



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Dr. Linda Clark  
President  
Idaho State Board of Education  
P.O. Box 83720  
Boise, ID 83720-0037

The Honorable Sherri Ybarra  
Superintendent of Public Instruction  
Idaho State Department of Education  
650 W. State Street, 2nd, Floor  
Boise, Idaho 83702

August 30, 2018

Dear Dr. Clark and Superintendent Ybarra:

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

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

External peer reviewers and Department staff carefully evaluated ISDE's submission and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that the components of ISDE's assessment system meet most, but not all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of section 1111(b)(1) and (3) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and the Department's analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

- General science assessments in high school (end-of-course tests in biology and chemistry): **Partially meets requirements** of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA

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

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

- Reading/ language arts and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (Smarter Balanced): **Substantially meets requirements** of ESEA, as amended by NCLB and ESSA.
- Reading/ language arts and mathematics general assessments in high school (Smarter Balanced): **Substantially meets requirements** of ESEA, as amended by NCLB and ESSA.
- Reading/ language arts and mathematics alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards ((National Center and State Collaborative/Multi-State Alternate Assessment (NCSC/MSAA))) in grades 3-8 and high school: **Substantially meets requirements** of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.

The components that substantially meet requirements meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. The Department expects that ISDE should be able to provide this additional information within one year. Regarding the end-of-course tests in biology and chemistry, the Department understands that ISDE intends to implement a new assessment in high school science. ISDE should provide a detailed implementation timeline for this new assessment to the Department within 30 days in the receipt of this letter. The ISDE should also address specific plans to implement new grades 5 and 7 tests in science, as well as a new alternate assessment in science.

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

The specific list of items required for ISDE to submit is enclosed with this letter. Because the State has not fully satisfied the condition placed on the State's Title I, Part A grant award related to its State assessment system, the Department is continuing to place a condition on the State's Title I grant award related to those components of the assessment system. To satisfy this condition, ISDE must submit satisfactory evidence to address the items identified in the enclosed list. ISDE must also provide to the Department a plan and timeline by which it will submit the additional documentation within 30 days of the receipt of this letter. If adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action. Additionally, the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) will monitor progress on matters pertaining to requirements in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) related to the participation of students with disabilities in Title I assessments. Insufficient progress to address such matters may lead OSERS to place a condition on ISDE's Federal fiscal year 2019 IDEA Part B grant award.

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

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 Cynthia Wright of my staff at: [OSS.Idaho@ed.gov](mailto:OSS.Idaho@ed.gov).

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank T. Brogan  
Assistant Secretary for  
Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Karlynn Laraway, Director of Assessment & Accountability

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

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<b>1.3 – Required Assessments</b>	For general science end-of-course (EOC) in high school: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that specifies the <i>one</i> EOC science (biology or chemistry) test that <i>all</i> students must take, or evidence that specifies that <i>all</i> students must take both EOC science tests (biology or chemistry). OR</li> <li>• Evidence that the State will implement a new science assessment that will meet this requirement (i.e., that all students take the same high school science assessment).</li> </ul>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b>	For the EOC science assessments in biology and chemistry: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that current biology and chemistry assessments' test designs assess the full depth and breadth of science content standards (e.g., an alignment study). OR</li> <li>• Evidence that the State will implement a new science assessment that will meet this requirement.</li> </ul>
<b>2.3 – Test Administration</b>	For reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul> For the ((National Center and State Collaborative/Multi-State Alternate Assessment (NCSC/MSAA)) assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that students are given the opportunity to familiarize themselves with technology prior to testing.</li> <li>• Evidence of a comprehensive contingency plan for Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b>	For the EOC science assessments in chemistry and biology: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the adequate overall validity for its current EOC science assessments, specifically that the State's assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State's academic content standards.</li> <li>• Evidence of alignment between the State's current EOC science assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content, full range of academic content standards balance of content, and cognitive complexity.</li> <li>• A plan to correct any misalignments that are found to exist. OR</li> <li>• Evidence that the State will implement a new science assessment that will meet this requirement.</li> </ul>
<b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b>	For the EOC science assessments in biology and chemistry: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the current EOC science assessments tap intended cognitive processes. OR</li> <li>• Evidence that the State will implement a new science assessment that will meet this requirement.</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b>	For the NCSC assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the unidimensionality assumptions of Item Response Theory have been met.</li> </ul>
<b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b>	For the EOC science assessments in biology and chemistry: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence to support the expected relationship of assessment scores with other variables (e.g., other science assessments). OR</li> <li>• Evidence that the State will implement a new science assessment that will meet this requirement.</li> </ul>
<b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</b>	For the EOC science assessments in biology and chemistry: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a process to manage and improve items flagged through differential item functioning analysis.</li> <li>• Evidence of bias and fairness training for item writers. OR</li> <li>• Evidence that the State will implement a new science assessment that will meet this requirement.</li> </ul>
<b>4.4 – Scoring</b>	For the NCSC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence regarding the quality of scoring for the tests (e.g., training of raters, scoring rubrics, evaluations of inter-rater reliability).</li> </ul>
<b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b>	For the EOC science assessments in biology and chemistry: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence, such as the final report on the technical analysis and ongoing maintenance of the ISDE science assessment, and any changes made as a result of the report. OR</li> <li>• Evidence that the State will implement a new science assessment that will meet this requirement.</li> </ul>
<b>5.2 – Procedures for Including ELs</b>	For the Idaho assessment system: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul> For reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced): Evidence of guidance regarding selection of the Spanish version of the Smarter Balanced assessments for English learners at a level of specificity such that an educator can apply the decision for an individual student.
<b>5.3 – Accommodations</b>	For the Idaho assessment system: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> <li>• Evidence of how exceptional requests for accommodations are handled once the assessment department is notified of the request.</li> </ul> For the NCSC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s), (ii) do not alter the construct being</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>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.</p>
<p><b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b></p>	<p>For the Idaho assessment system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Updated monitoring procedures for local educational agencies to comply with monitoring test administrations at the local level that are consistent with State policies for accommodations.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards (additional requirement under section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA)</b></p>	<p>For the NCSC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act. The State educational agency should provide this evidence by December 15, 2020.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p>	<p>For the Idaho assessment system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An explanation of how teachers obtain score reports in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand.</li> </ul>

