UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Tony Smith
State Superintendent of Education
Illinois State Board of Education
100 North 1st Street
Springfield, IL 62777

January 6, 2017

Dear Superintendent Smith:

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

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

- Reading and language arts (R/LA) and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC)): **Partially meets requirements**
- R/LA and mathematics general assessments in high school (PARCC): **Partially meets requirements**
- R/LA and mathematics alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards Dynamic Learning Maps-Year-End Model (DLM-YE)) in grades 3-8 and high school: **Substantially meets requirements**

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

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

The specific list of items required for ISBE to submit is enclosed with this letter. Because several of the State's components have partially met the requirements, the Department is placing a condition on the State's Title I grant award related to those components of the assessment system. To satisfy this condition, ISBE must submit satisfactory evidence to address the items identified in the enclosed list. ISBE must submit a plan and timeline within 30 days for when it will submit all required additional documentation for peer review. The Department will also host regular (e.g., quarterly) progress calls with the State to discuss the State's progress on its timeline. If, following the peer review of the additional evidence, adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action. Additionally, the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) will monitor progress on matters pertaining to requirements in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) related to the participation of students with disabilities in Title I assessments. Insufficient progress to address such matters may lead OSERS to place a condition on ISBE's federal fiscal year 2017 IDEA Part B grant award.

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

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 Karen Dorsey Hargrove and Joseph Suh at: OSS.Illinois@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

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

Enclosures

cc: Angela Chamness, Illinois State Board of Education

Critical Elements Where Additional Evidence is Needed to Meet the Requirements for Illinois' Standards and Assessment System

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
1.3 – Required Assessments	The Illinois State Board of Education's (ISBE) must provide: • Evidence that annual administration of science assessments complies with ESEA statutory requirements. • Evidence of policies and procedural guidance to local educational agencies (LEAs) regarding the high school assessment requirements to ensure that all students take the same assessment at some point in high school. (The Department notes that we have separately identified this need in the State and responded on October 25, 2016, that ISBE's plan is on track to address this concern in the 2016−2017 school year.)
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments	ISBE must provide: • Evidence that State policies require all high school students, including students with disabilities, and those who are publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education services, to take the same high school assessments for reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics (the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) or Dynamic Learning Maps-Year-End Model (DLM-YE)). (The Department notes that we have separately identified this need in the State and responded on October 25, 2016, that ISBE's plan is on track to address this concern in the 2016−2017 school year.)
1.5 – Participation Data	ISBE must provide: • Evidence of the number of enrolled students and the number who took each assessment, by subject, subgroup, and grade to confirm that all students are included in the assessment system. • Evidence of policies and procedural guidance to LEAs regarding the high school assessment requirements to ensure that all students take the same assessment at some point in high school.
2.1 – Test Design and Development	For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (PARCC), ISBE must provide: • Evidence that the assessment design measures the full breadth and depth of the State's academic content standards, including the speaking and listening aspect of the standards. For R/LA alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), ISBE must provide: • Evidence that the assessment design measures the State's academic content standards, including the language domain, or presents an explanation as to why this domain was not included.
2.2 – Item Development	For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (PARCC), ISBE must provide: • Information about the composition and credentials of content and bias/sensitivity reviewers. Specifically, information about the subject area specialization of content and bias/sensitivity reviewers on this panel

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	(grade level, general or special education specialization, English learner specialization).
2.3 – Test Administration	For all the entire assessment system, ISBE must provide: • Evidence of implementation of training resources provided by the Consortia for test administration, including administration with accommodations. • Documentation of the fidelity of implementation of training provided by PARCC and DLM. • Evidence of State-level plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration	For all components of the State assessment system, ISBE must provide: • Evidence that the State conducts monitoring of test administration to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.
2.5 – Test Security	For all components of the State assessment system, ISBE must provide: • Evidence that the State implements test security policies/procedures; investigation of possible test irregularities; and remediation following incident(s).
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy	For all components of the State assessment system, ISBE must provide: • Evidence of policies and procedures for securing student-level assessment data and to protect student privacy and confidentiality, including evidence of established guidelines for districts and schools.
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (PARCC), ISBE must provide: • Additional alignment evidence that addresses all remaining grades (grades 3, 4, 6, and 7) in both content areas. • Alignment evidence that supports a test design that assesses the full range of the State's academic content standards is needed for all tested grades (including speaking and listening as previously noted in 2.1).
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes	For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (PARCC), ISBE must provide: • Additional evidence, such as cognitive lab studies, that address the cognitive processes and cognitive complexity required by the standards across grades and content areas.
4.1 – Reliability	For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), ISBE must provide: • Evidence of monitoring and refinement of the diagnostic classification models from subsequent test administrations
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility	For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), ISBE must provide: • Evidence of the development and selection of reading passages that includes information about steps that test developers have taken to ensure reading passages are accessible to students with significant cognitive disabilities. • Evidence of the development and selection and/or creation of graphic components in the assessment (e.g., drawn or photographed images) that includes information about steps that test developers have taken to ensure

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	passages from general grade-level texts are made accessible to students with significant cognitive disabilities.
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum	For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (PARCC), ISBE must provide: • Cumulative frequency distributions across raw score/scale scores, that include the number and percentage of students scored at each raw/scale score point.
4.4 – Scoring	For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), ISBE must provide: • Evidence of monitoring procedures used for scoring DLM-YE writing items, including measures of inter-rater reliability of hand-scored items.
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (PARCC), ISBE must provide: • Evidence of continued mode comparability studies.
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), ISBE must provide: • Evidence of State and local policies that communicate the implications of a student's participation in an AA-AAAS and; • Evidence of how parents of these children are informed of these implications.
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs	For all components of the State assessment system, ISBE must provide: • Evidence of policies and procedures to ensure that 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. • Evidence of procedures for determining whether an English learners should be assessed with accommodations; and of selection procedures for accommodations for English learners.
5.3 – Accommodations	For all components of the State assessment system, ISBE must submit: • Evidence that confirms that the State is using the PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual and DLM Accessibility Manual OR evidence of other resources published by the State to meet the requirements for this element. • 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.
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	For all components of the State assessment system, ISBE must submit: • Evidence that the State conducts monitoring of test administration to ensure that standardized test administration procedures for special populations are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools (e.g., evidence indicating how Illinois is using data files from the testing delivery to monitor the selection and use of accommodations).
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting	For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (PARCC), ISBE must provide: • Additional information about areas of educational specialization for members of each achievement standards-setting panel, especially the specialty areas of special education and English learners.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
6.4 – Reporting	For all components of the State assessment system, ISBE must submit: • Evidence of a process and timeline for the delivery of student reports for all tests. • Evidence of availability of Braille and/or large print report formats upon request. • Evidence that indicates ISBE follows a process and timeline for delivering reports as soon as practicable after each test administration. For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (PARCC), ISBE must provide: • Evidence that ISBE and PARCC provide reports that enable itemized score analyses to LEAs and schools.

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

June 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes

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

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

Contents

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

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS 10
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 10
2.2 – Item Development..... 11
2.3 – Test Administration 12
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (Reviewed by Department staff only)14
2.5 – Test Security 15
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 16

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

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

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

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 34
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students 34
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 35
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 36
6.4 – Reporting..... 37

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

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State.	**THIS CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED ONLY IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.** Evaluate for all subjects	The state of Illinois provided documentation of the proposed adoption of CCSS standards and approved ELA and Math standards (Documents 1-4). Document 9 (Common Core Q&A 0413; p.2) includes a very detailed description of the CCSS approval process in Illinois. Document 8 (Common Core at a Glance) lacks any publication date or details about implementation of the survey results that are reported. This lessens the usefulness of this document. NOTE: Various evidence is listed (e.g., Document 10, 11, 12) that is intended to illustrate Illinois' commitment to aiding the transition to the new content standards, but there is no "connecting tissue" to clarify when, to whom, by what means, and how often teachers were provided with access to such resources. These and others (e.g., Documents 13 and 14 [learning progressions] are often samples covering only a grade band, with no evidence that similar resources are available for other grades/grade bands. Some explanation in the "Notes" section to convey the relationship among all of these evidence documents would have been helpful. Frontloading document 22 (2015 ISBE ILS Evaluation Summary Report) and cross-referencing tools mentioned or alluded to therein might help as well.
Section 1.1 Summary Statement		
__X_ No additional evidence is required.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards The State's academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science specify what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school to succeed in college and the workforce; contain content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.	**THIS CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED ONLY IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.** Evaluate for all three subjects	Illinois indicates that science is not currently up for submission. The submission deals with reading/language arts and mathematics. See note for section 1.1 regarding Illinois sources of evidence.
Section 1.2 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required.		

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

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
1.3 – Required Assessments The State's assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments (based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate academic achievement standards-AAAS) in: • Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12).	Evaluate for grade/subject combinations listed in left column • Document 23 – Illinois Statutory Assessment Language • Document 24 – IL ESEA Flexibility Request 4202014 (p.44-45) • Document 25 – IL Highlights of ESEA Flexibility Request	State submitted documents from the state statute (document 23) that requires testing in ELA and math in grades 3-8 beginning in 2014-15. ELA and math high school requirements – the state may have no more than 3 assessments per subject and one must be a college and career ready assessment; students must take the college and career ready assessment in order to get a regular high school diploma (but there are exceptions to this rule for: some students with disabilities; students in adults and continuing education; in the district doesn't have to include the student in accountability per NCLB; recently arrived English learner for the ELA test; and any other State Board rule for exemption. Unclear that the state has a clear set of the same assessments in high school for all students. (The state's Title I, Part A grant was recently placed on high risk grantee status for its policies around high school assessments.) Science assessments are not required until the 2017-18 school year. (NOTE: IL did not submit science for peer review at this time.)

Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY

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

- The evidence submitted indicates that the state has selected the PARCC high school assessments as the required high school assessments (grades 3-11) with the ELA I, II, and III assessments and the Math I, II, III or Algebra I, Geometry, and Algebra II series of assessments being the high school assessments. It is unclear that all students have to be included in the high school assessments and that all students take the same high school assessments.
- Science requirements do not begin until 2017-18, which is a problem as that conflicts with NCLB statutory requirements.

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

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

1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments
 	
The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.
• For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system;
• For English learners (EL):
  o Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment;
  o If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years.
	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column-SWD and EL
	
	Illinois Evidence:
	
	Document 23 – Illinois Statutory Assessment Language
	
	Document 26 – DLM Exception Guidance
	
	Document 27 – DLM Participation Guidelines
	
	Document 28 – Request for Exception to Percentage Cap
		From document 23, it appears the state requires all students to participate in the ELA and math assessments in grades 3-8 and high school.
		
		Document 27 indicates the participation guidelines, which clearly states that all students with disabilities must be included in the assessment system and who is eligible for DLM. Documents 26 & 28 provide the guidance to the field for requesting to exceed the cap and the form for districts to request to exceed the 1% cap on the percentage of students scoring proficient or above on the AA-AAAS and being included in accountability determinations.
		
		The guidance to the field could be clearer that all students need to be included in the assessment system – Illinois exempts recently arrived English learners from one administration of the ELA test in the student's first 12 months enrolled in schools in the United States. The document included was the state statute.
		
		There is no mention of how students with disabilities who are publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education services are included in the assessment system.
		
