgroup Performance (pp. 192-194) ii) Aggregated Reports (p. 196) **PLEASE SEE INDIVIDUAL STATE RESPONSES FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING STATE- SPECIFIC MEASURES TO PREVENT DISCLOSURE OF PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION IN AGGREGATED REPORTS.**	Guidelines were provided for the protection of personally identifiable data. Peers suggested that DLM describe their data store to ensure that any data for analysis by state users has appropriate protection for any PII that is contained within the system.
Section 2.6 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required		

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

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State's validity evidence includes evidence that the State's assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State's academic content standards, including:	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **Validity Framework and Overall Evaluation** 1) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 2015 a. Chapter I: Introduction i. Theory of action (pp. 5-8) b. Chapter XI: Conclusion and Discussion i. Evaluation Summary (Tables 114 and 115, pp. 285-286) ii. Summary and Evaluation of Validity Evidence (pp. 270-287) iii. Evaluation Summary (Table 116, p. 287) iv. Future Research (pp. 290-291) v. Operational Assessment (pp. 288-289) Propositions for Score Interpretation and Use (p. 270)	
• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State's assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State's academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State's academic content standards	**Measurement of Academic Content Standards** 2) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 2015 a. Chapter I: Introduction i. Theory of Action (pp. 5-8) ii. System Components (pp. 10-21) iii. Claims and Conceptual Areas (pp. 14-17) iv. Essential Elements (pp. 17-19) b. Chapter II: Map Development	Initial evidence provided by DLM demonstrates acceptable alignment of the essential elements to the CCSS, as per the summary on page 5 of the external alignment study (File 15). . States should be aware that to the degree that state standards differ from CCSS, additional alignment studies may be needed at the state level. In addition, states need to be aware that some essential elements appear to have lower alignment than others (e.g., table 1, File 15, page 5), since this may have

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
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.	i. Learning Targets: CCSS and Essential Elements (pp. 26-27) c. Chapter III: Item and Test Development i. Development of Essential Elements (pp. 38-41) ii. Test Blueprints (pp. 41-46) iii. Essential Element Concept Maps for Testlet Development (pp. 61-65) iv. Overview of the Test Development Process (pp. 46-47) Item Writer Training (pp. 69-70) vi. External Reviews (pp. 75-83) d. Chapter IV: Test Administration Testlet Selection During Instructionally Embedded Assessment (pp. 115-118) **Evaluative Evidence** 3) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 2015 a. Chapter III: Item and Test Development i. Overview of the Review Process (pp. 76-77) ii. Decisions and Criteria (pp. 78-82) iii. Results of Review (p. 82) b. Chapter IX: Validity Studies i. Evaluation of blueprint coverage (pp. 221-223) c. Chapter XI: Conclusion Operational Assessment (p. 289) 18) Chapter IV: Test Administration a) Testlet Assignment During Spring Window (pp. 118-120)	alignment implications for an individual member state. DLM presented simulated data that was based on assumptions regarding item fungibility within linkage levels. The underlying scoring and patterns of mastery in student reports are based on these assumptions. However, evidence of model fit and item fit to these assumptions is needed to assess the impact on comparability of scores, adaptive routing decisions within and across essential elements, and estimates of classification consistency and accuracy. Peers could not locate evidence that supports the interchangeability of testlets. In the updated reliability statistics section of the February 2016 TAC notes (File23), the issues regarding the model and scoring assumptions were discussed. Peers also would like clarification regarding the adaptive routing pathways within and/or across EEs.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	4) FILE 12 External Review Report 2013-2014 5) FILE 13 External Review Report 2014-2015 6) FILE 15 External Alignment Study a. Overview of DLM Assessment System (pp. 8-9) b. Number of Essential Elements, Target Level Nodes, Linkage Levels, and Items Sampled in Study (Table 5, p. 16) c. Alignment Methodology - Panelists, Training, Reliability of Codes, and Quality Control Check (pp. 15-16) d. Appendix B: Panelist Evaluation Results e. Executive Summary (pp. 4-8) 7) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014- 2015 - Appendices Appendix H.1 – DLM Response to External Alignment Study	
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
_____X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: See comments above regarding evidence needed relative to model assumptions and fit.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State's academic content standards.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet 1) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 2015 a. Chapter III: Item and Test Development i. Essential Element Concept Maps for Testlet Development (pp. 61-65) ii. Item Writer Training (pp. 69-70) iii. Overview of the Testlet Development Process (pp. 46-47) iv. Item Writing Process (pp. 70-71) v. Overview of Review Process (pp. 76-77) b. Chapter IX: Validity Studies i. Teacher Feedback (Table 101, p. 235) c. Chapter XI: Conclusion i. Accessibility (pp. 276-277) 2) FILE 18 Supplemental Evidence Related to Test Development a. Item Writing Handbook i. Planning a Testlet (pp. 9-19) Appendix A (p. 29) **Interaction with Testlet Content** 3) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 2015 a. Chapter IX: Validity Studies i. Student Cognitive Labs (pp. 221-228) Teacher Cognitive Labs (pp. 229-230) **Fidelity of Administration** 2) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 2015 a) Chapter X: Training and Professional	DLM provided adequate documentation that the assessment taps the appropriate cognitive processes (e.g., Technical manual pg 221-230).