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## March 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes-Resubmission



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

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

# STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Idaho Resubmission

## Contents

<b>SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS .</b>	<b>3</b>
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards .....	3
1.3 – Required Assessments .....	4
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments .....	5
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	6
2.3 – Test Administration .....	8
2.5 – Test Security .....	10
<b>SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	11
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	13
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables .....	14
<b>SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER .....</b>	<b>15</b>
4.1 – Reliability.....	15
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	16
4.4 – Scoring .....	17
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment .....	18
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance.....	19
<b>SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS .....</b>	<b>20</b>
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities .....	21
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	24
5.3 – Accommodations.....	27
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations .....	29
<b>SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .</b>	<b>30</b>
6.4 – Reporting.....	30

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Idaho Resubmission**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</b> ISDE must submit evidence that documents how Idaho incorporated broad stakeholder involvement into the State’s science content standards.</p>	<p>Evidence 2017_5 lists the names of participants in the science committee that reviewed the <u>new</u> science standards, and their makeup includes teachers, some parents, and community members. It is indicated that the new standards have gone out for public comment as well.</p>	<p>Peers believe that further explanation of the public comment process on the new standards would be beneficial, as would a detailed description of what changes were made based on stakeholder input.</p> <p>Peers were unable to locate evidence of broad stakeholder involvement in the development of the State’s prior science content standards, on which the 2016 peer review was based.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of broad stakeholder involvement in the development of the State’s content standards on which the 2016 peer review was based. This should include timing and method of dissemination for public comment.</li> <li>• A detailed description of what changes were made based on stakeholder input to the State’s content standards, on which the 2016 peer review was based.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Idaho Resubmission**

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p><b>1.3 – Required Assessments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For the general science EOC assessments in high school (biology and chemistry), ISDE must provide evidence that specifies the one EOC (biology OR chemistry) science test that all students must take, or evidence that specifies that all students must take both EOC science tests (biology and chemistry).</li> </ul>	<p>ID2017_7-Science-EOC_Spring 2017 Technical Report.pdf</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Spring 2017 technical report reads “<i>All students currently enrolled in grades 5 and 7 are required to take the ISAT science assessment, and all students in grades 10 through 12 who have completed a biology and/or chemistry course are required to take the End-of-Course (EOC) science assessment.</i>” The report states this is a draft. Idaho should confirm the finalization of this document to ensure that the policies are adhered to across the State. The evidence does not clarify the question about the one single standard in science assessed for all Idaho high school students.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/>_x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:            For the general science EOC assessments in high school (biology and chemistry), ISDE must provide evidence that specifies the one EOC (biology OR chemistry) science test that all students must take, or evidence that specifies that all students must take both EOC science tests (biology and chemistry).</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Idaho Resubmission**

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p><b>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ISDE must provide evidence of policies that indicate that students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services must be included in the assessment system.</li> </ul>	<p>ID2017_8_Private School Application.pdf  D2017_9_Private School Application Approval Procedure.pdf</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State indicates in its submittal that in order for the special education services program of a private school or facility to be approved by the Idaho State Department of Education, the entity must provide an instructional program description which includes participation in statewide assessments for students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>x<u>  </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Idaho Resubmission**

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></p> <p>For the EOC science assessments in biology and chemistry, ISDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that test designs assess the full depth and breadth of science content standards (e.g., all objectives of content standards).</li> </ul>	<p>The State referenced evidence 2017_1 (science assessment agreement) indicating that they will be submitting evidence on the new assessments in 2020.</p>	<p>Peers were unable to locate evidence that the current assessments’ test designs assess the full depth and breadth of science content standards (e.g., an alignment study).</p>
<p><b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that current biology and chemistry assessments’ test designs assess the full depth and breadth of science content standards (e.g., an alignment study).</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Idaho Resubmission

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Idaho Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p> <p>Evidence that ISDE established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the NCSC/MSAA assessments that include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a troubleshooting guide to address technology-related contingency plans.</li> <li>• Evidence of policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration (including the assessment delivery devices, accessibility tools and features available for students, and item formats) prior to testing.</li> <li>• Evidence of training to ensure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peers could not locate evidence of any technology-related contingency plans, although the State indicates in its narrative (p. 13) that it will “work with our test vendor to establish a contingency plan to address a test delivery system failure, resulting in catastrophic impact to the state testing system and provide an update on our plans as requested.”</li> <li>• In evidence 2017_20 (draft accommodations manual, p.12) there is some evidence of a policy that students can practice and become familiar with computer administration: “In addition to designated accommodations, students should have ample time to explore the test features and tools offered on computer-based tests in order to use them to their full advantage and to ensure that they don’t have the unintended effect of creating new barriers.”</li> <li>• Evidence 2017_11-20 shows provision</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ISDE’s final technology contingency plan should be submitted.</li> <li>• The accommodations manual provided is a draft; the final version should be submitted. Although the language therein suggests students “should” be given the opportunity to experience the technology prior to testing, this does not guarantee students will be given the opportunity.</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Idaho Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>consistency of administration across districts and schools.</p> <p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), ISDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of a comprehensive contingency plan to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>	<p>of training to ensure consistency of administration across districts and schools. Evidence 2017_12, slide 6 indicates that in order for a TE to administer an alternate assessment, the TE will be required to complete the test administration course online.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Apart from the narrative description in the state’s summary of the section 2.3 template, there is no additional evidence regarding a contingency plan to address possible technology challenges.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For NCSC, evidence that students are given the opportunity to familiarize themselves with technology prior to testing (not just that they “should be”).</li> <li>A comprehensive contingency plan for ISDE to address possible technology challenges during test administration for NCSC and Smarter Balanced assessments.</li> <li>A final version of the accommodations manual that is provided in draft form (evidence 2017_20).</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Idaho Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>2.5 – Test Security</b></p> <p>For the entire assessment system, ISDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Prevention of any assessment irregularities;</li> <li>○ Detection of test irregularities; and</li> <li>○ Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the assessments.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Evidence of consequences in the State for confirmed violations of test security.</li>   <li>• Evidence of annual training requirements for test security policies and procedures for ISDE educators.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence 2017_16-18</li>   <li>• Some limited evidence of consequences of violations is provided on p. 21 of evidence 2017_16. Peers also located a report of the number of violations (evidence 2017_17, slide 15) but the consequences that were actually imposed for confirmed test security violations were not reported.</li>   <li>• Evidence 2017_18 is a contract between ISDE and Caveon to create online test security modules for annual training.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peers commend ISDE for its thorough Assessment Integrity Guide (evidence 2017_16).</li>   <li>• No summary of consequences was found.</li>   <li>• Evidence for test security training appears sufficient.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of consequences for confirmed violations of test security (e.g., a summary report).</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Idaho Resubmission**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b>                      For the EOC science assessments in chemistry and biology, ISDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of adequate overall validity for its assessments, specifically that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards.</li> <li>• Evidence of alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Content (i.e., knowledge and process);</li> <li>○ The full range of the State’s academic content standards balance of content; and</li> <li>○ Cognitive complexity.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The State’s narrative indicates that it will provide such evidence for the new EOC science assessments in 2020.</p> <p>Peers also looked for validity evidence for the current EOC science assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence 2017_7 (Tables 15-18) demonstrate that in several cases the DOK of items on the assessment does not match the DOK of the blueprint.</li> <li>• The State did not provide an alignment study or other evidence of alignment between the assessments and content standards.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The evidence does not support a claim of validity based on content.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>x</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of adequate overall validity for its current EOC science assessments, specifically that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards.</li> <li>• Evidence of alignment between the State’s current EOC science assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content, full range of academic content standards balance of content, and cognitive complexity.</li> <li>• A plan to correct any misalignments that are found to exist.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Idaho Resubmission