		Given the lack of a clear policy with respect to the data provided for element 1.5 below, no evidence was provided that all students are included in the assessment system in high school – the policy identified in document 23 indicates that all students have to take the college and career ready assessment in order to get a diploma but from document 39 below, it is clear not all students are taking the college

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

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
		and career ready assessment for PARCC (ELA III and Algebra II/Math III); it's also not clear that students taking adult education or who are not going to receive a regular diploma have to be included in the assessment system.
Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • Clear policy that all students, including students with disabilities, have to take the same high school assessment.		

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

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
1.5 – Participation Data The State's participation data show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State's assessment system. In addition, if the State administers end-of-course assessments for high school students, the State has procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates on each required assessment and provides the corresponding data.	Illinois Evidence: Document 7 – Statutory Authority Courses of Study and Graduation Requirements Document 23 – Illinois Statutory Assessment Language Document 29 – 2015 Illinois State Participation Rates Document 30 – 2015 Illinois 95 Percent Participation Rates Document 31 – Illinois Interactive Report Card Participation Display http://www.illinoisreportcard.com/ Document 32 – Special Education Assessment Participation Report 2015 Document 33 – 2015 Illinois PARCC Participation Document 34 – 2015 Illinois 95 Percent Subgroup Participation Rates Document 35 – 2015 Illinois State Report Card Document 36 – 2015 Illinois PARCC Performance Levels by District and School Document 37 – 2015 Illinois PARCC Statewide Subgroup Performance Document 38 – Illinois Interactive Report	In document 29, it appears all students are being included in the assessment system (although there is not clear information provided to high school, specifically). The state did not include a table that indicated the number of students enrolled and the number of students assessed, by subject, grade, and subgroup. In document 39, it is clear that not all students are taking the same high school assessment. Document 48 makes it very clear that schools may elect one of the three PARCC high school tests. Given that the state has end of course tests in high school, the state has not provided any documentation that it has a policy to ensure all students are included in the assessment system. As noted in element 1.4, the policy identified in document 23 indicates that all students have to take the college and career ready assessment in order to get a diploma but from document 39 below, it is clear not all students are taking the college and career ready assessment for PARCC (ELA III and Algebra II/Math III); it's also not clear that students taking adult education or who are not going to receive a regular diploma have to be included in the assessment system.

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

Critical Element—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
	Performance Data http://www.illinoisreportcard.com/ Document 39 – 2015 Illinois PARCC Performance Combined with Optional ACT Performance Document 48 – SIS Assessment Process 2015 Presentation – 20141203 (p.21-30 describes inclusion of students via grade level or course selection using our student information system)	

Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY

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

- Table detailing the number of enrolled students and the number who took the assessment, by subject, subgroup, and grade.
- Policy or guidance to LEAs regarding the high school assessment requirements to ensure that all students take the same assessment at some point in high school and data confirming that all students are included in the assessment system.

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

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.1 – Test Design and Development The State's test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State's academic content standards, and includes: • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;	**THIS CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN CONSORTIA SUBMISSIONS ONLY.** **Purposes and Intended Interpretations and Uses of Results**	See PARCC and DLM reviews.
• 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;	**Test Structure and Blueprints**	See PARCC and DLM reviews.
• 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);	**Representation of Knowledge and Skills in the Assessment and the Standards**	See PARCC and DLM reviews.
• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.	**Item Pool and Selection Procedures**	See PARCC and DLM reviews.
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
_X__ See PARCC and DLM reviews.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.2 – Item Development The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State's academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.	**THIS CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN CONSORTIA SUBMISSIONS ONLY.** **Item Development**	See PARCC and DLM notes.
Section 2.2 Summary Statement		
_X__ See PARCC and DLM reviews.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.3 – Test Administration The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State: • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;	**THIS CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN BOTH STATE AND CONSORTIA SUBMISSIONS.** **Standardized Procedures**	Document 40 makes clear who may serve as a test administrator (and also explicitly identifies some examples of those who may not). Document 40 serves the same purpose for DLM. Although Illinois submitted multiple sources of evidence for this Critical Element, they provided no resource that "connects the dots" to indicate when and how the policies and procedures for standardized test administration are communicated to educators. In other words, Illinois provided content but little/no detail on process for implementation. Peer reviewers call Illinois' attention to the Summary Statement in the PARCC review (when it is available to Illinois) that "States will need to provide evidence of how they implemented the training resources provided by PARCC for test administration, and for which staff the training is required."
• 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.	**Training**	Communications on training are provided at state level (see Documents 40, 41, 47 and 48).
• 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.	**Technology Requirements & Contingency Plans**	Document 60 (Determination of Online Assessment Readiness) provides some guidelines to schools/districts about technology-based administration (including determination of readiness to do so). Peers were unable to find any evidence of state-level plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.
Section 2.3 Summary Statement		
__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• Illinois needs to provide evidence of how it implemented the training resources provided by the Consortia for test administration (including implementation of accommodations) and make sure that all appropriate parties involved had timely access to those resources. • Illinois needs to provide documentation of the fidelity of implementation of training provided by PARCC and DLM. • Illinois needs to provide more detail on the process(es) for implementation. • Illinois needs to provide evidence of state-level plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.		

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

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.	Illinois Evidence: Document 62 – Illinois Test Irregularity Identification and Reporting Process Document 63 – 23 Ill Admin Code 1.30 Identification and Reporting of Irregularity Document 67 - PARCC Irregularity Report Form Document 68 – PARCC Security Agreement Document 78 – Personal Needs Profile Accommodation Delivery Issues Sections 2.3 and 2.5 provide additional evidence related to educator expectations and reporting expectations for irregularities.	There is no information provided of a policy related to monitoring the administration of the state tests. It is unclear what the state does. The only information provided was in the notes of the of the state's index template, which said: "During the first year of online administration of both PARCC and DLM, Illinois sent a representative to districts to monitor and assist with administration. The process was designed to be supportive rather than punitive, and technology issues related to administration were addressed immediately on site whenever possible. Online monitoring of assessment administration was also undertaken using our Student Information System data, PearsonAccessNext/PARCC, and KITE/DLM-AA. Noted irregularities were subjected to the same process identified in Documents 62 and 63."
Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • Description of the policy for the state's monitoring system for the general and alternate assessments and documentation for how the state is implementation that policy.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.5 – Test Security The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through: • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;	**THIS CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN BOTH STATE AND CONSORTIA SUBMISSIONS.** **Evidence of Prevention of Irregularities**	Document 62 sets forth a substantial list of possible test irregularities and provides some information on sanctions possible. It also describes steps involved in investigating a possible violation. Peer reviewers advise Illinois to revise this document to make clear its source and authorship, and include letterhead or logo to make clear that this is an official document. If it is excerpted from another document, please note that. Document 65 outlines the legal code for teacher/educator misconduct, but its relation to reported/confirmed violations of test security was not fully clear.
• Detection of test irregularities;	**Evidence of Detection of Irregularities**	The PARCC-issued Test Administrator's Manual contains a form with which to report a possible test irregularity (Document 67) as well as a post-test form certifying that the administration conformed to all security requirements (Document 70). Peer reviewers were unable to find evidence of Illinois' adherence to all test security policies and procedures (e.g., a summary of test security incidents and follow-up, remediation, actions to reduce/avoid similar incidents in future).
• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities	**Evidence of Investigation of Remediation Following Incidents**	Peers were unable to locate any examples of investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities following any incident(s).
• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State's assessments;	**Remediation Following Test Security Incidents**	Peers were unable to locate any examples of remediation following any incident(s).

Section 2.5 Summary Statement

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

To adequately address all factors for this Critical Element, Illinois needs to provide evidence of its adherence to all test security policies/procedures; investigation of possible test irregularities; and remediation following incident(s).

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically: • To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results;	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS **THIS PORTION OF THE CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN BOTH STATE AND CONSORTIA SUBMISSIONS.** **Security and Integrity of Test Materials**	Peer reviewers were unable to find evidence in this section that explicitly addresses policies/procedures to ensure the security and integrity of test materials. However, peer reviewers noted that Document 68 listed under earlier Critical Elements does address this factor.
• To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;	**Secure Student-Level Assessment Data**	Illinois has provided evidence in Document 71 (Illinois School Student Records Act), which outlines access/privacy policies, content of student data records, and response to violations of state policy in regard to student records. However peer reviewers were unable to find evidence of policies and procedures for securing student-level assessment data.
• To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.	**PII Protection in Reporting**	The only purpose of including Document 31 (Illinois Interactive Report Card Participation Display) appears to be to point to a one-sentence statement of a suppression rule for subgroups under 10 on display). The same applies to Document 38 (Illinois Interactive Report Performance Data).
Section 2.6 Summary Statement		
__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • Illinois needs to provide evidence of policies and procedures for securing student-level assessment data.		

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

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State's validity evidence includes evidence that the State's assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State's academic content standards, including: • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State's assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State's academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity;	**THIS CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN CONSORTIA SUBMISSIONS ONLY.** **Validity Framework and Overall Evaluation**	
• 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.	**Measurement of Academic Content Standards**	
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
See PARCC and DLM EOY notes.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State's academic content standards.	**THIS CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN CONSORTIA SUBMISSIONS ONLY.** **Assessments Tap Intended Cognitive Processes**	
Section 3.2 Summary Statement		
See PARCC and DLM EOY notes.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State's academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.	**THIS CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN CONSORTIA SUBMISSIONS ONLY.** **Validity Based on Internal Structure**	
Section 3.3 Summary Statement		
See PARCC and DLM EOY notes.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State's assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.	**THIS CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN CONSORTIA SUBMISSIONS ONLY.** **Validity Based on Relationships to Other Variables**	
Section 3.4 Summary Statement		
See PARCC and DLM EOY notes.		

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

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.1 – Reliability The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State's student population overall and each student group and, if the State's assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including: • Test reliability of the State's assessments estimated for its student population;	**THIS CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN CONSORTIA SUBMISSIONS ONLY.** **Reliability for Student Population**	
• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State's assessments;	**Overall and Conditional Standard Error of Measurement**	
• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results;	**Achievement Levels**	
• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student's achievement.	**Computer-Adaptive Tests**	
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
See PARCC and DLM EOY notes.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.	**THIS CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN CONSORTIA SUBMISSIONS ONLY.** **Accessibility & Fairness**	
Section 4.2 Summary Statement		
See PARCC and DLM EOY notes.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.	**THIS CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN CONSORTIA SUBMISSIONS ONLY.** **Adequately Precise Estimate Across the Continuum**	
Section 4.3 Summary Statement		
See PARCC and DLM EOY notes.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.4 – Scoring The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State's academic achievement standards.	**THIS CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN CONSORTIA SUBMISSIONS ONLY.** **Standardized Scoring Procedures**	
Section 4.4 Summary Statement		
See PARCC and DLM EOY notes.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State's academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.	**THIS CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN CONSORTIA SUBMISSIONS ONLY.** **Multiple Assessment Forms Represent Academic Content Standards and Yield Consistent Score Interpretations**	
Section 4.5 Summary Statement		
See PARCC and DLM EOY notes.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State: • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;	THIS CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN CONSORTIA SUBMISSIONS ONLY. **Comparable Interpretation of Results**	
• Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.	**Documented Evidence of Comparability**	

Section 4.6 Summary Statement
See PARCC and DLM EOY notes.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).	**THIS CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN CONSORTIA SUBMISSIONS ONLY.** **Monitoring, Maintaining, and Improving Quality of Assessment**	

Section 4.7 Summary Statement
See PARCC and DLM EOY notes.