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Development i. Completion of All Modules (p. 260) ii. Training Content (pp. 257-260) b) Chapter IV: Test Administration Educator Experience (Table 55, p. 151) ii. Resources and Materials (pp. 123-124) iii. Chapter IV: Test Administration ï Consortium Test Administration Observation Protocol (pp. 128-130) iv. Chapter IX: Validity Studies ï Observations of Test Administration (pp. 230-234) 3) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014- 2015 - Appendices Appendix C.12: Test Administration Observation Research Protocol **Accessibility** 6) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 2015 a. Chapter IV: Test Administration i. Accessibility (pp. 131-138) User Experience- Accessibility (pp. 155-158) • Test Administration Resources (Table 46, p. 124) • Practice Activities and Released Testlets (p. 126) • User Experience - Accessibility (Table 62, p. 158) 4) Chapter IX: Validity Studies a) Test Administrator Feedback Studies (Table 101, p. 235) 5) Chapter XI: Conclusion	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	a) Accessibility (pp. 276- 277) 6) Chapter X: Training and Professional Development Module 3: Accessibility for All Students (pp. 258-259)	
Section 3.2 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State's academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **Scoring and reporting structures' consistency with sub-domain structures** 1) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 2015 a. Chapter I: Introduction i. Claims and Conceptual Areas (pp. 14-17) b. Chapter III: Item and Test Development i. Blueprint Development Process (pp. 43-46) ii. Essential Element Concept Maps for Test Development (pp. 61-65) iii. Student Performance Within and Across Complexity Bands (Table 24, p 88) c. Chapter V: Modeling i. Additional DLM Categorizations: Essential Elements and Linkage Levels (pp. 166-168) d. Chapter VII: Assessment Results i. Individual Reports (pp. 195-196) ii. Data Files (pp. 198-199) iii. Aggregated Reports (p. 196) e. Chapter II: Map Development i. Development Process (pp. 25-30) ii. Educator and Expert Review (p. 35) iii. Nodes Reflect the Products of Learning and Cognitive Growth (pp. 28-29) 6) Chapter IX: Validity Studies a) Vertical Articulation of Linkage Levels for each Essential Element	Internal structure is classically related to how well items are working together to measure the construct. Peers could not locate item-level data such as factor loadings or item-total correlations, or comparable node-level data. Even when overall reliability indices are satisfactory, it is still conceivable that certain items and/or nodes are not contributing to the reliability of the mastery classifications. The practical consequence of this is that students may take test items that do not contribute significant information on how they are performing relative to the underlying construct. This issue was raised by the TAC in the minutes from the January 2016 meeting. Peers understand that DLM uses an innovative model and suggested that DLM may wish to evaluate whether or how the DCM model can accommodate differences in item difficulty. Peers recommend that operational data be used to provide percentage correct item level data as in Table 24, pg. 88 of File06, for all grades and content areas. Peers also question why more analyses of operational data from the 2014-2015 operational assessment were not included in the submission. As additional operational data becomes available, DLM should do additional analyses to support validity based on internal structure of the assessment. The reliability simulations do not consider the issue of variation of difficulty of items and testlets within linkage levels. Reliability estimates based on assumptions of equal item difficulty represent upper limits. Follow-up analyses need to be conducted when more data become available so that simulation studies can be conducted based on item and testlet

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	(pp. 218-219) 7) Chapter XI: Conclusion a) Propositions for Score Interpretation and Use (p. 270) 2) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014- 2015-Appendices a. Appendix E.1: Individual Student Score Report Sample b. Appendix E.2: Aggregated Reports Sample 3) FILE 15 External Alignment Study Focus #3: Vertical Articulation of Linkage Levels (pp. 23-24) **Consistency of Measurement** 4) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a. Chapter VIII: Reliability Evidence Content-Area (Performance-Level) Reliability Evidence (pp. 208-209) ii. Essential-Element Reliability Evidence (pp. 210-211) Linkage-Level Reliability Evidence (pp. 212-214) **Differential Item Functioning (DIF)** 5) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a. Chapter IX: Validity Studies i. Evaluation of Item Level Bias (pp. 236-242) b. Chapter XI: Conclusion and Discussion Future Research (p. 290)	parameters. Peers noted that the student score reports contain a great deal of detailed information. The concern was raised that the current system may not have the level of reliability evidence to support this level of detail with confidence considering the intended inferences. DLM may wish to consider the comments above regarding model fit and item level data as they evaluate how to address the reporting issue. An estimate of classification consistency (and accuracy) is needed for each level within each EE, conditional on true mastery being at that level. Estimates based on the overall distribution of mastery in the simulated population will be high for extreme high or low linkage levels mainly because most simulated examinees are not close to these levels.