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Idaho Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b></p> <p>For the EOC science assessments in biology and chemistry, ISDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<p>The State’s narrative indicates that it will provide such evidence for the new EOC science assessments in 2020.</p> <p>Peers also looked for validity evidence for the current EOC science assessments:</p> <p>Evidence 2017_7 (technical report on the current assessments)</p>	<p>No alignment study, cognitive labs, or other evidence was provided to show that the assessments tap intended cognitive processes.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the current EOC science assessments tap intended cognitive processes (e.g., cognitive labs).</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Idaho Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b></p> <p>For EOC science assessments in biology and chemistry ISDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence to support the expected relationship of the State’s assessment scores with other variables.</li> </ul>	<p>The State’s narrative indicates that it will provide such evidence for the new EOC science assessments in 2020.</p> <p>Peers also looked for evidence to support the expected relationship of the State’s current EOC science assessment scores with other variables but could not locate any.</p>	<p>Peers did not find sufficient evidence for this critical element.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ For current biology and chemistry assessments, evidence to support the expected relationship of assessment scores with other variables (e.g., other science assessments).</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Idaho Resubmission

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4.1 – Reliability</b></p> <p>For EOC science assessments in biology and chemistry, ISDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of test reliability for the student population overall.</li> <li>• Evidence of overall and conditional standard errors of measurement.</li> </ul>	<p>The State’s narrative indicates that it will provide such evidence for the new EOC science assessments in 2020.</p> <p>Peers also examined the evidence provided in 2017_7 (technical report) for reliability information about the current EOC science assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reliability coefficients reported on p. 39 (table 22) are all acceptable, but they combine items from two standards (1 and 5) and peers were unsure of the justification for this.</li> <li>• Overall and CSEMs were found on p. 40 and 43.</li> </ul>	<p>Evidence appears sufficient to meet the requirements of this critical element.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><u>  x  </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Idaho Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</b> For EOC assessments in biology and chemistry, ISDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a process to manage and improve items identified through DIF analysis.</li> <li>• Evidence of training for item writers in relation to bias and fairness.</li> </ul>	<p>The State’s narrative indicates that it will provide such evidence for the new EOC science assessments in 2020.</p> <p>For the current EOC science assessments,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peers were unable to locate evidence of a process to manage and improve items flagged through DIF.</li> <li>• Peers were similarly unable to locate evidence of bias and fairness training for item writers.</li> </ul>	<p>Peers did not find sufficient evidence for this critical element.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For current biology and chemistry assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence of a process to manage and improve items flagged through DIF.</li> <li>○ Evidence of bias and fairness training for item writers.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Idaho Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></p> <p>For the EOC science assessments, ISDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of the process used to develop scale scores for the tests.</li> </ul>	<p>The State’s narrative indicates that it will provide such evidence for the new EOC science assessments in 2020.</p> <p>Peers located evidence for the current EOC science assessments: evidence 2017_7 (p. 44-45) lists conversion information for raw to scale scores.</p>	<p>Evidence appears to be sufficient to address this portion of the critical element.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>x</u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Idaho Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b></p> <p>For EOC science assessments in biology and chemistry, ISDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of the comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results across multiple versions of the assessments.</li> </ul>	<p>The State’s narrative indicates that it will provide such evidence for the new EOC science assessments in 2020.</p> <p>For current biology and chemistry assessments, peers examined evidence 2017_7 and 2017_14, although these were not specifically referenced in this section of the State submission.</p>	<p>The State does not appear to have addressed the comparability of multiple versions of the current biology and chemistry assessments. For instance, are print-on-demand and computerized versions comparable? Is the American Sign Language (ASL) version comparable to the standard version?</p>
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of statistical comparability across multiple versions of the current biology and chemistry assessments.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Idaho Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b>                      For the Science EOC assessments in biology and chemistry, ISDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of 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.</li> </ul>	<p>The State’s narrative indicates a process to address technical analysis and ongoing maintenance through a contract with Assessment Solutions Group. The narrative indicates that its report is due in June 2018.</p>	<p>The final report from Assessment Solutions Group should be submitted once it is complete, and ISDE also should report on any changes that result.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The final report from Assessment Solutions Group should be submitted once it is complete, and ISDE also should report on any changes that result</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Idaho Resubmission