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

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State's assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that: • Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student's education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards;	**THIS CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN BOTH STATE AND CONSORTIA SUBMISSIONS.** **Clear Explanation of Difference Between Assessments Based on Mainstream and Alternate Academic Achievement Standards**	Illinois provides sufficient evidence to address this factor. Document 7 identifies high school graduation requirements and merely mentions that these do not apply to students with the most significant disabilities with an IEP. Document 23 identifies state policies related to IEP-based identification of students eligible for alternative assessment and indicates state authority to develop rules governing the administration of that assessment. Documents 26 and 27 clarify waiver policies (exception guidance) and participation guidelines. Simply as a courtesy, peer reviewers wish to point out that in Document 28 the word "proficient" is misspelled in several locations, including the title page.
• 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;	**IEP Based Assessment Decision**	Document 72 consists of a PowerPoint presentation that deals in part with IEP-based assessment decisions. Although this serves as sufficient evidence, peer reviewers would have liked to see an introductory slide or other resource that provided context (what policy documents the presentation slides were drawn from, who has access to the PP presentation—and when—etc.)
• Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment;	**Guidelines for Choice of Assessment**	Document 72 provides evidence by reiterating guidelines provided in PARCC and DLM submissions. This PowerPoint presentation includes a link to Illinois resources and contact information for key Illinois personnel.
• Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for	**Information on Supports and Accommodations**	Documents 75, 76 and 77 include useful outlines of PARCC accessibility tools and features for students participating in the general assessment. Document

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
students with disabilities		72 provides details on DLM and PARCC related to supports and accommodations.
• Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;	**Guidance on Selection of Accommodations**	Illinois includes evidence based on PARCC and DLM resources.
• Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;	**Disability Categories for Alternate Assessment**	Document 27 is sufficient evidence.
• Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student's achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State's general assessments)	**Parent Notification of Assessment with AAAS**	Peer reviewers were unable to find evidence to address this factor.
• The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.	**Promote Access to the General Curriculum**	Document 27 (p. 2) indicates that for SWSCD, the student's instruction is linked to grade level content and reflective of Core Content Essential Elements (CCEE).

Section 5.1 Summary Statement

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

- Illinois should provide evidence that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities (SWSCD) will be assessed with the alternate achievement standards any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State's assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum: • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);	**THIS CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN BOTH STATE AND CONSORTIA SUBMISSIONS.** **Determining Appropriateness of Accommodation for EL's**	Document 82 clearly provides information on accessibility tools and accommodations available to ELs. However, peer reviewers were unable to locate among cited evidence any clear information on the procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed with accommodations. Peer reviewers would like to see some confirmation that Illinois uses the PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual (4th edition) and DLM Accessibility Manual 2014-2015 and that no supplementary evidence is required.
• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;	**Information on Supports and Accommodations**	Document 82 provides information on which accessibility tools and features are available to all students (p. 14) and accommodations available to ELs (p. 10).
• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.	**Guidance on Selection of Accommodations**	Peer reviewers were unable to find any evidence of guidance on selection procedures for accommodations for ELs. Peer reviewers would like to see some confirmation that Illinois uses the PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual (4th edition) and DLM Accessibility Manual 2014-2015 and that no supplementary evidence is required.

Section 5.2 Summary Statement

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

- Illinois needs to confirm that it uses the PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual (4th edition) and DLM Accessibility Manual 2014-2015 and that no supplementary evidence is required for the first and third bullets (factors) above.
- Illinois needs to provide evidence any clear information on the procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed with accommodations.
- Illinois needs to provide evidence of guidance on selection procedures for accommodations for ELs.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.3 – Accommodations The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State: • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504;	**THIS CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN BOTH STATE AND CONSORTIA SUBMISSIONS.** **Evidence of Appropriate Accommodation Availability**	Evidence provided by Illinois reiterate and/or summarizes information in the PARCC and DLM submissions.
• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);	**Evidence of Appropriate Accommodations for English Learners**	Evidence provided was sufficient for this factor.
• 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;	**Appropriateness and Effectiveness of Accommodations**	Peer reviewers would like to see some confirmation that Illinois uses the PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual (4th edition) and DLM Accessibility Manual 2014-2015 and that no supplementary evidence is required.
• Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.	**Exceptional Accommodations Requests:**	Evidence is sufficient for this factor (see Document 75).

Section 5.3 Summary Statement

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

- Confirmation that Illinois uses the PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual (4th edition) and DLM Accessibility Manual 2014-2015 and that no supplementary State evidence is required for the third bullet (factor) above.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are: • Consistent with the State's policies for accommodations;	**THIS CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN BOTH STATE AND CONSORTIA SUBMISSIONS.** **Accommodations and Participation Decisions are Consistent with State Policy**	The following comments apply to all factors in Critical Element 5.4: On page 41 of the Illinois Submission Index there is a note that: "ISBE does not currently employ external monitors for assessment monitoring. Internal staff members provide training to districts regarding the appropriate selection of accommodation and accessibility features, and ISBE collects and investigates district reports of irregularities in the administration of these features. The ISBE Division of Special Education monitors test administration as part of their routine monitoring process and use and indicator related to Adequate Yearly Progress in Assessment. Deficiencies are addressed through their process." However, peer reviewers were unable to find evidence to document Illinois' monitoring process/protocol by the ISBE Division of Special Education that address the components of this Critical Element. In addition, peer reviewers were unable to find evidence of how Illinois is using data files from the vendor systems to monitor accommodations preselected versus those utilized. NOTE: Not all evidence listed clearly addresses this Critical Element.
• Appropriate for addressing a student's disability or language needs for each assessment administered;	**Appropriateness of Accommodations and Participation Decisions for Addressing Student Needs**	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;	**Consistent with Accommodations during Instruction and/or Practice**	
• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student's IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner;	**Consistent with Accommodations Identified by Team**	
• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.	**Administered with Fidelity to Procedures**	

Section 5.4 Summary Statement

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

- Provide evidence to document monitoring process/protocol by the ISBE Division of Special Education that address the components of this Critical Element.
- Provide evidence of how Illinois is using data files from the vendor systems to monitor accommodations preselected versus those utilized

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

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically: • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities;	**THIS CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED ONLY IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.**	Evidence for this factor is sufficient. For all factors of Critical Element 6.1 peer reviewers would have found it useful for Illinois to submit some of the more detailed information on this topic from PARCC and DLM to supplement Document 90. However, in Document 93, p. 1, a statement appears that "Each state determines how the DLM performance levels translate into its own definitions of proficiency for accountability purposes." Peer reviewers were unable to find evidence of how Illinois makes this determination. Peer reviewers were unable to find evidence of descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level for DLM.
• The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply;		Evidence is sufficient for this factor.
• The State's academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.		Evidence is sufficient for this factor.

Section 6.1 Summary Statement

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

- Illinois should provide descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level for DLM.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.	**THIS CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN CONSORTIA SUBMISSIONS ONLY.** **Technically Sound Method with Panelist with Experience and Expertise**	
Section 6.2 Summary Statement		
See PARCC and DLM EOY notes.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards The State's academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State's academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce. If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State's grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.	**THIS CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN CONSORTIA SUBMISSIONS ONLY.** **Challenging Alternate Academic Achievement Standards and Differentiated Content Across Grades**	

Section 6.3 Summary Statement
See PARCC and DLM EOY notes.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.4 – Reporting The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including: • The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;	**THIS CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN BOTH STATE AND CONSORTIA SUBMISSIONS.** **Reporting Results**	Without notes from the State or any organizational structure connecting sources of evidence to factors to be considered for this Critical Element sub-element, it is difficult to know for sure the intent of the State when reviewing the 40 different documents listed. Document 35 shows reporting to the public the % students who met PARCC and DLM standards by grade.
• The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;	**Assessment Results Reported to Support Appropriate Uses of Results**	Document 36 provides data on % students by school/district at each performance level in each grade. Document 37 appears to break down % scoring at or above "met" by race, gender, SES, etc.; however, the document itself does not make clear what these numbers represent. Document 91: PARCC Scores Report Card Guide can facilitate stakeholder understanding of results; to some extent, Document 93 can serve the same purpose for DLM results. Peer reviewers were unable to find evidence regarding any analyses that demonstrated classroom level findings (e.g., a claim-level summary useful to teachers, instruction leaders, and administrators).
• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that:	**Delivery of Student Reports**	Illinois provided an individual student report that included a link to the PLDs. Peer reviewers were not able (and indeed are not supposed) to access such links. Peers also noted that in Documents 86-89 the

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student's achievement; ○ Report the student's achievement in terms of the State's grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors); ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; ○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;		PLDs are provided. Are these the same as what is found on the link. Peer reviewers were unable to find evidence that PLDs for DLM were available on the student reports. Documents 95-103 provide useful information to parents in a "wrapper" for individual student reports, including explanation of performance levels. Documents 104-106 do the same for high school level (writing, integrated math I, II, and III). Document 108—3 Things to Know about PARCC Results and 109—3 Things to Know about PARCC Results-Spanish provide information useful to parents. Also helpful should be Document 110—PARCC Results Parent Fact Sheet 1512 and Document 111—PARCC Results Parent Fact Sheet 1512-Spanish. Peer reviewers were unable to locate information about availability of Braille and/or large print formats upon request.
• 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	**Process and Timeline**	Peer reviewers were unable to locate information that indicates that Illinois follows a process and timeline for delivering reports as soon as practicable after each test administration.

Section 6.4 Summary Statement

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

- Illinois should provide evidence that PLDs for DLM were available on the student reports.
- Illinois should provide evidence regarding any analyses that demonstrated classroom level findings (e.g., a claim-level summary useful to teachers, instruction leaders, and administrators).
- Illinois should provide information about availability of Braille and/or large print formats upon request.
- Illinois should provide information that indicates that they follow a process and timeline for delivering reports as soon as practicable after each test administration.

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

April, 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes—PARCC Consortium Evidence

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Contents

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

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS 6
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 6
2.2 – Item Development..... 8
2.3 – Test Administration 9
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)10
2.5 – Test Security 11
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 13

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 14
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 14
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 16
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure 17
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables..... 18

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER 20
4.1 – Reliability..... 20
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 21
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... 25
4.4 – Scoring 26
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 28
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment 29
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance..... 31

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS 32
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 32
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 34
5.3 – Accommodations..... 35
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations 37

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 38
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students 38
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 39
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 40
6.4 – Reporting..... 41

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

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

Critical Element	Evidence **(Record document and page # for future reference)**	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State.	1.1.1 Common Core State Standards a. Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts & Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Studies b. Common Core State Standards for Mathematics Science standards not included	
Section 1.1 Summary Statement		
See State 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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards The State's academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science specify what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school to succeed in college and the workforce; contain content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.	1.2.4 Reaching Higher: The Common Core State Standards Validation Committee a. Findings, pp. 2-3 1.2.5 The Common Core State Standards: Insight into Their Development and Purpose NA for Science	
Section 1.2 Summary Statement		
See State 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.

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

1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments
 	
The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.
• For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system;
• For English learners (EL):
  ○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment;
  ○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years.
	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column-SWD and EL
	
	*PARCC Accessibility/Accommodations Manual
		Several policy-like statements (Sections 3 and 4) support inclusions of all students, including those with disabilities and EL in statewide assessments
		
		Same sections also support inclusion of English Learners in statewide assessments.
		
		The PARCC manual submitted clearly outlines an approach for instructional staff to consider when considering accessibility features for all students.
		
		The manual also clearly outlines an approach for IEP teams to use when considering and selecting assessment accommodations.
		
		This manual also clearly outlines an approach for instructional staff to use when considering and selecting allowable accommodations for EL students.

Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
This summary feedback for "No Additional Evidence Needed", or "Additional Evidence Needed" is most appropriately limited to the context of a specific state		

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

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
submission. This consortium submission, however, provides very good evidence and support for element 1.4 criteria, for any state that implements the PARCC assessment system.		

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.1 – Test Design and Development The State's test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State's academic content standards, and includes: • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State's grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; • Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State's academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.	• Purpose 2.1.1.1 About PARCC Assessments; Intended Interpretation and uses of results 2.1.1.2 – 2.1.1.7 • Test blueprints and item specifications provide detailed guidance to item development that addresses coverage and support for interpretation and use of results 2.2.1a-2.1.2.6 • ECD, Claims Structure, and Descriptions provide information about content challenge and required complexity of items and tasks 2.1.2.7a-2.1.2.9 and 2.1.3.4a-2.1.3.14 • The PARCC Cognitive Complexity Study 2.1.3.1evaluation was intended to guide selection of items for test forms to meet challenge and complexity requirements. • The NNSTOY 2.1.3.3, Fordham 2.1.3.2a (intended to evaluate grades 5 and 8 for alignment and comparisons of challenge and rigor with other measures) and HumRRO 2.1.3.2b (intended to evaluate HS assessments for alignment and comparison to challenge and rigor of other measures) studies address issues of cognitive complexity. • Technology-based = Usability of accessibility tools 2.2.5 and 2.2.6 • NA-not computer-adaptive	More than adequate evidence is provided for the intended interpretation and uses of results both in an overarching statement and as communicated in score reports and interpretation guides to support score reports. Several documents provide guidance for item development to ensure appropriate content challenge and complexity. Pre-item development documentation supported item development that addressed a variety of complexity levels consistent with the intent of the full range of the grade-level academic content standards. PARCC Cognitive Complexity Study investigators evaluated item content for cognitive complexity for the purpose of assembling operational test forms to align with the content standards.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
__X__ No additional evidence is needed		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.2 – Item Development The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State's academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.	• Content challenge and cognitive complexity are defined for use in item and task development in 2.2.12 and 2.2.21, 2.2.13-2.2.14, 2.2.21 • Item development processes 2.2.1-2.2.4, 2.2.9-2.2.10, 2.2.12, 2.2.15-2.2.16, 2.2.17-2.2.19 • Item research and reviews 2.2.5-2.2.8, 2.2.11, 2.2.20	Peers could not locate information about the composition (e.g., racial and geographic diversity) and credentials (e.g., certification, grade levels, special population, etc.) of those participating in the Content and Bias/Sensitivity. Peers could not locate information about the most common reasons for item rejections that should be useful in future item development.

Section 2.2 Summary Statement

___ No additional evidence is required or

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

- Composition and credentials of Content and Bias/Sensitivity Reviewers

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

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

2.3 – Test Administration
 	
The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:
• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;
• Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State's general and alternate assessments receive training on the State's established procedures for the administration of its assessments;
• If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.
	Administration policies and procedures include:
	• Communicate admin procedures:
	  ○ Standardized 2.3.1.1Admin Bulletin, 2.3.1.1 Technology Bulletin, TCM & TAMs 2.3.1.7
	  ○ Accommodations: Manual 2.3.1.8, TCM 2.3.1.6 pp 54-60
	• Training:
	  ○ Practice tests 2.3.1.2
	  ○ Sample items 2.3.1.3
	  ○ Tutorials 2.3.1.4
	  ○ Online Training Modules 2.3.1.5
	  ○ Test Admin study 2.3.2.1
	• Technology:
	  ○ Technology Bulletin 2.3.1.1
	  ○ Customer Support 2.3.1.9
	  ○ Technology Set-up Tools 2.3.3.1
	  ○ Contingency TCM 2.3.1.6 pp.33, Early Warning System 2.3.3.2, Error Codes 2.3.3.3, Escalation Protocol 2.3.3.4
	
	NA-AA-AAS
		In the HumRRO report, reviewers found that accommodations offered were valid and appropriate based on current research, However, reviewers were unable to locate information regarding research regarding whether the accessibility features and accommodations alter the constructs measured.
		
		It is not clear who is and whether personnel are required to complete all training prior to administration. PARCC says they provide data to states on who has viewed which modules and completed the end-of-training quiz.
		• Do States decide who takes the training?
		• Are States individually making policies concerning training requirements since format of training varies from state-to-state?
		• If so, how does this variation affect accuracy of results? (See Test Admin Study)
		
		PARCC States should document fidelity of implementation of training materials provided by PARCC through the States' monitoring processes.
		
		Use of a common test platform ensures consistency for delivery for training and test administration and a common experience for students. It also minimizes test administration problems that are introduced by the use of multiple platforms.

Section 2.3 Summary Statement

__X_ No additional evidence is required for PARCC.

___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
- [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]

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

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.	2.4.1 PARCC State Alert/Escalation Protocol SECURE DOCUMENT 2.4.2 Online Testing Support 2.4.3 Troubleshooting Guide for Online Testing 2.4.4 PARCC Service Now Dashboard 2.4.5 Quality of Test Administration Study a. Including on-site observations from HumRRO, pp. 6-9 2.4.6 PARCC Support Center 2.4.7 Administration Scripts a. PARCC 2016 Spring ELA CBT Administration Scripts b. PARCC 2016 Spring ELA PBT Administration Scripts c. PARCC 2016 Spring Math CBT Administration Scripts d. PARCC 2016 Spring Math PBT Administration Scripts 2.4.8 Data Forensics Study Plan SECURE DOCUMENT a. Pearson/Caveon response change analysis; Erasure analysis	2.4.1-outlines PARCC procedures to escalate various online testing issues to vendor via state contacts. 2.4.2 describes various PARCC support options for online testing 2.4.3 outlines PARCC procedures for trouble shooting 2.4.4 example of PARCC online status monitoring interface. 2.4.5 describes an HumRRO independent monitoring/observation study in 2015 participating states—test proctors, student, and LEA data gathered; combined with audit sample of testing sites (100+) during administration. Study provides direct evidence of consortium efforts to monitor test administration. This was a commendable effort to monitor, observe, and evaluate administration of a large-scale assessment and provide actionable feedback for system improvements. 2.4.7 PARCC documents show standardized administration prompts for LEA test proctors 2.4.8 shows PARCC data analysis plan for monitoring test anomalies
Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
This summary feedback for "No Additional Evidence Needed" or "Additional Evidence Needed" is most appropriately limited to the context of a specific state submission. This consortium submission, however, provides very good evidence and support for element 2.4 criteria, for any state that implements the PARCC assessment system.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.5 – Test Security The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through: • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State's assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.	2.5.1.1 TCM and TAMs 2.5.1.2 Security Agreement 2.5.1.3 Post-Test Certification Forms 2.5.1.4 Form to Report Testing Irregularities and Security Breaches 2.5.1.5 Form to Report Contaminated, Damaged, Missing Materials 2.5.1.6 Chain-of-Custody Requirements in 2016 Spring Test Coordinator Manual a. Section 2.1, pp. 3-5: Maintaining The Security of Test Materials and Content b. Section 3.3.2, p. 16: Security Plan c. Chain-of-Custody Forms 1. Computer-Based Testing Form 2. School-Level Paper-Based Testing Form 3. LEA/District-Level Paper-Based Testing Form 2.5.1.7 TestNav Security Highlights 2.5.1.8 DDoS Migration AWS-Pearson SECURE DOCUMENT 2.5.1.9 Troubleshooting Guide for Online Testing 2.5.1.10 TestNav Early Warning System 2.5.1.11 PearsonAccessNext Operational Reports 2.5.2.1 Data Forensics Study Plan SECURE DOCUMENT 2.5.2.2 PARCC Handscoring Alert Process SECURE DOCUMENT 2.5.3.1 PARCC State Alert/Escalation Protocol SECURE DOCUMENT	PARCC Evidence of recommended Test Security procedures to create a secure environment and to protect PII is more than adequate. States need to demonstrate full use and application of these procedures and protections.

Section 2.5 Summary Statement

_X__ No additional evidence is required or

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically: • To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.	2.6.1.1 Chain-of-Custody Requirements in 2016 Spring Test Coordinator Manual 2.6.1.2 Paper-Based Testing Materials Security Procedures in 2016 Spring Test Coordinator Manual 2.6.1.3 PARCC State Alert/Escalation Protocol SECURE DOCUMENT 2.6.1.4 Data Forensics Study Plan SECURE DOCUMENT 2.6.1.5 Student Registration/Personal Needs Profile Field Definitions 2.6.1.6 Non-Disclosure Agreements for all item reviewers, forms reviewers, etc. 2.6.1.7 PARCC Data Privacy and Security Policy 2.6.2.1 Pearson Privacy Policy 2.6.2.2 Pearson Terms and Conditions 2.6.2.3 User Role Matrix for Pearson Access Next 2.6.2.4 Score Report Interpretation Guide a. Section 1.3, p. 1: Confidentiality of Reporting Results 2.6.2.5 Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 2.6.3.1 Protection of Student Privacy: Aggregate Reports SECURE DOCUMENT	Minimum cell sizes for reporting for PARCC is Performance View-16 students; Growth View-25.students. State member minimum cell sizes range from 10 to 25. Policies and procedures for reporting conform to industry standards. (PARCC honors the minimum *n* sizes and suppression rules for the respective states.)

Section 2.6 Summary Statement

_X__ No additional evidence is required or

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

- [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]

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

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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

3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content
 	
The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State's validity evidence includes evidence that the State's assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State's academic content standards, including:
• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State's assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State's academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity;
• If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State's academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.
	3.1.1.1 2015 PARCC Technical Report
	
	3.1.1.2 Evidence of PARCC Validity
	
	3.1.1.3 Quality of Items, Tasks, and Stimuli Study
	
	3.1.1.16 Cognitive Complexity Study
	
	Evidence cited elsewhere relevant to this CE:
	Thomas B. Fordham Institute, "Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation Assessments," and HumRRO, "Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation High School Assessments"
	
	• Alignment
	  ○ Content (knowledge and process) 3.1.1.3 Quality of Items, Tasks, and Stimuli Study a. pp. 1-4, 8-17, 72-73, 79-80
	  ○ Range Fordham p.7 and 54
	  ○ Balance HumRRO p.25, 36, and 38
	  ○ Cognitive Complexity 3.1.1.16 Cognitive Complexity Study
	
	NA for AA-AAA
		NNSTOY, Fordham, and HumRRO reports evaluated alignment only for grades 5, 8, and High School in ELA/L and Mathematics. These investigators noted that more PLD Level 1 items are needed, particularly at grade 8 and High School Mathematics. PARCC has indicated they are adding items to address this concern. In addition, Fordham investigators were unable to summarize results for balanced emphasis as regards concepts, procedures, and applications.
		
		PARCC evidence of coverage of the full range of the grade-level academic content standards was lacking in both ELA and Mathematics particularly at grades 5 and 8. Future alignment studies that include multiple forms per grade for all grades tested may find that coverage is not an issue across forms. Further evidence is needed.
		
		PARCC Technical Report indicates that alignment studies found excellent alignment for both content and depth. However, the HumRRO study of the High School assessments found that the ELA/L assessment was limited overall for Depth. This finding contrasts with the Fordham study findings for ELA/L grades 5 and 8, where a good to excellent match was found for Depth. Both studies found a weak match at all levels for Speaking and Listening.
		