Section 3.3 Summary Statement

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: See comments above in the right-hand column.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State's assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **Score Relationship to Other Variables** 1) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-2015 a. Chapter III: Item and Test Development i. Student Performance Within and Across Complexity Bands (Table 24, p. 88) b. Chapter IX: Validity Studies Evidence based on Relationships to other Variables (Table 108, p. 243)	The DLM assessment is new and as a result there is limited evidence of validity based on relationships with other variables. State members of the DLM consortium may need to provide additional evidence to address this critical element.
Section 3.4 Summary Statement		
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence presented for this critical element was limited due to the newness of the assessment. DLM should present additional evidence with future submissions when that is available. DLM Consortium member states may also wish to provide evidence to address this critical element.		

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

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.1 – Reliability The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State's student population overall and each student group and, if the State's assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including: • Test reliability of the State's assessments estimated for its student population;	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet 1) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a) Chapter V: Modeling i) Linkage Level Model with Fungible Item Parameters (pp. 169-170) b) Chapter VII: Assessment Results i) Score Reports (pp. 195-198) c) Chapter VIII: Reliability i) Content-Area (Performance-Level) Reliability Evidence (pp. 208-209) ii) Essential Element Reliability Evidence (pp. 210-211) Linkage Level Reliability Evidence (pp. 212-214)	As previously noted, the reliability simulations do not consider the issue of variation of difficulty across testlets. DLM will also need to consider whether assumptions made about item fungibility are valid. Follow-up empirical analyses need to be conducted with additional operational results. The reliability evidence presented by DLM is not clearly related to the decisions that are going to be made about students based on the student reports. Peers need to know the consistency with which students are classified at or above a given linkage level. This aligns with reporting the highest level mastered on the student reports. DLM should provide supplementary analyses that address the consistency and accuracy of the highest level of mastery of the linkage levels within the essential elements. Peers were concerned about the possibility of underreporting the data and analyses necessary to demonstrate content area and EE reliability. Peers recommend that student reports include more reliability data to help parents and teachers better interpret the assessment results. Peers noted that the reliability evidence from the simulation studies provided an initial estimate of reliabilities, but additional analyses based on operational are desirable as evidence of reliability of the assessment. Peers also noted that the simulations do not appear to have considered the impact of variation in item difficulty has on reliability. Peers suggested that DLM consider reporting the distribution of student performance on