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Idaho Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b></p> <p>For the EOC assessments in biology and chemistry, ISDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s science assessments, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) teams to inform decisions about EOC science assessments that:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP team based on each student’s individual needs;</li> </ul> </li>   <li>• Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State referenced evidence 2017_20 and 2017_21 in its submission. In evidence 2017_20 there is an indication that decisions about assessing students with disabilities are made by IEP teams.</li>   <li>• The State indicates in its resubmission that previously supplied evidence contained the documentation needed to address this part of the critical element. Peers do not have access to the documentation from the original</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peers commend ISDE on a draft comprehensive accommodations manual (evidence 2017_20) in keeping with CCSSO guidance. Since the version submitted is labeled as a draft, peers request that the final version be submitted when complete, along with assurances that it will be distributed to IEP teams and other stakeholders as needed.</li>   <li>• Peers could not locate information relevant to this critical element in evidence 2017_21.</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Idaho Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general assessments and accommodations available for students with disabilities; and</li> <li>Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities.</li> </ul>	<p>submission and could not locate relevant new evidence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence 2017_20</li>   <li>Evidence 2017_20</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence appears sufficient to meet the requirements of this part of the critical element.</li>   <li>Evidence appears sufficient to meet the requirements of this part of the critical element.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For biology and chemistry, guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment.</li> <li>Final version of the accommodations manual, along with assurances that it will be distributed to IEP teams and other stakeholders as needed.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Idaho Resubmission

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Idaho Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</b>                      For the R/LA and mathematics alternate assessments based on AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (NCSC/MSAA), and State science general assessments and AA-AAAS, ISDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the AA-AAAS tests provide test-taking accommodations for those students taking AA-AAAS who are English learners; and</li> <li>• Evidence that guidance is provided to local educational agencies regarding the selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners in the State science assessments.</li> </ul> <p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), ISDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of guidance regarding selection of the Spanish version of the Smarter Balanced assessments for English learners, and evidence of procedures for communication of this guidance to districts, schools, teachers and parents.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited evidence that the alternate assessments provide accommodations for ELs is provided in 2017_20.</li> <li>• The state’s narrative indicates it is in the process of developing guidance for selection of appropriate accommodations for ELs.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not clear on what basis Spanish versions of the Smarter Balanced assessments are selected. The only evidence of procedures for communication to districts, schools, teachers, and parents is a generic parent letter (2017_22) that includes as one option a “fully</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ISDE must submit guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for ELs once it is finalized.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peers could not locate evidence of guidance regarding selection of the Spanish version of the Smarter Balanced assessments, nor could we locate evidence of procedures for communication of this guidance.</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Idaho Resubmission**

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

**Section 5.2 Summary Statement**

<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ISDE must submit guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for ELs once it is finalized.</li> <li>• Evidence of guidance regarding selection of the Spanish version of the Smarter Balanced assessments</li> <li>• Evidence of procedures for communication of this guidance to stakeholders</li> </ul>
--

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Idaho Resubmission

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Idaho Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>5.3 – Accommodations</b></p> <p>For the NCSC/MSAA, ISDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the accommodations provided (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</li> <li>• Evidence that appropriate accommodations for English learners are available.</li> <li>• Evidence that the State has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Evidence 2017_20</b></li> <li>• The state’s narrative indicates it is in the process of developing guidance for selection of appropriate accommodations for ELs.</li> <li>• <b>Peers located evidence that exceptional requests for</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Since the accommodations listed are fairly standard and in keeping with CCSSO guidelines, peers believe it is reasonable to assume they meet the requirements of this part of the critical element.</li> <li>• ISDE must submit guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for ELs once it is finalized.</li> <li>• It is unclear to peers what happens once an exceptional request is received by ISDE. Further evidence should be submitted.</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Idaho Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>accommodations should be submitted to the assessment department (evidence 2017_20, p. 22 and elsewhere). Further detail is not provided about the other steps in the process at the state level.</b></p>	
<p><b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for ELs.</li> <li>• Evidence of how exceptional requests for accommodations are handled once they reach the state.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Idaho Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b></p> <p>For the entire Idaho assessment system, ISDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that procedures for local educational agencies to comply with monitoring test administrations at the local level are consistent with State policies for accommodations.</li> </ul>	<p>The State indicates in its narrative that it is working “to develop monitoring procedures of local education agencies to comply with test administrations at the local level that are consistent with state policies for accommodations.”</p>	<p>Peers request that ISDE submit updated monitoring procedures once they are finalized.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Updated monitoring procedures for local education agencies to comply with monitoring test administrations at the local level are consistent with State policies for accommodations</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Idaho Resubmission

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p> <p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), and for AA-AAAS (NCSC/MSAA), ISDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that individual student reports are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent with limited English proficiency, be orally translated for such parent.</li> </ul>	<p>Evidence provided is a Spanish translation of score reports (2017_25, 27, 29, 30 and 31). Other evidence of alternate forms for visually impaired parents or others is not specifically provided, but there is an indication at the bottom of the “understanding your students’ scores” documents (e.g., evidence 2017_24) that alternate forms are available by request.</p>	<p>The Spanish versions are well done and appropriate given that the largest non-English speaking population in the state speaks Spanish.</p> <p>Requests for alternate versions to address parents’ needs are, in essence, being directed to the teacher. No alternate score report versions other than Spanish are provided in the resubmission, and the process for teachers to obtain them is unclear. Please explain how teachers obtain alternate versions.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explain how teachers obtain alternate versions of score reports..</li> </ul>		

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

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## February 201 State Assessment Peer Review Notes

(resubmission of evidence based on 2016 Peer Review)