		Alignment study findings for Mathematics at all levels for most aspects of alignment were good to excellent, although Fordham found that the distribution of items for grade 8 was weak at DOK1. Fordham also experienced difficulty in

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		ascertaining balance of emphasis across the key concepts of the domains. No summary result was provided for this dimension of alignment. Balance of emphasis is an essential dimension of alignment. As adjustments are made to address the DOK1 issue, PARCC needs to verify all aspects of alignment for adjusted forms.

Section 3.1 Summary Statement

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

- Peers were unable to find that grades other than grades 5, 8, and High School were included in alignment studies. It was also not clear how many forms were evaluated. PARCC should perform alignment studies to cover multiple operational forms that will be used in future administrations for every grade tested in both content areas.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State's academic content standards.	3.2.1 PARCC Item Development Research: Cognitive Labs 3.2.2 Quality of Items, Tasks, and Stimuli Study 3.2.3 Cognitive Complexity Study	PARCC evidence from 3.1 that applies to this critical element: 3.1.1.5a-3.1.1.7l documents provide additional evidence for cognitive processes in the design of items in ELA/L and Mathematics to meet the requirement. The recommendation was made in the Cognitive Complexity Study that this study be repeated based on 2015 operational data. What is PARCC's plan to address this? PARCC cognitive labs that explore student performance on items to show the items require complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skill would more clearly support the validity of the assessment in eliciting the intended cognitive processes. See Peer Review Guidance 3.2. Examples page 36.

Section 3.2 Summary Statement

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

- Conduct cognitive labs based on cognitive processes across grades and content areas, or
- Conduct follow-up Cognitive Complexity Studies that focus on cognitive processes across grades and content areas.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State's academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.	3.3.1 2015 PARCC Technical Report Section 9.3: Evidence Based on Internal Structure (pp. 115-147) 3.3.2 PARCC 2014 Field Test Technical Report Section 9: Dimensionality Analyses (pp. 115-209)	PARCC's internal structure evidence and Dimensionality analyses provide strong evidence for validity. PARCC's descriptive information for subclaim reporting as opposed to numerical scores was a useful approach for this critical element for users and sound approach for test developers. PARCC's *DIF* Analyses were conducted and used as one piece of evidence to determine exclusion of items. Flagged items are designated as DNU (Do Not Use) or recommended to be re-field tested.
Section 3.3 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State's assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.	2015 PARCC Technical Report a. Section 9: Validity (pp. 115-147) b. Addendum 9: Validity (pp. 563-566) Postsecondary Educators' Judgment Study Benchmarking Study Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation Assessments: The Right Trajectory: State Teachers of the Year Compare Former and New State Assessments Quality of Test Administration Study Predictive Validity of MCAS and PARCC Study Evidence found elsewhere relevant to this Critical Element: PARCC College- and Career-Ready Determination Policy	PARCC's convergent and divergent validity analysis results were reported. PARCC's preliminary studies considering the relationship between the high school tests and post-secondary outcomes are reported. The PARCC Benchmarking Study 3.4.3 provides validity evidence for comparisons to other highly respected assessments. PARCC's plans for future investigations of consequential validity are also reported. PARCC should continue to provide the results of these studies and actions taken based on the recommendations of these studies to USED. In the PARCC College- and Career-Ready Determination Policy, PARCC sets forth an agenda for empirical investigation of consequential validity: "The following statement will be used to conduct validation studies of the efficacy of PARCC's College- and Career-Ready Determinations in the future. Students who earn a College- and Career-Ready Determination by performing at level 4 in grade 11 ELA/literacy and enroll in College English Composition, Literature, and technical courses requiring college-level reading and writing have approximately a 0.75 probability of earning college credit by attaining at least a grade of C or its equivalent in those courses. Students who earn a PARCC College- and Career-Ready Determination by performing at level 4 in Algebra II or Mathematics III

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		and enroll in College Algebra, Introductory College Statistics, and technical courses requiring an equivalent level of mathematics have approximately a 0.75 probability of earning college credit by attaining at least a grade of C or its equivalent in those courses. In the statement above, a 0.75 probability of earning a C is used as a *benchmark* against which the CCR cut score on the PARCC assessments will be validated through empirical research." The Peers look forward to examining the results of future validity studies as outlined in the PARCC evidence documents.
Section 3.4 Summary Statement		
__X_ No additional evidence is required		

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

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.1 – Reliability The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State's student population overall and each student group and, if the State's assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including: • Test reliability of the State's assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State's assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student's achievement.	4.1.1 2015 PARCC Technical Report a. Section 8: Reliability (pp. 76-114)	All reliabilities reported by PARCC met industry standards except for certain subjects, accommodations, and subgroups, e.g., American Indians/Alaska Natives, Students with Disabilities, and English learners. Overall SEMs and conditional SEMs (Addendum 7) are better than most state results, probably due to the much larger sample size, a benefit of consortium test participation. These are more than acceptable for a new assessment program. The Livingston Lewis procedures and the results were also acceptable at all cut score levels and achievement levels and when the proficiency levels were collapsed into pass/fail decisions for both accuracy and consistency, they were even higher. (Tables 8.27 and 8.29) NA-CAT
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
__X_ No additional evidence is required.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.	**Test Design and Development**: PARCC Accessibility Guidelines PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual, Fourth Edition Creating Accessible PARCC Reading Assessments: Separating the Constructs and Providing Text-to-Speech Accommodations for Students with Disabilities by Daniel Wiener and Martha Thurlow PARCC Item Development Technical Guide Accommodations for English language learners and students with disabilities: A research-based decision algorithm Public Comment on Select Reading Access Accommodations & Calculator Accommodations for Students with Disabilities Public Comment on Writing Access Accommodations for Students with Disabilities NCEO Analysis of Public Comments in Response to PARCC Draft Accommodations Policies PARCC Accommodations Manual for Public Comment FAQ (Questions 11-12) Draft *PARCC Accommodations Manual* for Public Comment PowerPoint slides 14-16 General Assessment Student Engagement: A Framework for Assessment Tasks	Design and development: The information contained in the documentation below describes a robust process indicative of the extensive work done by the consortium to do things according to industry standards. These include the development of the PARCC Accessibility Guidelines, the PARCC Accessibility and Accommodations advisory committee, the PARCC Accessibility, Accommodations, and Fairness Technical Working Group, the fourth edition of the PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual etc. Analysis: PARCC: Nearly all accommodated students were included in the IRT calibrations except for students taking certain forms including: a) Spanish forms (mathematics only), b) American Sign Language (ASL) forms online, and c) AT/Screen Reader forms online. The assumption was made that mathematics items translated into Spanish were equivalent to the same items in English. The results of Spanish versus English differential item functioning (DIF) analyses supported this assumption. Also, ASL and AT/Screen Reader forms were delivered online, but were constructed from PBT items. As a result, these students could not be combined with the CBT and/or PBT IRT data files in a psychometrically defensible way. Technical Report p.82. Two closed caption and text-to-speech had adequate sample size to examine reliability for ELA. In mathematics, PARCC calculated reliabilities only for text-to-speech. Does PARCC intend to generate a Spanish form for new base forms as they are administered each year?

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Stereotype Threat and Enhancing Equity and Validity in Assessment Processing Demands Checking (Including Linguistic Complexity) WCAG Guidelines for ARIA tagging PARCC Heading Structure Guidelines for Screen Reader Audio Guidelines PARCC Text-to-Speech Phonetic-Mark-up Guide PARCC Audio and Non-Visual Guidelines for Text to Speech and Screen Reader Users PARCC Tactile Accessibility Guidelines **Item Review and Analysis**: PARCC Item Review for Universal Design as Applied to Assessment Training Bias and Sensitivity Text Review Training PowerPoint PARCC Fairness Guidelines PARCC Item Bias and Sensitivity Training PowerPoint Accommodated Test Form Test Construction Checklists by Accommodation Type PARCC Spanish Glossary PARCC Transadaptation Guidelines	Peers encourage PARCC to continue investigating accommodated forms as sample sizes allow. Are future accommodations studies planned to determine the use and impact of individual and bundled accommodation use? Match between PNP and accommodations received? Over/Under-accommodated?

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	American Sign Language GAAP Guidelines Accommodated Test Form Validation Checklists by Accommodation Type PARCC Human Reader Script Guidelines PARCC 2015 Operational Equating Plan and Procedures, pages 18-25 Sample Data Review Item Card Templates • Sample ELA constructed response or technology-enhanced 2-point item card • Sample math constructed response 6-point item card • Sample PCR Task Try Out item card • Sample EBSR and TECR Task Try Out item card • Sample math constructed response 4-point item card • Sample math multiple choice item card • Sample math constructed response 3-point item card TestNav Item Evaluation Iteration 1 – Students with Visual Impairments Usability Study Summary Findings from the PARCC Accommodations and Accessibility Studies Report Findings from the Quality of Items/Tasks/Stimuli Investigations: PARCC Field Tests PARCC Item Development Research: Cognitive Labs for Students with Disabilities and English Learners Product Review Board September Quarterly	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	PowerPoint	
Section 4.2 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required at this early stage of the assessment.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.	2015 PARCC Technical Report a. Section 12: Scale Scores (pp. 193-219)	Technical Report Section 12 pp 204-215 data appears to support the findings of the Fordham and HumRRO studies regarding a lack of Level 1 items in certain grades and courses. Appendix 12.3 pp 383-384 (Grade 3 ELA/L) indicates that the top 20 achievable score points all round down to 850. This is pattern across grades. What did the TAC think of the impact on IRT calibrations? Peers would be interested in viewing the cumulative frequency distributions across raw score/scale scores – What number and percent of students scored at each raw/scale score point? NNSTOY, Fordham, and HumRRO reports evaluated alignment only for grades 5, 8, and High School in ELA/L and Mathematics. These investigators note that more PLD Level 1 items are needed, particularly at grade 8 and High School Mathematics. Further evidence was noted in the SEM findings from the operational test. Additional item development is reportedly planned to remedy this situation so that the performance of low-achieving students can be more precisely measured.

Section 4.3 Summary Statement

___ No additional evidence is required or

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

- Reference questions in right hand column.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.4 – Scoring The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State's academic achievement standards.	2015 PARCC Technical Report a. Section 4: Item Scoring, pp. 40-49 b. Section 10: IRT Calibration and Scaling in Operational Year One, pp. 148-186 c. Section 12: Scale Scores, pp. 193-219 Handscoring Specifications: Fall 2014 and Spring 2015 Operational Assessments a. pp. 13-67 Final Report: 2015 PARCC Operational Assessment: Psychometric Evaluation PARCC Spring 2015 Test Coordinator Manual, pp. 11-15	Evidence provided conforms to industry standards. Peers noted that "two separate vendors independently conducted the calibration and scaling of the Fall and Spring administrations with a third vendor conducting an external evaluation of these procedures." Recommendations and suggestions noted on page 41 of the 2015 PARCC Operational Assessment: Psychometric Evaluation (4.4.3) should be incorporated by PARCC in future years. For human or hand-scored items (Tech Manual, Section 4.2), "the first score is the score to be reported, while the second, resolution, and adjudication scores are used to monitor scorer performance only." Approximately 90% of the responses were scored only once. A random selection of ten percent of responses were scored a second time by human scorers.. Pearson backread approximately five percent of the hand-scored responses. Backreading scores were used to monitor scorer performance. The first score was always used for both second reads and back reads. Inter-rater agreement in PARCC Technical Report p. 49 for perfect agreement range in mathematics was 92% and in ELA/L was 65%; within one point for mathematics was 99% and for ELA/L was 98%. The inter-rater reliability for ELA/L at the 65% exact agreement expectation should be monitored closely in future years (Technical Report, page 49). Peers noted that this seems a low threshold for exact agreement and should be expected to improve as the assessment matures. PARCC should continue to work toward a more ideal perfect agreement rate on ELA/L scoring.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		To strengthen the credibility of results and precision of scoring, Peers recommend a deeper examination of ELA/L inter-rater exact agreement at the grade for specific areas of concern. Results of this examination could be used to reflect on the precision of rubrics and the adequacy of training for all scorers. Peers' concern is for the implications of the exact agreement rate for the 90% of scores not examined by a second reader for reliability. In Table 4.4 page 49 of the Technical Report, Peers recommend increasing exact agreement expectations for the future for Mathematics to maintain the high mark they have established in the actual results.