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State's assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student's achievement.	**Overall and Conditional Standard Error of Measurement** e. FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 i. Chapter VIII: Reliability ï Background Information on Reliability Methods (pp. 201-214) ii. Chapter XI: Conclusion Future Research (pp. 290-291) **Achievement Levels** 4) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a. Chapter VIII: Reliability Content-Area (Performance-Level) Reliability Evidence (pp. 208-209) **Computer-Adaptive Tests** 8) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 9) a. Chapter VIII: Reliability Linkage Level Reliability Evidence (pp. 212-214)	which the simulation is based. DLM has provided promising reliability statistics, but these may be insufficient for demonstrating that the assessment provides reliable results for the range of uses of the assessment. See also the Peers' comment about reliability and model fit in section 3.1. Because DLM is based on a DCM model, the evidence did not include traditional measures of SEM. Peers recommended, however, that DLM provide additional information on the achievement level classification accuracy as aggregated across all simulated students. DLM states on page 212 of File06 that Kappa values above .6 indicate substantial agreement between simulated and estimated linkage-level mastery status. However, page 213 of File06, table 82, indicates that nearly one-third of the linkage levels have a Kappa statistic less than the target value of .6. DLM should provide classification accuracy information based on one linkage level for each student. More evidence is required to meet this critical element. The evidence provided does not appear to relate to the linkage levels. Reliability estimates in the DLM system are dependent on teacher input and potential override of system recommendations. While the system appears to be well-designed, the evidence that this has been carried out reliably needs further support. Peers commend DLM's use of simulations in this area. More specifics and details need to be reported in the future.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: See comments in the right-hand column for specific recommendations.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **Accessibility** 1) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a) Chapter III: Item and Test Development i. Essential Element Concept Maps for Testlet Development (pp. 61-65) ii. Items and Testlets (pp. 46-61) iii. Introduction (pp. 37) iv. Item Writing Process (pp. 70-71) v. The First Contact Survey (pp. 84-85) vi. Item Writing Resource Materials (p. 70) vii. Essential Element Concept Maps for Testlet Development (pp. 61-65) viii. Review Criteria (pp. 79-82) b) Chapter IV: Test Administration i. Overview of Accessibility Supports (pp. 131-136) ii. Testlet Assignment During the Spring Window (pp. 118-120) c) Chapter IX: Validity Studies i. Student Cognitive Labs (pp. 224-228) Observations of Test Administration (pp. 230-234) a) FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-15 i) Step 2 – Learn about the	Peers noted that evidence of item level fairness and accessibility review appeared to be complete, including DIF analyses. In addition, DLM used two different cognitive labs to address fairness and accessibility (one study was student-focused and the other teacher-focused). The assessment design reflected consideration of accessibility and fairness issues. Teachers are given latitude and flexibility to address accessibility issues, and are required to pass a certification quiz to ensure consistency and fairness in administration. Students are given opportunity to practice prior to the administration of the assessment. Peers noted and agreed that the type of disability could not be considered as part of the eligibility criteria for the assessment. Page 258 of the technical manual discussed the Personal Needs and Preference Profile, which is an important aspect of how the fairness is addressed in the assessment implementation.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Accessibility Features and Supports (pp. 15-18) b) FILE 18 Supplemental Evidence Related to Test Development i) Principles of Item Writing: Accessibility (p. 11) c) FILE 19 Pilot Administration Technical Report Initialization (pp. 5-16) **Fairness** 5) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a) Chapter III: Item and Test Development i. Item Writing Process (pp. 70-71) ii. Review Criteria (pp. 79-82) b) Chapter IV: Test Administration Allowable Practices (pp. 136-138)	
Section 4.2 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **Adequately Precise Estimate Across the Continuum** v. FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 ï Chapter III: Items and Test Development ï The First Contact Survey (pp. 84-85) ï Chapter IV: Test Administration ï Linkage Level Selection and Adaptive Delivery (pp. 114-120) ï Chapter V: Modeling ï Linkage Level Model with Fungible Item Parameters (pp. 169-170) ï DLM Scoring: Mastery Status Assignment (p. 170) ï Chapter VII: Assessment Results ï Student Performance (pp. 190-194) ï Linkage Level Mastery (p. 194) ï Chapter VIII: Reliability Evidence ï Content-Area (Performance-Level) Reliability Evidence (pp. 208-209) Essential-Element	Peers noted that Table 78 on page 195 of File06 indicated that a significant percentage of students had no evidence of mastery on some essential elements. This may simply be a reflection of the characteristics of the student population. Peers commend the overall design of the DLM system appears to represent the full range of performance.
Section 4.3 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.4 – Scoring The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State's academic achievement standards.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **Standardized Scoring Procedures** 7) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter III: Item and Testlet Development i. General Testlet Structure and Item Types (pp. 47-48) ii. English Language Arts Writing Testlets (pp. 52- 55) b) Chapter V: Modeling i. Psychometric Background Information (pp. 159-160) ii. Linkage Level Model with Fungible Item Parameters (pp. 169-170) iii. DLM Scoring: Mastery Status Assignment (p. 170) c) Chapter VI: Standard Setting i. Results (pp. 180-185) d) Chapter VII: Assessment Results i. Score Reports (pp. 195- 198) ii. Quality Control Procedures for Data Files and Score Reports (pp. 199-200) iii. Data Files (pp. 198-200) e) Chapter VIII: Reliability Evidence Content-Area (Performance-Level) Reliability Evidence (pp 208-209) 2) Essential-Element Reliability Evidence (pp. 210-211) 3) Linkage-Level Reliability Evidence (pp. 212-213) f) Chapter X: Training and Professional Development i) Modules 4-7 (pp. 259-260)	Peers noted that the DCM model appears appropriate for this type of assessment. Peers noted that most scoring is automated. Peers noted that writing scores appear to be derived in part from test administrators observing and rating the writing process and products through the use of checklists. Peers were unable to locate evidence of writing scoring reliability statistics that are typically generated as a result of such a process. Peers noted that the scoring of the writing assessment is unclear; more information is needed on the R-script (how it was developed, the pilot population on which it was originally calibrated, the need for any scoring guide, etc.) and whether the scoring model was recalibrated once operational data were available. More information is needed on what scoring at the 'option level' versus scoring at the 'item level' means.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	5) FILE 05 Test Administration Manual 2014-15 a) Teacher Administered Testlets (pp. 39-51) 6) FILE 17 Supplemental Evidence Related to Test Administration Writing FAQ	