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

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

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

**Contents**

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

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

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b> (stemming from 2016 review)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the Smarter Balanced test design aligns the assessments to the full depth and breadth for all of the academic content standards in R/LA and mathematics at each grade level.</li> <li>Evidence that the item selection procedures for the computer adaptive test (CAT) online assessment adequately deliver tests that meet test design requirements for the intended depth of knowledge (DOK) of the assessments (also applies to evidence requested for element 2.2).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Evidence #S021</i> – Evaluating Alignment in Large-Scale Standards-Based Assessment Systems</li> <li><a href="#">Evidence #S022 – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Common Core State Standards Analysis: Eligible Content for the Summative Assessment, Final Report</a></li> <li><i>Evidence #S023</i> – Race to the Top Application for New Grants Comprehensive Assessment Systems (p. 41)</li> <li><a href="#">Evidence #12b – Smarter Balanced Content Specifications for Mathematics</a></li> <li><i>Evidence #S024</i> – PCG - Claim/Target and Common Core Standard Associations Data Input Specifications</li> <li><a href="#">Evidence Packet #S010 – Blueprint Fidelity</a></li> <li><i>Evidence #S029</i> – Summary of Smarter Balanced CAT Algorithm on Depth of Knowledge</li> </ul>	<p>Peers felt that S021 was not relevant for this request.</p> <p>S022 was previously provided and calls out 48 (R/LA) and 3 (Mathematics) standards as “not measurable.” However, they were judged “not measurable” using the item types proposed by SBAC: “A standard was considered measurable via on-demand summative assessment tasks if it can be assessed by any of the item types listed in the following subsection, as defined in the SBAC proposal (SBAC, 2010b, pp. 42, 52–53).” (p.9) Page 6 lists the item types. Peers feel that the standards should drive the item types / components of the assessment system. It seemed, however, that the item types were determining the assessable content, rather than the standards determining the item types / components. Regulation and Guidance clearly state “full depth and breadth for all of the academic standards.”</p> <p>S023 includes a statement of intent, not evidence for this CE.</p> <p>S024 described the new coding scheme for the items. Peers felt it was not relevant.</p> <p>Suggestion: SBAC might provide evidence of how the other components of the assessment system (formative, interim, benchmark) cover the standards deemed ineligible for the summative, AND that the states using the SBAC incorporate those other elements meaningfully into their assessment system. (That is, those other elements contribute to scores / performance levels.)</p> <p>Peers commend SBAC for conducting a thorough blueprint fidelity study, and for taking measures to correct the error identified for Grade 6 Math. We would like to see the blueprint fulfillment rates at the student level, in addition to the claim / content category level, as presented in S010a. In other words, we’d like data answering the question, “What percent of students received a test event conforming to the blueprint?,” rather than “What percent of test events fulfilled blueprint requirement X?”</p> <p>Peers feel that 100% blueprint fulfillment (at the student level) is implied by this CE. A reason for less than 100% blueprint fulfillment may reside in the way in the which algorithm treats blueprint fulfillment as described in S029 – that is, not as an absolute constraint.</p>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

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

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

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

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT  
CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION –

NCSC

**Peer Review of State Assessment Systems**  
**August 2017 State Assessment Peer**  
**Review Notes for the NCSC Assessment**  
**Consortium RESUBMISSION**

(follow up on evidence requested from 2016 Peer Review)



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

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

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

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

<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2.3 – Test Administration.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>2.5 – Test Security .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>4.1 – Reliability.....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>4.4 – Scoring.....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>5.3 – Accommodations .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>6.4 – Reporting .....</b>	<b>32</b>

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

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

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center">2.1 – Test Design and Development</p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results;</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills);</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.</li> </ul>	<p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; p. 82 (Chapter 3, Study #5, Vertical Coherence)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 72-75 (Relationship of the CCCs to Grade-level CCSS Academic Content Standards: Alignment Question #1)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; p. 65 (English Language Arts)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; p. 28-29 (Adoption of Prioritized Academic Grade-Level Content)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 25-30 (Item Development)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; p. 64 (Table 2-15b)</p>	<p><b>NCSC 15:</b> The Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015 was previously submitted for peer preview. At the time the technical manual was constructed, writing items were not part of the operational test.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> p. 28. The writing panelists indicated that the focal KSAs/Essential Understandings provided some evidence of the writing claim but fell short of providing full evidence in support of it.</p> <p>Of the three content areas, only writing panelists indicated that many of the focal KSAs/Essential understandings at higher grades represented skills identical to those at the lower grades.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> p. 83. The results from the Mathematics, Reading, and Writing Relationship Studies indicated that the prioritized academic grade-level content targets and their alignment to intended college and career ready standards was strong with regard to content centrality, performance centrality, and DOK.</p> <p>Results of the End of the Test Survey (EOTS) were not located in NCSC 15.</p> <p>While the NCSC Coordinated Peer Review Response lists “Balancing reading and writing items” as part of the process described on pgs.</p>

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 66-67 (Operational Design; Operational Core Items and Embedded Field Test Items; Specifications)</p> <p><b>NCSC 10:</b> Guide for Score Report Interpretation; pp. 27-34 (Performance Level Descriptors for ELA)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; p. 187 (Reporting of the Writing Prompt (Field Test))</p> <p><b>NCSC 100:</b> Writing Timeline (2013-2015 Writing Timeline)</p>	<p>25-30, there is only one mention of balancing reading and writing, and it is just listed as a “factor” on p. 26. Peers were not clear on how decisions about balancing reading and writing for the ELA tests were made.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> pgs. 33-34 describes the Item Content Review Focus Group Reports for Math and for Reading. It is not clear if this not done for writing.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> p.65.The three CCCs prioritized for writing at each grade level consist of one CCC assessed by a Constructed Response item and two CCCs assessed by Student Response (SR) items. The CR writing items were considered field-test items and did not count toward the student’s score.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> p. 64. The writing CR items (prompts) were field tested as part of the 2015 administration, so are not represented as part of the actual ELA distribution of content shown in Table 2-15b. This table shows that writing comprises 19-21% of the overall ELA Blueprint across all grade levels but the guidelines on the same page account for 30%. It is assumed that the CR items will fill the additional 10-11%.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Page 73. The one major change that was made to the Pilot Phase 2 forms for the operational assessment was the addition of writing sessions to create a full ELA test.</p>

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
		Tier 1 prompts were included in the overall ELA score for 2015. Tier 2 writing prompts were field tested in ELA in each grade. It is unclear if Tier 2 writing prompts been included as part of operational tests.
<b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b>		
“State must provide evidence to support the NCSC test design criteria for the writing portion of the reading/language arts AA-AAAS. This will also impact evidence for related critical elements in sections 3 and 4”		
<b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State must provide evidence to support the NCSC test design criteria for the operational writing portion of the reading/language arts AA-AAAS. This will also impact evidence for related critical elements in sections 3 and 4. No new relevant information was presented.</li> </ul>		