Section 4.4 Summary Statement

__X_ No additional evidence is required at this early stage in the assessment.

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

- [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State's academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.	2015 PARCC Technical Report Operational Equating Plan and Procedures for the 2015 Spring and 2014 Fall Block Administrations ELA/Literacy Blueprints a. ELA Blueprints, 2016 versions for: b. ELA Common Form Specifications for: c. Task Generation Models for: d. Item Guidelines for ELA/Literacy Mathematics Blueprints a. PARCC Mathematics High Level Blueprints b. PARCC Mathematics Assessment Unit Structure c. Mathematics Claim Structure Documents d. Math Subclaim Points Document	Form to form equating: ETS provided a more than adequate model for scaling, equating, etc. that was clearly described in the Technical Report. Peers recommend that PARCC have an independent third party replicate calibrating, scaling, and equating. Peers understand that for the first administration, Pearson attempted to replicate these procedures and the results were checked somewhat independently by Measured Progress. Peers feel a full replication by an independent third party would increase confidence of the final raw score to scale score tables that are used for reporting. Across years – not yet available.

Section 4.5 Summary Statement

__X_ No additional evidence is required at this early stage of the assessment.

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

- [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State: • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.	**1. Design and Development Process** • 2015 PARCC Technical Report • ELA/Literacy Blueprints • Math Blueprints **2. Comparability Studies** • Mode Comparability Study based on Spring 2015 operational test • Spring 2014 Digital Devices Comparability Research Study • Spring 2015 Digital Devices Comparability Research Study • PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual, 4th Edition	Multiple Versions: PBT v CBT =The Mode Comparability Study found significant mode differences between PBT and CBT versions of the test. A small number of items for English Language Arts/Literacy (i.e., 0 to 7 items per grade) and a slightly higher number of items for Mathematics (i.e., 2 to 17 items per grade) possessed either positive or negative C-level differential item functioning (DIF) across modes. CBT and PBT items were calibrated separately for each grade/subject. PARCC excluded items flagged for positive and negative C-DIF from the linking sets. Common items that behave differently across modes will have two sets of item parameter estimates: one set for online conversions and one set for paper. Technical Report pp.143-144. Because mode differences were found, Peers noted that PARCC, in the Technical Report referenced calibrating the PBT and CBT separately and post-equating them. This approach will allow for a strong interpretation and compensation for the mode difference. However, Peers were unable to ascertain whether the process was applied prior to reporting scores for the 2014-15 school year or was it done only within the Mode Comparability Study. Did PARCC apply this procedure prior to reporting the 2014-15 test scores? Mode Comparability Study leaders noted, "The current study was not conducted on all PARCC tests but on selected forms of certain grade levels and subjects from one state [sic]. The results varied across grade levels and subjects, which suggests that any preliminary and descriptive conclusions based on these selected tests cannot be generalized to the tests that were not included in this study."

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		What are PARCC's plans for further comparability studies between computer and paper tests? What are the plans to address the issues raised by the study or further investigation given the limitations of this study? What is PARCC doing in the future to ensure score comparability across modes? When scores are reported, PARCC should ensure that adjustments are made across modes so that scores have the same meaning for all students.

Section 4.6 Summary Statement

___ No additional evidence is required or

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

- Plans for applying findings/proposed methodology from the Mode Comparability Study to ensure scores in future years have the same meaning for all students, given possible mode comparability issues.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).	2015 PARCC Technical Report Section 13: Quality Control Procedures, pp. 220-229 PARCC Program Quality Plan Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Members Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Agendas TAC White Papers commissioned by PARCC	Extensive evidence is provided for the examination and implementation of quality controls during the development of the assessment. TAC Agendas were interesting but excerpts from minutes or summaries of key TAC recommendations would have been more useful. Technical Report page 17 describes the process for evaluating the sufficiency of the item bank for ongoing maintenance of the assessment program, including replenishing items and passages. Peers also noted that field test items were embedded in the Spring 2015 forms.

Section 4.7 Summary Statement
__X_ No additional evidence is required or

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

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State's assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that: • Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student's education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards; • States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student's IEP Team based on each student's individual needs; • Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment; • Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities; • Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;	PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual, Fourth Edition Online Professional Development Module on the PARCC Accessibility System Training Module for PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations PARCC Assistive Technology Guidelines	Guidance is extensive and detailed and assumes compliance with IDEA. Training is also provided. In PARCC's Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual, Fourth Edition, IEP information is consistent with federal law and regulations. PARCC has provided a series of steps to guide schools in decision-making regarding accessibility and accommodations. However, it is up to PARCC states to develop and adopt policies for educators and ensure that policies are carried out to ensure fairness. PARCC States need to document fidelity of appropriate PNP registration to ensure student access to appropriate accessibility features provided by PARCC. NA per AA-AAS.

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

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

Section 5.1 Summary Statement

- PARCC evidence can be used by the States to support the inclusion of all students in the general assessment. However, each State is ultimately responsible for implementing practices such as those contained in the PARCC materials to ensure that all students have a fair and equitable assessment experience.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State's assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum: • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.	5.2.0.1 Informational brochures for students, parents, and educators in English and Spanish that pertain to EL participation in PARCC were developed and are available online: Parent PARCC Accessibility Brochure Training Module for PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Initial Draft Development of ELL Section of PARCC Accommodation Manual PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual, Fourth Edition Appendix K Bilingual Dictionaries and Glossaries Authorized for Use by English Language Learners on MCAS and PARCC	Guidance is extensive and detailed. Training is also provided. PARCC offers Spanish forms of all math assessments. Use of translated versions is a state option. A list of bilingual dictionaries is provided. Accessibility tools and features are available to all students including ELs. Future translations into other languages is planned as an option for States. Accommodations specific to ELs are also provided. PARCC has provided a series of steps to guide schools in decision-making regarding inclusion of and accommodations for EL students. However, it is up to PARCC states to develop and adopt policies for educators and ensure that policies are carried out to ensure fairness. PARCC States need to document fidelity of appropriate PNP registration to ensure student access to appropriate accessibility features provided by PARCC.

Section 5.2 Summary Statement

- PARCC evidence can be used by the States to support the inclusion of EL students in the general assessment. However, each State is ultimately responsible for implementing the recommended practices contained in the PARCC materials to ensure that all students have a fair and equitable assessment experience.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.3 – Accommodations The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State: • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student's need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.	PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual, Fourth Edition PARCC Translation Policy 2015 PARCC Technical Report Findings from the Quality of Items/Tasks/Stimuli Investigations: PARCC Field Tests PARCC Item Development Research: Cognitive Labs (for Students with Disabilities and English Learners) Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation Assessments: 5.3.4.2 PARCC Unique Accommodation Summary Request SECURE DOCUMENT Additional evidence found elsewhere: Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation High School Assessments Quality of Test Administration Investigation	A wide array of accommodations are available for SWD, EL, and students covered under section 504. PARCC evidence describes an array of accessibility features and accommodations provided. However, it is up to PARCC states to ensure they are made available to students with disabilities (IDEA), students covered by Section 504, and English learners. PARCC States need to document fidelity of appropriate PNP registration to ensure student access to appropriate accessibility features provided by PARCC. PARCC has conducted Cognitive Labs to gather initial information about the interaction of students with disabilities and English learners with items and accessibility tools. The HumRRO investigators note in *Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation High School Assessments* that "The Center's forthcoming test characteristics methodology, that considers data from administered tests, will support a fuller examination of accessibility." Findings from the PARCC *Quality of Test Administration Investigations* provide some initial findings from Year 1 operational test for the effectiveness of training and fidelity of use of accessibility features and accommodations. The observational sample was very small for this study. Most data was self-report via survey. Are further studies planned on exactly how well the accessibility tools and features, accommodations, and

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		assistive technology worked in actual use during testing? PARCC provides procedures for exceptional requests to be reviewed and approved in addition to those routinely allowed. (5.3.4.2) During the first operational administration, there were twenty-five exceptional requests of which 17 were approved and 8 were denied. PARCC added one of those 17 approved were added to the fourth edition of the Accessibility and Accommodations Manual. NA per AA-AAS.

Section 5.3 Summary Statement

_X__ No additional evidence is required for PARCC at this early stage of the assessment program.

- Each State is ultimately responsible for implementing the accommodations provided by PARCC to ensure that all students have a fair and equitable assessment experience.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are: • Consistent with the State's policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student's disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student's IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.	Findings from the PARCC Quality of Test Administration Investigations: Year I of the Operational Assessments Technical Report Additional evidence cited elsewhere: Test Administration Manual 2.6.1.1. Test Coordinator Manual	PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual provides guidance for policies for accommodations and describes their availability in the PARCC assessment. The TAM contains recommendations for test administration practices to support fidelity of test administration procedures. Because PARCC makes available data concerning individual accessibility features and accommodations for download by Test Coordinators, this information should be used by the states for monitoring. States are responsible for monitoring test administration of all assessments in the system.

Section 5.4 Summary Statement

_X__ No additional evidence is required for PARCC at this early stage of the assessment program.

Each State is ultimately responsible for monitoring test administration of all assessments within the State system.

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

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically: • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; • The State's academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.	Performance Level Setting Technical Report Performance Level Descriptors 2015 PARCC Technical Report Section 12: Scale Scores, pp. 193-219	PARCC followed an established standard setting process. Cut scores were set for each grade in each content area and for each EOY assessment. PARCC developed achievement level descriptors at each grade level for each content area. Mathematics PLDs are more clearly differentiated and aligned with subclaims from grade to grade than ELA/L PLDs for reading. These were reviewed and confirmed as part of Standard Setting. NA for AA-AAS. State evidence is required to substantiate adoption.

Section 6.1 Summary Statement

_X__ No additional evidence is required from PARCC.

States must provide evidence of formal adoption of academic achievement levels and performance levels.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.	Performance Level Setting Technical Report Performance Level Descriptors	Achievement standards were developed using an industry standard methodology. In Appendix 5 of the Performance Level Setting Technical Report, general descriptive tables of panel participants are provided, but lack sufficient detail to understand the real composition of the panels. PLDs are grade and content specific and were reviewed. Standard setting panels are only described in general terms. Special education and EL participants are not specifically noted.