Section 4.4 Summary Statement

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: More information and evidence regarding the scoring of writing and other open-ended items is needed.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State's academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **Assessment Forms Represent Academic Content Standards** 8) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter III: Item and Test Development ï Operational Assessment Items for 2014-2015 (pp. 103-107) b) Chapter IV: Test Administration ï Instructionally Embedded Assessments (p. 109) ï Testlet Selection During Instructionally Embedded Assessment (pp. 115-118) ï Spring Assessments (p.109) ï Testlet Assignment During the Spring Window (pp. 118-119) ï Administration Errors (pp. 148-149) ï Monitoring Testlet Delivery (pp. 130-131) 9) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 – Appendices Appendix C.7 Incident Summaries 2014-2015 **Assessment Forms Yield Consistent Score Interpretations** 8) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter III: Item and Test Development ï Operational Assessment Items for 2014-15 (pp. 103-107) ï Item Flagging Criteria (p. 99)	DLM makes an underlying assumption about the fungibility of item parameters. If that assumption is not valid, then comparability of test forms may be impacted. Peers noted that the instructionally embedded testlet bank is separate from the spring testlet bank. DLM may need to consider conducting simulation studies to explore the comparability of the difficulty of testlets in the two testlet banks.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	ï Essential Element Concept Maps for Testlet Development (pp. 61-65) ï Item Writing Process (pp. 70-71) ï Field Testing (pp. 94-103) b) Chapter V: Modeling Linkage Level Model with Fungible Item Parameters (pp. 169-170)	
Section 4.5 Summary Statement		
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: See comments in the right-hand column.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State: • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **Comparable Interpretation of Results** 14) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a) Chapter III: Item and Test Development i) Alternate Testlets for Students who are Blind or Have Visual Impairments (pp. 60-61) ii) Item Writing Process (pp. 70-71) iii) Item Writing Resource Materials (pp. 70) Essential Element Concept Maps for Testlet Development (pp. 61-65) **Documented Evidence of Comparability** 2) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a. Chapter III: Item and Test Development i. Item Flagging Criteria (pp. 99) ii. Operational Assessment Items for 2014-2015 (pp. 103-108) b. Chapter IV: Test Administration i. Overview of Accessibility Supports (pp. 131) ii. Practice Activities and Released Testlets (pp. 126-127) iii. Additional Allowable Practices (pp. 136-138) c. Chapter V: Modeling Linkage Level Model with Fungible Item Parameters	DLM has documented the design and development process that in theory supports comparable interpretations of results. However, the possible variability of difficulty of testlets calls into question the comparability of the meaning and interpretation of assessment results.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	(pp. 169- 170)	
Section 4.6 Summary Statement		
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: See right-hand column for additional information required.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **Monitoring, Maintaining, and Improving Quality of Assessment** 1) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter III: Item and Test Development i. Item Writing (pp. 65-75) ii. Item Flagging Criteria (p. 99) iii. Item Data Review Decisions (pp. 99-100) b) Chapter IV: Test Administration i. Forensic Analysis Plans (pp. 142-143) ii. Adaptive Delivery (pp. 143- 147) c) Chapter IX: Validity Studies i. Evidence Based on Internal Structure (pp. 236-242) d) Chapter XI: Conclusion and Discussion i. Future Research (pp. 290-291) ii. Table 114: Dynamic Learning Maps Alternate Assessment Propositions and Sources of Related Evidence for 2014-15 (p. 285) iii. Table 115: Evidence Sources Cited in Previous Table (pp. 286-287) 2) FILE 15 External Alignment Study FILE 20 Scoring Reporting and Analysis 4) FILE 23 TAC Materials 5) FILE 14 Standard Setting Technical Report 2015 a) Appendix B: Rationale for	DLM has a highly qualified TAC that is consulted regularly about assessment and measurement issues. Peers noted that on page 3 of the TAC meeting minutes (January 2016) that there are recommendations for modeling/review of simulation study plans and the need to review model assumptions and fit issues. Peers supported this process for addressing classification uncertainty addressing issues of model fit and more specific calibrations of nodes with regard to reliability estimates, routing algorithms, and mastery inferences. Peers recommended that DLM prioritize and work with states to determine a plan and timeline for conducting forensic analyses to ensure that issues identified are followed-up on an ongoing basis.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Determining Mastery and Developing Profiles (pp. 58-59) 6) FILE 15 External Alignment Study a) Focus 3: Vertical Articulation of Linkage Levels (pp. 23-24) b) Focus 4: Learning Map Nodes within a Linkage Level and Assessment Items (pp. 24-30) 7) FILE 22 Scope of Work	

Section 4.7 Summary Statement
_X__ No additional evidence is required. See suggestions above for recommendations regarding ongoing maintenance of the assessment.