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

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

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

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center">2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>• Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments;</li> <li>• If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>	<p><b>NCSC 1:</b> Test Administration Manual 2015; p. 13 (Sample Test Items)</p> <p><b>NCSC 1:</b> Test Administration Manual 2015; pp. 16-17, 19, 24 (Test Administration Training Requirements)</p> <p><b>NCSC 8:</b> System User Guide for Test Administrators; pp. 65-67 (Keyboard-Only Navigation Shortcuts, Technology Requirements)</p> <p><b>NCSC 9:</b> System User Guide for Test Coordinators; pp. 72-73 (Technology Requirements)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 94-95 (Administration Support, NCSC Service Center, Additional Supports)</p>	<p><b>NCSC 1, 8, 9, and 15:</b> The Test Administration Manual 2015, the System User Guide for Test Administrators, the System User Guide for Test Coordinators were previously submitted for peer preview.</p> <p><b>NCSC 1:</b>p. 13, 16. Availability of sample items does not ensure that all students are familiar with the item format and online functionality. As a starting point, TAs are asked to review and complete the sample items with students Additionally, a policy statement and possibly some systematic documentation may be warranted.</p> <p><b>NCSC 1:</b> p.19. TCs must complete the NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Coordinators, including NCSC accommodations.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b>pp.94-95. Numerous examples of test administrative support and technical support through the NCSC Service Center during test administration were provided It appears that TAs and students do not have access to sample items in writing.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> p. 95. The Tip Sheet described on of might be meeting this need. The tip sheets developed in each year should probably be aggregated and given out at the beginning of the next year to help alert folks to commonly</p>