Section 6.2 Summary Statement

___ No additional evidence is required or

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

- More descriptive information about the composition of each panel including certification, particularly for special education and English learners

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards The State's academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State's academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce. If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State's grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.	Postsecondary Educators' Judgment Study PARCC Benchmarking Study Performance Level Setting Technical Report PARCC Pioneers Information Predictive Validity of MCAS and PARCC Study	Substantial effort has been made to validate the college and career readiness aspect of their PARCC academic achievement standards. NA-AA-AAS

Section 6.3 Summary Statement
_X__ No additional evidence is required

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

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

6.4 – Reporting
The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:
• The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;
• The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;
• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that:
  o Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student's achievement;
  o Report the student's achievement in terms of the State's grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);
  o Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;
  o Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to
	2014-2015 Tables of Cross-State and State-Specific PARCC Results
	
	Score Report Interpretation Guide
	
	PARCC 2014-15 Published Report Guidance
	
	Score Report Interpretation Guide (for educators)
	
	Score Report Interpretation Guide For Parents
	
	Summative Record File, field definitions
	
	Parent Score Report Guides in English and Spanish
	
	Setting a New Baseline in English and Spanish
	
	Translated Individual Student Report shells, available in 10 languages
	
	Translated Score Report Interpretation Guide for Parents, available in 10 languages
	
	Report shipment memos (Memos were tailored for each state). Examples from 3 states
	
	PARCC 2014-15 Published Report Guidance
	
	Pearson key dates document: Overview of PARCC reports release dates. Each state had individual release dates within the PARCC window.
		Public Reporting: States are responsible for this item.
		
		Educator Reporting: An Interpretation Guide is provided for educators for all reports available to them. Information is reported in the form of student rosters at the overall content area level and for subclaims for each school and district.
		
		How will teachers receive information about classroom performance? How are classroom results generated? What do they look like?
		
		Peers were unable to locate itemized score analyses. Are they available?
		
		Parent Reporting: PARCC score reports to parents are provide in multiple languages. The reports provide score information in the context of achievement levels and abbreviated subclaim PLDs at the proficient level. The reports are clear and supported by an Interpretation Guide that directs those interested to the location of complete PLDs available on-line.
		
		How will States calculate the percentage of students not tested? No enrollment data are indicated in consortium and State tables. 6.4.1.1. It is unlikely that PARCC has this information. If this is the case, then States will need to calculate and report the percentages of students not tested.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand; • The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.		

Section 6.4 Summary Statement

___ No additional evidence is required or

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

- What mechanism does PARCC have in place to assist States to provide classroom level reports for teachers?

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

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

June 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes DLM End of Year Consortium Evidence

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

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

Contents

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS 3
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 3
2.2 – Item Development..... 6
2.3 – Test Administration 8
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)11
2.5 – Test Security 12
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 13

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 14
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 14
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 16
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure 17
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables..... 18

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER 19
4.1 – Reliability..... 19
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 21
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... 23
4.4 – Scoring 24
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 25
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment 26
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance..... 27

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS 28
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 28
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 31
5.3 – Accommodations..... 33
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations 35

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 37
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students 37
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 39
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 40
6.4 – Reporting..... 41

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

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.1 – Test Design and Development The State's test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State's academic content standards, and includes: • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;	**Purposes and Intended Interpretations and Uses of Results** File 06: page 1, page 5	PLEASE NOTE: The peer reviewers wish to acknowledge the magnitude and significance of this endeavor to create and implement a assessment for students with significant cognitive disabilities based on an articulated learning map aligned to content standards for the general student population. While the feedback that follows contains questions and a few requests for additional evidence, as well as some suggestions for consideration in the future, peers were cognizant of the enormous amount of work and time that went into the DLM assessment. The technical manual provides a clear statement of the purpose and intended interpretations and uses of the results of the DLM assessment.
• 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;	**Test Structure and Blueprints** File 06: pp. 41-46 File 08 File 09 File 10 File 11	Test blueprints clearly present the structure of the DLM testlets and the assessment as a whole. The DLM year-end-model assesses EEs in five conceptual areas across two claims. Coverage is summarized on page 2 of File 10. The DLM year-end-model assesses EES in mathematics across all four major claims (File 11 p. 1). Peer reviewers were unable to gain a sufficiently clear understanding of how EEs were "prioritized" for inclusion in the assessment (which includes a subset of EEs rather than all per grade level). Although various documents (e.g., Sample Student

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		Report in File 07, Appendix E.1) illustrate that not all EEs eligible for assessment are addressed by every student, it would have been extremely helpful to peer reviewers for DLM to have provided more detail, and in the appropriate sections of the submission, on what constitutes a typical assessment experience at the student level. This might take the form of a summary that describes the minimum-maximum number of testlets, the minimum-maximum number of items per testlet, and the minimum-maximum coverage across EEs in both ELA and Math. To frame differently, it would have helped to see how the distribution of EEs presented in Files 10 and 11 is operationalized for individual students. The picture of the DLM assessment at the global level is far clearer and richer than the picture of the assessment at the student level. Peers could not find evidence that the EEs address Speaking and Listening, which are among the domains in the CCSS. While the ELA blueprints include a few EEs that correspond to certain CCSS Language standards, these are identified in the blueprint under one or another of the five Conceptual Areas (CAs) covered by the DLM assessment (sometimes C.1.2. and other times C.2.1.) The peers could not find evidence that the CCSS domain of Language is explicitly addressed.
• 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);	**Representation of Knowledge and Skills in the Assessment and the Standards** File 06: pp. 5-8, 24-28, 38-41, 46, 61-64	Evidence conveys the degree and nature of coverage of the EEs (learning targets for students with significant cognitive disabilities [SWSCD]) and their correspondence to CCSS.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.	**Item Pool and Selection Procedures** File 06: pp. 60-61, 83-84, 101-106, 112-114	The adaptive delivery of testlets via KITE is well designed as described in the Technical Manual (112-14). While computer-adaptive procedures described made clear how linkage level would be adjusted based on performance, the peers were unable to find evidence to explain how this might impact EE coverage at the student level.
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • DLM should explain why some CCSS ELA domains are not directly addressed (Language) or are not addressed at all (Speaking/Listening)		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.2 – Item Development The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State's academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.	**Item Development** File 06: Introduction, pp. 20-21, 46,47-48, 37-38, 69-70, 69, 65-68, 68-69, 61-64, 60-61, 85-87, 46-47, 75-76, 76-77, 82-83, 89-93,126-130, 219-233, 210-217 File 18: pp. 9-10, 11-15	Evidence was sufficient for this section. Training materials for item writers are described and in some instances, provided in their entirety. One concern, however, is that peers could not find much evidence, beyond simple criteria for writing keys and distractors, that item development has attended fully and well to matters related to determining a correct/complete response (e.g., specifically how to screen for flaws in item options (ambiguous options, multiple options where not intended, etc.). Training might be enhanced with examples of well-written and poorly written items. If more training resources are available (e.g., the section of File 18 on bias and sensitivity review), then these should be cited, as they are likely to only strengthen the submission. The assumption must be made that all items are treated as dichotomous items, although this is never stated/made explicit. Why and how DLM decided against awarding partial credit for multiple select items and others with multiple correct response options should be included in evidence for this Critical Element. The testlet design (with % items correct to indicate "mastery") may not permit this, but perhaps that should/could be explained. More detail on the duration of training of item writers—as well as a typical training agenda—would be useful as evidence of sound procedures to develop and select items. Some background/rationale for item types and

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		features (e.g., use of three response options in MC item, use of color photograph as text feature in ELA testlets) would be helpful—In other words, documentation of the research/best practice behind key item features/formats. Peers suggest that additional cognitive labs to investigate possible option order effect on student response be considered.
	Item Selection File 06: pp. 77- 82, p. 93, 46- 47, 75-83, 93-101, 97- 98, 101-106, 98	The Technical Manual (p. 233) indicates the intention to follow up on DIF analysis by expanding in future years; DLM should be encouraged to submit this supplementary analysis when available. Overall, the evidence was sufficient for this section. However, while observations are described as part of validity studies, peer reviewers did not see any evidence of the use of observation during field-testing to inform item development, review and revision. This additional source of information might be helpful and should be considered for future rounds of item development.
Section 2.2 Summary Statement		
__X_ No additional evidence is required		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.3 – Test Administration The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State: • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;	**Standardized Procedures** File 05: pages 9-12, 89-116, 78-150, 149-159, 22-38, 38-50, 49-50 File 02: pp. 7-13 File 03: p. 8 File 04: pp. 6-7	The evidence provided collectively identifies all of the steps necessary (and the resources to guide key individuals involved) to conduct standardized administrations of the assessment. The Test Administration manual is made easier to follow with supporting visuals (screen shots from Educator Portal and KITE) and numerous "hints" in sidebars to address specific needs/issues. DLM provides states with live updates through "state landing page" and updates on website. Detail is provided on the range of testing devices that may be used. DLM provides some information on handling such matters as extended inactivity when KITE is open, and exiting and returning. One incident summary (involving incorrect testlet information pages) is provided among evidence to illustrate/document contingency plans. State landing pages and updates on the DLM website appear to serve as a mechanism—if needed—to deal with unexpected technology challenges during test administration.
	Communication File 17: a) Sample state landing page from DLM website; b) Test updates – website and email example	
	Administration with Accommodations File 01: pp. 19-22, 15-18 File 05: pp. 32-37	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State's general and alternate assessments receive training on the State's established procedures for the administration of its assessments.	**Training** File 06: pp.251-254, 250-251, 254, 248-249, 124-125 File 07: Appendices G.1, C.14 File 16: p. 5 File 02: pp. 7-13 File 03: p. 8 File 04: pp. 6-7	Training resources are provided as evidence for all key personal: Test Administrators, Data Stewards, and Technical Liaisons. Required training for test administrators consists of eight modules on such topics as accessibility, preparing for the test, computer delivered testlets and teacher delivered testlets. Detail on required performance (80%) on post-test quizzes is provided. Peer reviewers could not find any information on "next steps" or consequences if trainee failed to reach that performance on one or more of the post-test quizzes. More detail would be helpful on how training can ensure that ALL teachers of SWSCD will be able to administer DLM to their students.
• 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.	**Technology Requirements** File 06: pp.110, 251-254 File 07: Appendix G.1 File 04: pp. 9-13, 8 File 05: pp. 149-150, 62-65 File 02: p. 55	
	Contingency plans for technology-based assessment administration File 06: p. 111, 123-125, 133-134,193-195 File 07: Appendix C.7	Good systems in place for addressing localized administration issues (Technical Manual, p. 111) and internet connectivity issues (see Technical Liaison Manual p. 12). Peer reviewers would like to have seen more

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	File 04: pp. 6-7, 12 File 17:	information on contingency plans based on potential disruptions of service/functioning of technology.
Section 2.3 Summary Statement		
__X_ No additional evidence is required from the DLM consortium		

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

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.	_____ policies and procedures apply to all grade-level and AA-AAAS in all subjects	The DLM consortium submitted evidence of procedures to monitor test administration (File 06 p. 123-125 and p. 225-231) and made a variety of materials and resources available to partner states for the purpose of monitoring test administration. These included a test administration monitoring protocol and an observation protocol for use by SEAs and LEAs. Among other things, the monitoring protocols captured accessibility supports used, level of engagement and barriers to engagement (File07 Appendix C 13). In addition, training tools were provided on the use of these protocols. Monitoring of test administrations was also possible at the SEA and LEA levels through the DLM Educator Portal which permitted checking on progress toward test completion at the student level. Again, training on this feature was submitted (File 07 appendix C 14). Focused monitoring of the test administration was conducted both by DLM and at the SEA and LEA levels, indicating fidelity of test administration (File 06 p.225-231). Errors in routing of students to testlets was also monitored and procedures provided to test administrators to rectify errors (File 06 pp. 142-143 and pp. 193-195) . Finally, states were provided with summaries of these errors as addenda to score reports (File 06 pp. 193-195)
Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
__x_ No additional evidence is required from the DLM consortium-State specific.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.5 – Test Security The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through: • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;	**Evidence of Prevention of Irregularities** File 06: pp. 46-47, 68-69, 69-70, 75-76, 77, 132-133, 134, 133, 135, 252 File 07: Appendices B.3 and C.3 File 05: p. 121-12 File 02: p. 36	Evidence of detection, remediation, and investigation of test irregularities focused on data breaches. Page 252 of File 06 provides a broad statement of expectations regarding security in context of training.
• Detection of test irregularities;	**Evidence of Detection of Irregularities** File 06: pp.135-136 File 07: Appendix C.15	Evidence from DLM is sufficient in this section; more evidence is expected from States.
• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities	**Evidence of Investigation of Remediation Following Incidents** File 06: p. 133, 134-135 File 07: Appendices C.5, C.6	Evidence from DLM is sufficient in this section; more evidence is expected from States.
• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State's assessments;	**THIS PORTION OF THE CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.**	N/A
Section 2.5 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required from the DLM consortium.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically: • To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results;	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS **Security and Integrity of Test Materials** File 06: pp. 133-134, 134- 135	Detailed evidence documenting policies and procedures to protect integrity and confidentiality of data is provided. Evidence includes definition of minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students/student groups. There is evidence of an appropriately hierarchical system of access to data based on scope of responsibility.
• To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;	File 06: 133-134, 135 File 07: Appendices C.4, C.5, C.6	Evidence is sufficient for this section.
• To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.	**PII Protection in Reporting** File 06: pp.134-135, 186-188, 191 File 07: Appendices C.4, C.5, C.6	Evidence is sufficient for this section.
Section 2.6 Summary Statement		
__X_ No additional evidence is required from the DLM consortium.		