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

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State's assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that: • Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student's education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards; • States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student's IEP Team based on each student's individual needs; • Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment;	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS State evidence State evidence **Guidelines for choice of assessment** 3) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a. Chapter X: Training and Professional Development Accessibility for All Students (pp. 258-259) 2) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 - Appendices a) Appendix C.16: Dynamic Learning Maps Participation Guidelines b) Appendix G.1: Required Test Administration Training	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities; • Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;	**Information on Supports and Accommodations** 5) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a. Chapter IV: Test Administration i. Accessibility (pp. 131-137) b. Chapter X: Training and Professional Development i. Accessibility for All Students (pp. 258-259) 6) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 - Appendices a. Appendix G.1: Required Test Administration Training 7) FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-2015 a. Step 2: Learn about the DLM Accessibility Features: What Does DLM Provide? (pp. 15-18) **Guidance on Selection of Accommodations** 19) FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-2015 a) Accessibility by Design: Customization for Each Student (pp. 11-12) b) Step 3 – Discuss and Select Appropriate Accessibility Features and Supports: Considerations for Individual Education Plan (IEP) Teams (pp. 19-22) c) Step 6 – Evaluate the Accessibility Features Used After the Assessment (p. 30) 20) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter X: Training and Professional Development i) Accessibility for All Students (pp. 258-259)	Peers noted that DLM provides adequate and appropriate guidelines and supports to states regarding selection of appropriate accommodations, participation in the appropriate assessment, etc. However, it is incumbent upon the states to have sound plans to operationalize and monitor these guidelines and supports.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	21) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 Appendices a) Appendix G.1: Required Test Administration Training 22) FILE 05 Test Administration Manual 2014-15 a) Complete Access (Personal Needs and Preferences(PNP)) Profile (p. 96) b) Before Beginning Assessments: Evaluate and Choose Accessibility Supports (PNP Settings) (p. 61) c) Prepare for Next Year: Evaluate Accessibility Supports (PNP Setting) (p. 77)	
• 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;	**Disability Categories for Alternate Assessment** 2) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 - Appendices a) Appendix C.16: Dynamic Learning Maps Participation Guidelines	
• 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	State Evidence **Promote Access to the General Curriculum** 4) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State's general assessments); • The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.	a. Chapter IV: Test Administration i. Instructionally Embedded Assessments (p. 109) b. Chapter X: Training and Professional Development i. Professional Development Participation and Evaluation (pp. 261-267) ii. Instructional Professional Development (pp. 260-261) iii. Overview of the Dynamic Learning Maps Alternate Assessment System (pp. 257-258) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 - Appendices	

Section 5.1 Summary Statement
__X_ No additional evidence is required.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State's assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum: • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS **Determining Appropriateness of Accommodation** 4) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter VII: Assessment Results ï Results – Student Participation (pp. 180-190) 5) FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-15 a) Six Steps to Customize DLM Accessibility Features for Students (pp. 13-30) **Information on Supports and Accommodations** 3) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter IV: Test Administration i. Accessibility (pp. 131-138) b) Chapter X: Training and Professional Development i. Accessibility for All Students (pp. 258-259) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 - Appendices a) Appendix G.1 Required Test Administration Training • FILE 05 Test Administration Manual 2014-15 ï CD Testlets/Accessibility Supports/Language Translation (pp. 33-36) ï TA Testlets/Accessibility Supports/Language Translations (p.	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.	49) • FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-15 **Guidance on Selection of Accommodations** 7) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter IV: Test Administration i) Accessibility (pp. 131-138) b) Chapter X: Training and Professional Development i) Accessibility for All Students (pp. 258-259) 8) FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-2015 a) Step 2: Learn about the DLM Accessibility Features: What Does DLM Provide? (pp. 15-18) b) Step 6: Evaluate the Accessibility Features Used After the Assessment (p. 30) 9) FILE 05 Test Administration Manual 2014-15 a) KITE User Guide/Change An Accessibility Support During Testing (pp. 150-158) b) Before Beginning Assessments/Evaluate and Choose Accessibility Supports (pp. 56-61)	