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
		occurring issues. This meets the needs of the troubleshooting guide.
<b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide, then State must):</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that State established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the NCSC/MSAA assessments that include:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence of a troubleshooting guide for the NCSC/MSAA to address technology-related contingency plans.</li> <li>○ Evidence of policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration (including the assessment delivery devices, accessibility tools and features available for students, and item formats) prior to testing.</li> <li>○ Evidence of training to ensure consistency of administration across districts and schools.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that State established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the NCSC assessments that include:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence of policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration in writing (including the assessment delivery devices, accessibility tools and features available for students, and item formats) prior to testing.</li> <li>○ Evidence of training to ensure consistency of administration across districts and schools.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center">2.5 – Test Security</p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> </ul>	<p><b>NCSC 1:</b> Test Administration Manual 2015; pp. 16-17 (Responsibilities for Test Administrators)</p> <p><b>NCSC 1:</b> Test Administration Manual 2015; p.13 (Open Response: Foundational Reading)</p> <p><b>NCSC 123:</b> Architecture and Technology System Requirements; pp. 53-56; 64-69 (Component Transport; Security)</p>	<p><b>NCSC 1:</b> Test Administration Manual 2015 was previously submitted for peer review.</p> <p>NCSC noted that individual states handle investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. Training modules 1 and 2 were dedicated to testing irregularities and testing integrity.</p> <p><b>NCSC 5:</b> p. 31. TAs must follow their state procedures. Pages 33-36. The peers noted the quiz for TAs regarding inappropriate test practices is low level and an educator could likely pass it without taking the training.</p> <p>Note: While states have specific responsibility in test security, the underlying architecture responsibility is with NCSC. States using NCSC will need to be aware of their responsibility as part of Test Security.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide then State must):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the NCSC/MSAA, documentation of a process to prevent, detect, report, investigate, and remediate assessment regularities.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> <li>• If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul>	<p>No evidence was provided.</p>	<p>See Element 2.1</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b></p> <p>For the NCSC/MSAA, as noted in element 2.1, evidence that demonstrates its assessments measure the full breadth and depth of the State’s content standards (writing). Following that, the State will need to document adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, including evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards. This will also effect other critical elements in sections 3 and 4.</p>		
<p><b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the NCSC as noted in element 2.1, evidence that demonstrates its assessments measure the full breadth and depth of the State’s writing (ELA) content standards. Following that, the State will need to document adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, including evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards for writing.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
This will also affect other critical elements in sections 3 and 4.		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>No evidence was provided.</p>	<p>See Element 2.1.</p> <p>See 3.1 comment NCSC may consider cognitive lab or observational data to address validity evidence for this critical element.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b> For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p>		
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the NCSC, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 179-183 (Dimensionality Analyses)</p> <p><b>NCSC 104:</b> Exploring Dimensionality within the 2015 NCSC Operational Administration Data 12-16; pp. 5-10 (Exploratory Factor Analysis), pp. 15-20 (Dimensionality Review Workshops; Further Investigation; Discussion)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15-B:</b> Appendix 2_2015 Tech Manual Appendix 2-K update   pp. 2-3 (Table B1; B2)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 123-124 (Calibration; Item Response Theory Results)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15-F:</b> Appendix 6_2015 Tech Manual Appendix 6-A – 6-L)</p>	<p><b>NCSC 104:</b> p.6. The Center for Assessment essentially confirmed results from 2015 Technical Manual. All grade/content combinations showed two dimensions except ELA at third and fourth grade.</p> <p><b>NCSC 104:</b> p. 20. The quantitative and qualitative (review committee) results suggested that some students favor a particular response option and that this favoritism is reflected as multidimensionality on certain forms. It was suggested that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Future form development and revision carefully consider the balance of the number of correct responses per selected response option, particularly in math.</li> <li>2. Students’ preferential selection of a given response option be studied further, potentially using qualitative means. Such behavior, if undesirable, could be corrected through revisions to the test administration procedure.</li> </ol> <p>It is unclear whether the above two suggestions were implemented and if so, whether they worked. It is recommended that the current data be factor analyzed.</p> <p><b>NCSC 104:</b> makes the case that the tests, as a whole, function unidimensionally even though there with a few students with an aberrant item selection behavior. NCSC refers to Test Characteristic Curves (TCC), Test Information Function (TIF) curves, and Conditional Standard Error of Measurement (CSEM)</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		curves, and the IRT model fit analyses as evidence.
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b>                      For the NCSC/MSAA, additional evidence that supports the internal structure of the tests, specifically a plan and timeline for documenting how the test meets item response theory (IRT) assumptions of test unidimensionality.</p>		
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide evidence of how NCSC will address answer choice presentation and impact of scrolling in the administration of the test as evidenced by NCSC 104.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	No evidence provided	<p>No new relevant information was presented.</p> <p>It is possible to address this by providing data to show correlations between writing and other variables such as math, science, reading or any other norm tests.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b> For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p>		
<p><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the NCSC, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.1 – Reliability</p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement.</li> </ul>	<p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 124-128; 171-177 (Item Response Theory Results; Chapter 8)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15-F:</b> Appendix 6_2015 Tech Manual Appendix 6-F</p> <p><b>NCSC 15-I:</b> Appendix 8_2015 Tech Manual Appendices 8-A and 8-B</p>	<p><b>NCSC 15, 15-F and 15-I:</b> Test Administration Manual 2015 plus the two appendices were previously submitted for peer preview.</p> <p>Statistical tables show ELA and Mathematics, but not Writing.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15-F:</b> p.5, Appendix 6. Example item-level fit plots for Tier 1 Writing Prompt I items were presented. The purpose seemed to be determining whether combined or single item scores should be used, reporting reliability for Writing.</p> <p>ELA scores used in the various statistical analyses contained between 19% and 22% writing items.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15: p. 187.</b> Tier 2 writing prompts were field tested in ELA in each grade this year to enable further research and examination of results. Further development is in progress with the intention of including Tier 2 writing prompts in the overall ELA score for students in the future. Writing SRs and Tier 1 prompts were included in the overall ELA score for 2015.</p> <p>It is unclear if there will be writing reliability data independent of ELA. The TAC meeting discussion reviewed the writing issue, but did not provide any guidance.</p> <p>All data provided in evidence relates to field</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		test writing items. No new evidence about operational items was presented.
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b>                      For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p>		
<p><b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If NCSC implements CR operational writing items, appropriate studies must be conducted to determine reliability.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center">4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p><b>NCSC 15:</b> p. 19. To allow the widest possible range of students to demonstrate what they know and can do and to be able to make valid inferences about the performance of all students who participate in an assessment, universally designed assessments are developed from the beginning with an eye toward maximizing fairness.</p>	<p>See Element 2.1.</p> <p>The use of UDL (Universal Design for Learning) is designed to meet the full continuum.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b> For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p>		
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p><b>NCSC 15: Operation Assessment Technical Manual 2015</b>                      p. 105 -110 –training of scorers – on field-test items                      p. 114 –Inter-rater reliability on Field Test Writing CR items                      p. 187 Reporting of field-test Writing Prompt</p> <p><b>NCSC 10: Guide for Score Report Interpretation</b>                      pgs. 27-34: Performance Level Descriptors for Writing are embedded in ELA</p>	<p>See Element 2.1.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> p. 188 – Some states opted to not report writing. It is unclear if this was true in 2016-17 as well as 2015.</p> <p>No new evidence was presented regarding training of raters, scoring rubrics, or evaluation of inter-rater reliability, other than on field-test writing items. It is unclear if this same process used for operational writing items.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b>                      For the NCSC/MSAA, evidence of documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols designed to produce reliable results and facilitate score interpretations for constructed-response items in reading/language arts and mathematics and also operational writing items. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Adequate procedures and criteria for ensuring and documenting inter-rater reliability;</li> <li>○ Clear scoring rubrics, comprehensive instructions for raters, adequate training of raters, evaluation of inter-rater reliability; and</li> <li>○ Documentation that the model-data fit issue identified in item 3.3 has been resolved.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the NCSC, evidence of documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols designed to produce reliable results and facilitate score interpretations for constructed-response items in reading/language arts and mathematics and also operational writing items. Specifically:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Adequate procedures and criteria for ensuring and documenting inter-rater reliability;</li> <li>○ Clear scoring rubrics, comprehensive instructions for raters, adequate training of raters, and evaluation of inter-rater reliability.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b></p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>• Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<p><b>NCSC 1:</b> Test Administration Manual 2015; pp. 9, 24 (Overview of NCSC AA-AAS; Accommodations)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 67-68 (Table 2-16; Table 2-17)</p>	<p><b>NCSC 1 and 15:</b> The Test Administration Manual 2015 and the Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015 were previously submitted for peer preview.</p> <p>The use of a paper-based presentation of test item/s is a state-specific policy. (P.9 and Appendix A).</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> p. 13. NCSC created and adopted policies for accessibility and item features that resulted in flexible assessment design and delivery (computer vs paper based). On p. 89, they refer to paper version of items as an accommodation.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b></p> <p>For NCSC/MCAA, evidence either that paper versions of the assessments are an accommodation or an analysis of the comparability of the meaning and interpretation of the assessment results across the technology-based and paper-based versions of the assessments.</p>		
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center">4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p><b>NCSC 17:</b> Post-Operational NCSC Research Studies; pp. 1-15</p> <p><b>NCSC 106:</b> Final Project Meeting Agenda</p> <p><b>NCSC 107:</b> Final Project Meeting Evaluation</p> <p><b>NCSC 109:</b> Estimating and Evaluating Student Growth</p> <p><b>NCSC 110:</b> Evaluating Precision of NCSC Scores</p> <p><b>NCSC 111:</b> Future Test Development</p> <p><b>NCSC 112:</b> Item Difficulty Study</p> <p><b>NCSC 113:</b> Managing Assessment Assets</p> <p><b>NCSC 116:</b> Part Perf analysis as of 12-20-16</p> <p><b>NCSC 117:</b> Part Rate Follow-up as of 12-26-</p> <p><b>NCSC 118:</b> UKY Communication White Paper Final</p> <p><b>NCSC 119:</b> UKY Communicative Competence Policy Brief Final</p> <p><b>NCSC 120:</b> UKY On-line Learning Final</p> <p><b>NCSC 121:</b> UNCC 4 Studies 9-16</p> <p><b>NCSC 122:</b> UNCC How Teach Standards</p>	<p><b>NCSC 17:</b> The Post-Operational NCSC Research Studies was previously submitted for peer preview.</p> <p>Writing scores were not analyzed independent of ELA.</p> <p>12 research reports documenting NCSC support for studies to do ongoing research for evaluating and improving the assessment system. The evidence provided are final reports. It is unclear if there are plans to do more research in the future. In NCSC 107, members indicated in using the information provided from studies to improve the system for the future.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b></p>		
<p>For NCSC/MSAA, evidence of a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of the assessments for future years</p>		
<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center">5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> <li>• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;</li> <li>• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>	<p><b>NCSC 2:</b> Guidance for IEP teams on participation decisions</p>	<p>See 5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p><b>NCSC 2:</b> p. 3-3. If ELLs have an IEP that calls for the alternate assessment, they will be included in this test. Accommodations will be determined for ELLs in the same way they are determined for all students taking this assessment.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15-B,</b> p. 6-7 accommodation          “All key information in dominant language is also available in prevalent first languages for second language learners” is listed as “allowed.” But this does not appear in any of the materials for TAs. (This is also pertinent for Critical Element 5.3.)</p> <p>It would be helpful if this is accommodation is communicated for TA use. Clarification should be provided to TAs regarding the accommodations listed as allowed.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide, then State must):</b>            For the NCSC/MSAA, evidence that the State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); and</li> <li>o Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:            For the NCSC evidence that the State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); and</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li></ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities (SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504;</li> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);</li> <li>• Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> <li>• Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>	<p><b>NCSC 2:</b> Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions; pp. 3-4 (Introduction; Description of the [NCSC Alternate Assessment]; Participation Decisions)</p> <p><b>NCSC 2:</b> Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions; p. 5 (Do Not Use the Following as Criteria for Participation Decisions)</p> <p><b>NCSC 2:</b> Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions; p. 8 (How do I know if the [NCSC Alternate Assessment] is appropriate for an ELL with an IEP whose language proficiency makes it difficult to assess content knowledge and skills?) Participation Decisions Document; pp. 52-63 (Student Profile Example C) pp. 12-18 (Appendices A-C)</p> <p><b>NCSC 1:</b> Test Administration Manual 2015; p. 23 (Table 11. NCSC Assessment Features) p. 24 (Accommodations) pp. 44-56 (Assessment Features)</p> <p><b>NCSC 5:</b> Test Administration Training for Test Administrators; p. 66 (What are test accommodations?)</p> <p><b>NCSC 8:</b> System User Guide for Test Administrators; pp. 18; 26-28 (Accommodations: Before Test &amp; After Test)</p>	<p><b>NCSC 1, 2, 5, 8, 15-B, 15, and 15-F:</b> were previously submitted for peer preview.</p> <p><b>NCSC 2:</b> p. 7. “An ELL should be considered for the alternate assessment if (a) his/her intellectual functioning indicates a significant cognitive disability using assessments in his/her home language as appropriate, and (b) he/she meets the other participation guidelines for the [NCSC Alternate Assessment]”. Frequently Asked Questions</p> <p><b>NCSC 5:</b> pgs. 23-24. All accessibility features and accommodations listed in each student’s IEP are applicable to each eligible participant, including English Learners. Accessibility features are also listed in the training for TA.</p> <p><b>NCSC 5:</b> p. 66. Each state in the NCSC consortium has its own process by which unique/non-traditional accommodations are processed for approval</p> <p><b>NCSC 5:</b> p. 66. “Accommodations are changes in the materials or procedures of the assessment that do not alter the construct being measured.” “If a student requires an Accommodation for the assessment that is not currently in his/her IEP, please see TAM, Appendix A. State Specific Information.” The accommodations were designed to remove construct-irrelevant barriers related to individual characteristics that would interfere with the measurement of the target construct.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>NCSC 15-B:</b> Appendix 2; 2015 Tech Manual Appendix 2-B update 2.pdf; ELA Appendix C</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; p. 88 (Documentation of Accommodations)</p> <p><b>NCSC 1:</b> Test Administration Manual 2015; p. 34 (Accommodations: After Test)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15-F:</b> Appendix 6; 2015 Tech Manual (Appendix 6-L – Accommodation Freqs-2.pdf)</p> <p><b>NCSC 101:</b> NCME 2016 Accessibility Presentation; (Appendix 6-L – Accommodation Freqs-2.pdf)</p> <p><b>NCSC 102:</b> NCME 2016 Accessibility Handout); Accessibility: Consideration of the Learner, the Teacher, and Item Performance</p>	<p><b>NCSC 15:</b> p. 61. Recommendations for areas of further study included the use of accommodations. It is not clear if further study was completed. If so, what were the results?</p> <p>In <b>NCSC 15-B</b>, p. 6-7. the accommodation “All key information in dominant language is also available in prevalent first languages for second language learners” is listed as “allowed.” But this does not appear in any of the materials for TAs. (This is also pertinent for Critical Element 5.2.)</p> <p>Several studies are cited, but none seem to address the question of whether the accommodations provided allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide, then State must):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For both the NCSC/MSAA, evidence that the accommodations provided (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</li> <li>• Evidence that appropriate accommodations for English learners are available.</li> <li>• For the NCSC/MSAA, evidence that the State has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the NCSC, evidence that the accommodations provided do not alter the construct being assessed, and allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">6.4 – Reporting</p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;</li> <li>• The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;</li> <li>• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;</li> <li>○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>NCSC 103:</b> Reporting Timeline (2014-2016)</p> <p><b>NCSC 10:</b> Guide for Score Report Interpretation; pp. 24-26 (Appendix A: Individual Student Report)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 132-138 (Chapter 7: Standard Setting)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 139-140 (Chapter 7: Standard Setting)</p> <p><b>NCSC 124:</b> ADE November 2015 Examiner Newsletter; p. 7 (NCSC 2015 Reports)</p>	<p><b>NCSC 10 and 15:</b> were previously submitted for peer preview.</p> <p>An expanded timeline with additional important dates for Alternate Assessment would be helpful. Testing window dates (March-May) were included in the Examiner Newsletter (p. 7).</p> <p>Student reports were delivered through an online reporting portal as soon as the reports and data had been verified and approved for each administration.</p> <p><b>NCSC 124:</b> AZ process is provided as an example of the reporting process.</p> <p>No evidence is provided regarding individual student reports being available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand.</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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

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