Section 5.2 Summary Statement
_X__ No additional evidence is required.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.3 – Accommodations The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State: • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS; **Evidence of appropriate accommodation availability** 7) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter IV: Test Administration ï Accessibility (pp. 131-138) b) Chapter X: Training and Professional Development ï Training Content/Module 6 & Module 7 (p. 260) 8) FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-15 a) Accessibility by Design: Customization for each Student (pp. 11-12) b) Step 2: Learn about the DLM Accessibility Features: What Does DLM Provide? (pp. 15-18) 9) FILE 05 Test Administration Manual 2014-2015 Allowable Practices (pp. 53-54) **Evidence of appropriate accommodations for English learners** 10) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter IV: Test Administration ï Testlet Information Pages (pp. 125-126) b) Chapter VII: Assessment Results Student Participation (pp. 188-190) 2) FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-15 a. Step 2: Learn about the DLM Accessibility	Peers noted that DLM provides adequate and appropriate guidelines and supports to states regarding accommodations. However, it is incumbent upon the states to have sound plans to implement and monitor these guidelines and supports.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• 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;	Features: Category 3- Supports provided outside the DLM System (pp. 17-18) 3) FILE 05 Test Administration Manual 2014-15 Introduction to DLM Testlets - Computer-Delivered Testlets: Accessibility Supports, Language Translation (pp. 36) **Appropriateness and effectiveness of accommodations** 5) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a. Chapter IV: Test Administration i. Implementation Evidence - Accessibility (pp. 155-158) ii. User Experience with Assessment Administration and KITE Experience (pp. 149-155) iii. Accessibility/Overview of Accessibility Supports (pp. 155-158) iv. Additional Allowable Practices (pp. 136-138) v. Category 2: Supports Requiring Additional Materials (pp. 133-134) b. Chapter IX: Validity Studies i. Opportunity to Learn (pp. 223-224) ii. Observations of Test Administrations (pp. 230-234) c. Chapter XI: Conclusion and Discussion i. Accessibility (pp. 276-277) Future Research (pp. 290-291) ii. FILE 05 Test Administration Manual 2014-15 ï Kite User Guide/Change an Accessibility	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.	Support During Testing (p. 158) ï Spring Operational Assessments/Key Steps (p. 56) ï KITE User Guide/Access Practice Activities and Released Testlets (pp. 150-152) iii. FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-15 ï Step 6: Evaluate the Accessibility Features Used After the Assessment (p. 30) FILE 21 First Contact: A Census Report State Evidence	

Section 5.3 Summary Statement
_X__ No additional evidence is required.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are: • Consistent with the State's policies for accommodations;	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS; **Accommodations and participation decisions are consistent with state policy** 3) FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-2015 a) Accessibility by Design: Customization for each Student (pp. 11-12) b) Step 2: Learn about the DLM Accessibility Features: What Does DLM Provide? (pp. 15-18) 4) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 - Appendices a) Appendix C.16: Dynamic Learning Maps Participations Guidelines	
• Appropriate for addressing a student's disability or language needs for each assessment administered;	**Appropriateness of accommodations and participation decisions for addressing student needs** 7) FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-2015 a) Accessibility by Design: Customization for each Student (pp. 11-12) b) Step 2: Learn about the DLM Accessibility Features: What Does DLM Provide? (pp. 15-18)	
• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;	**Consistent with accommodations during instruction and/or practice** 4) FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-2015 a) Accessibility by Design: Customization for each Student (pp. 11-12)	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	b) Step 3: Discuss and Select Appropriate Accessibility Features and Supports: Considerations for IEP Teams (pp. 19-22) 5) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter IV: Test Administration i) Implementation Evidence from 2014-2015 Test Administration (pp. 143-158) b) Chapter XI: Conclusion and Discussion i) Future Research (pp. 290-291)	
• 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;	**Consistent with accommodations identified by team** 3) FILE 02 Assessment Coordinator Manual 2014-15 a) Access Reports and Data Extracts: View a Data Extract (pp. 44-46)	
• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.	**Administered with fidelity to procedures** 7) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter IV: Test Administration i) Consortium Test Administration Observation Protocol (pp. 128-130) Chapter IX: Validity Studies i) Observations of Test Administration (pp. 230-234)	

Section 5.4 Summary Statement
X___ No additional evidence is required.

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

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically: • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; • The State's academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet State Evidence	

Section 6.1 Summary Statement
_N/A__ No additional evidence is required – state evidence to be provided.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **Technically Sound Method** 2) FILE 14 Standard Setting Tech Report a) Chapter 2: Standard Setting Methods i) Rationale and general approach (pp. 19-20) ii) Profile selection (pp. 20- 24) iii) Evaluation Procedures (pp. 26-27) b) Chapter 3: Standard Setting Panel Meeting Participation i) Panel Facilitator Training (p. 31) c) Chapter 4: Standard Setting Panel Meeting Procedures i) Procedures (pp. 37-40) ii) Advanced Panelist Training (pp.32-33) iii) On-site Panelist Training (33-34) iv) Table 9 (p.33) v) Independent Evaluations of Panel-Recommended Cut Points (pp. 40-41) d) Chapter 5: Results i) Statistical adjustment (pp. 50-54) ii) Final results (p. 54) iii) Evaluations (pp.42-49) Appendix C: Sample Profile (pp. 60-64) f) Appendix G: Panel Training Materials (pp.139-163) g) Appendix B: Rationale for Determining Mastery and Developing Profiles(pp. 62- 63) 4) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	a. Chapter VIII: Reliability Evidence Content-Area (Performance-Level) Reliability Evidence (pp. 208-210) **Panelist experience and expertise** f. FILE 14 Standard Setting Tech Report i. Chapter 3: Standard Setting Panel Meeting Preparation ï Panelist Recruitment (p.28) ï Selection of Panel Participants (p. 28) ï Panelist Characteristics (pp.29-31) ii. Appendix E: Standard Setting Panelist Recruitment Letter and Survey (pp. 66-70) iii. Table 18, item #8 (p. 48) Appendix L: TAC Resolution, commentary #6-7 (p. 98)	

Section 6.2 Summary Statement
_X__ No additional evidence is required.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards The State's academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State's academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce. If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State's grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **Challenging Alternate Academic Achievement Standards** 3) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 ï Chapter I: Introduction ï Essential Elements (pp. 17-19) ï Chapter II: Map Development ï Learning Targets: CCSS and Essential Elements (pp. 26-27) ï Chapter III: Item and Test Development ï Development of the Essential Elements (pp. 38-41) 4) FILE 15 External Alignment Study ï Focus 3: Vertical Articulation of Linkage Levels (pp. 23-24) 5) FILE 18 Supplemental Evidence Related to Test Development Edvantia Stakeholder Survey Summary (pp. 63-67) 4) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a. Chapter VI: Standard Setting i. Standard Setting Approach: Rationale and Overview (pp. 171-172) ii. Grade Level/Content Performance Level Descriptors (pp. 185- 187) Policy Performance Level Descriptors (pp. 173) **Differentiated content across grades** 1) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a. Chapter I: Introduction i. Learning Map Models (pp 10-13)	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	b. Chapter II: Map Development i. Learning Targets: CCSS and Essential Elements (pp. 26-27) c. Chapter VI: Standard Setting Grade Level/Content Performance Level Descriptors (pp. 185- 187)	
Section 6.3 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.4 – Reporting The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including: • The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **Reporting Results** 6) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a) Chapter VI: Standard Setting i. Policy Performance Level Descriptors (p. 173) b) Chapter VII: Assessment Results i. Data Files (pp. 198-200) c) Chapter XI: Conclusion i. Operational Assessment (pp. 288-290) 7) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014- 15 – Appendices – Appendix E.7: Guide to Scores and Reports	
• 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;	**Assessment results reported to support appropriate uses of results** 3) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a) Chapter V: Modeling i) Linkage Level Model with Fungible Item Parameters (pp. 169- 170) Chapter VII: Assessment Results i) Score Reports (pp. 195- 198) vi. Chapter IX: Validity Studies ï DLM Score Report Design and Use (pp. 244-245) ï Report Use for Planning Instruction (pp. 250- 252) 6) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014- 15-	Peers were unable to locate itemized (e.g., testlet, EE, or conceptual area) score analyses at the state and district level. Peers suggested that state- and district-level summaries include frequency information on which EEs were assessed and which were mastered. This information would be useful for state and district management of the program and in helping to drive pattern analyses and overall decisions impacting instruction.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Appendices a) Appendix E.2: Aggregated Reports Sample b) Appendix E.1: Individual Student Score Report Sample	
	Interpretive Guides 4) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a) Chapter VII: Assessment Results i. Interpretation Resources (pp. 196-197) 5) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014- 15 - Appendices Appendix E.3: Parent Interpretive Guide 3) Appendix E.9: Parent Letter Teacher Version 4) Appendix E.10: Parent Letter Superintendent Version 5) Appendix E.4: Teacher Interpretive Guide 6) Appendix E.5: Scoring and Reporting Guide for Administrators 7) FILE 20 Scoring, Reporting, and Analyses	Peers noted that DLM has made a concerted effort to produce materials to support interpretation and effective use of the assessment results by teachers and parents. It is incumbent upon states to implement the use of the materials and resources within their schools and districts.
• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student's achievement; ○ Report the student's achievement in terms of the State's grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors); ○ Provide information to help parents,	**Delivery of Student Reports** 10) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a) Chapter VIII: Reliability Evidence ï Reliability Evidence (pp. 201-214) b) Chapter IX: Validity Studies ï DLM Score Report Design and Use (pp. 244-245) c) Chapter VII: Assessment Results ï Interpretation Resources (pp. 196-198)	Peers noted that the individual student score reports do not appear to include any mention of estimates of uncertainty regarding mastery classification or potential measurement error associated with student scores. Reports should include this information to meet the requirements of the critical element and APA standards. Consideration of measurement error may impact the level of detail that is able to be supported on the score reports, based on the types of inferences intended to be made from the assessment data.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; ○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand; • 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.	d) Chapter XI: Conclusion ï Proposition 1 (pp. 271- 280) 11) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014- 15- Appendices Appendix E.3: Parent Interpretive Guide **Process and Timeline** 11) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a) Chapter VII: Assessment Results ï Score Reports (pp. 195- 198) b) Chapter XI: Conclusion ï Operational Phase (pp. 288-290) 12) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014- 15- Appendices a) Appendix E.6: File Structure Data Dictionary	Peers were unable to locate evidence of score reports in alternate formats. States may need to request reports in alternate formats if those are required under the circumstances.

Section 6.4 Summary Statement
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: See comment above regarding inclusion of estimates of uncertainty on student score reports.

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