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

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State's validity evidence includes evidence that the State's assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State's academic content standards, including: • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State's assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State's academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity;	**Validity Framework and Overall Evaluation** File 06: pp. 5-7, 279-280 (Tables 108 and 109), 264-278), p. 281 (Table 110), 283-284, 282-283, 263-264	Overall, the interpretation and use argument was clearly tied to four validity claims (how the scores could be used) and these guided validation efforts. The submission provides evaluative evidence of technical quality through an overview of the review process, criteria used, and results (pp. 75-76; 77-82; 82-83). The External Alignment Study (File 15) provides detail on fidelity to the content in the grade-level standards (see pp. 4-8 for Executive Summary). It is worth noting that DLM acknowledges the need to do further alignment studies (see Technical Manual p. 267) since earlier study was done on limited sample rather than on operational testlets as administered. Over time peer reviewers would like to see more evidence of alignment between instructional content and assessment content. The Technical Manual (282-284) included a detailed account of anticipated areas for continuous improvement and future research. Follow-up on consequential validity evidence is advisable, since admittedly limited based on 2014-15 administration.
• 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	**Measurement of Academic Content Standards** File 06: Introduction, pp. 5-7, 10-21, 14-17, 17-19, 26-27, 38-41, 41- 46, 61-64, 46-47, 68-69, 75-82	Evidence demonstrates that the EEs of the DLM (the equivalent of alternate academic content standards) are adequately linked to State academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.		cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. Testlets are constructed from items that each address an EE aligned to college and career ready standards.
	Evaluative Evidence File 06: pp. 75-76, 77-82, 82-83 File 12 File 13 File 15: pp. 8-9, 16 (Table 5), 15-16, Appendix B, 4-8 File 07: Appendix H.1	
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
__X_ No additional evidence is required.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State's academic content standards.	**Assessments Tap Intended Cognitive Processes** File 06: pp. 61-64, 68-69, 46-47, 69-70, 75-76, p. 230 (Table 95), Conclusion, 270-271 File 18: pp. 9- 19, Appendix A	The use of Essential Element Concept Maps (EECMs) in item and testlet development is intended to ensure that the assessments tap intended cognitive processes as represented in State academic content standards. This is confirmed in external review. For classification purposes, Anderson and Krathwohl's (2001) revision to Bloom's taxonomy is used by DLM. The assignment of cognitive levels for 2014-15 items/testlets was reviewed and confirmed by various stakeholders (item writers/reviewers, teachers, advisory panel members).
	Interaction with Testlet Content File 06: pp. 219-223, 224-225	Additional cognitive labs to investigate possible option order effect on student response.
	Fidelity of Administration File 06: p. 254, 251-254, 147 (Table 55), 117-121,123-124, 225- 229 File 07: Appendix C.12	The submission contains adequate evidence of administration fidelity was provided.
	Accessibility File 06: pp. 125-132, 148-150, 119 (Table 43), 121, 150 (Table 57), p. 230 (Table 95), 252-253, 258- 259	The submission contains acceptable evidence of accessibility.
Section 3.2 Summary Statement		
__X_ No additional evidence is required.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State's academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.	**Scoring and reporting structures' consistency with sub-domain structures** File 06: Introduction, pp. 14-17, 43-46, 61-64, 85 (Table 21), 58-160, 190-191, 193, 25-34, 35-36, 28-29, 214-215, 263-264 File 07: Appendices E.1, E2 File 15: pp. 22-23	Adequate evidence has been provided. The data files provide for accountability and school improvement purposes indicate overall performance level results for each content area and highest linkage level mastered for each EE (See Chapter VII of Technical Manual).
	Consistency of Measurement File 06: pp. 203-204, 205-206, 207-209	Evidence is adequate for the consistency of the scoring and reporting with the sub-domain structures of the consortium content standards.
	Differential Item Functioning (DIF) File 06: pp. 231-236, 283-284	Evidence of appropriate procedures is provided; DLM has only considered gender because of sample size. Peers suggest that as more data are available (recommended as >200 per class), further analyses be conducted on other categories (e.g., race, ethnicity, different disability classifications, etc.)
Section 3.3 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State's assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.	**Score Relationship to Other Variables** File 06: p. 85 (Table 21), 327 (Table 102)	DLM acknowledges that evidence of the relationship between student responses on the assessment and other measures is limited, given that the first operational administration was in 2014-2015. However, they provide information about test administrators' judgments regarding difficulty level of testlets (Technical Manual, pp. 236-237). Per the DLM Consortium's self-analysis of this Critical Element: "To date, evidence on the relationship between student responses on the DLM assessments and other measures is limited to teacher evaluations of student academic knowledge and skills as measured by the First Contact survey, and teacher perception of testlet difficulty." Recognizing that that the submission reflects only the 2014-15 administration, peer reviewers would like to see included other evidence such as correlations between student performance on DLM and States' previous alternative assessment or another measure (for consortium members who have such data available).
Section 3.4 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required.		

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

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.1 – Reliability The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State's student population overall and each student group and, if the State's assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including: • Test reliability of the State's assessments estimated for its student population;	**Reliability for Student Population** File 06: pp. 161- 162, 190- 193, 203-204, 205-206, 207-209)	General comment: DLM made a very strong assumption about the fungible item parameters (items at the same linkage level have the same intercept and main effect). Peers have not found any evidence that this assumption was tested. DLM calculates reliability by using simulation. They use a model but peers did not see evidence that the model fits adequately to the data. Peers acknowledge that DLM plans to examine model fit (File 06, p. 36) and support that plan. Evidence includes documentation of involvement of TAC in decisions regarding the scoring model (p.162).
• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State's assessments;	**Overall and Conditional Standard Error of Measurement** File 06: pp. 196-200, 283-284	DLM indicates that due to the model chosen, they will report classification consistency instead of overall and conditional standard error.
• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results;	**Achievement Levels** File 06: pp. 203-204	From Table 74 in File 06 (p. 204), results appear to be adequate. These analyses need to be extended to subgroups as more data are available.
• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student's achievement.	**Computer-Adaptive Tests** File 06: pp. 207-209	From Table 77 in File 06 (page 208), results are acceptable. Again, these analyses need to be extended to subgroups as more data are available.
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • Beyond the one paragraph on p. 162 of File 06, provide clarification as to what was done so far and anticipated plans for what will be done in the future with		

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

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.	**Accessibility** File 06: 61-64, 46-61, 37, 69-70, 83, 69, 61-64, 82, 126-130, 136-139, 219-223, 225- 229 File 01: 15-18 File 18: 11-16 File 19: 5-16	External review of testlets is described in the Technical Manual (pp. 78-82). Content review criteria are provided (p. 79). These seem very general and perhaps limited in scope (e.g., nothing to direct writers to ordering of response options, inadvertent cueing). This has a potential impact on fairness and accessibility. The ability to evaluate the sufficiency of evidence related to fairness and accessibility is impacted by the fact that there is no reference in evidence to the process by which text passages are created (when, by whom, using what specific selection and creation/revision processes, specification, etc.) beyond indicating that they are based on/drawn from grade appropriate selections and then reduced in cognitive complexity level. (See p. 48; "short narrative passages were constructed from books commonly taught in general education, and short informational texts were written to relate to thematic elements from narratives"). There is also no reference to the processes involved in providing images/graphic adjuncts to items and testlets. Peer reviewers could find no information on when, how, and by whom images included in the assessment are selected and/or created, nor could they find any evidence of specifications or review criteria for this component of items and testlets.
	Fairness File 06: pp. 69-70, 78-82, 130-132, 133, 219-223, 225-229, 231-236	See comments about DIF (3.3)

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	File 05: pp. 51-53	
Section 4.2 Summary Statement		
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • Include detail on development and selection of reading passages to address accessibility per above. Peers need to see steps that test developers have taken to ensure passages from general grade level texts are made accessible to SWSCD. • DLM needs to provide information to address the selection and/or creation of graphic components in the assessment (e.g., drawn or photographed images) and include criteria used to evaluate this component to ensure fairness and accessibility.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.	**Adequately Precise Estimate Across the Continuum** File 06: p. 83, 112-114, 161-162, 162, 184-185,189-190, 203-204, 205-206, 207-209 File 14: 62- 63	The design of the DLM (nodes, linkage levels, EEs, etc.) and test administration placement (see first contact survey, Technical Manual pp. 83) and adaptive delivery (Technical Manual pp. 112-114) supports the capacity of the assessment to provide an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum as reflected in the linkage levels.
Section 4.3 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.4 – Scoring The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State's academic achievement standards.	**Standardized Scoring Procedures** File 06: pp. 47-48, 52-56, 151-152, 161-162, 172-178, 190- 193, 194-195, 193-195, 193-195, 203-204, 205- 206, 207-209, 253, 254. File 05: pp. 38-50 File 17: pp. 8-10)	The evidence provided makes clear the automated scoring procedures for the majority of items in the DLM assessment system. However, additional information may be warranted for those writing testlets (File 06, pp. 47-48) and other testlets for which teachers make score judgments while the testlet is being administered. While there is documentation of support for teacher fidelity in the training modules (pp. 253 and 254) and teacher input on student response was evaluated as part of DLM's validity studies, peer reviewers were unable to find any evidence of monitoring procedures for this particular aspect of scoring to ensure reliable results (e.g.. inter-rater reliability). That is, where the Test Administer must "choose the description that matches the highest level of evaluation of the student's writing" (File 05, p. 47), it is not clear whether, or how often, these choices that impact scoring are checked/confirmed.

Section 4.4 Summary Statement

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

- Because some writing testlets and other testlets involve teacher judgment on scores, DLM needs to provide an explanation of what scoring monitoring procedures (e.g., the equivalent of "read-behinds") are being used, or what one(s) were considered but rejected and the rationale for that decision (fidelity of scoring).

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State's academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.	**Assessment Forms Represent Academic Content Standards** File 06: pp. 112-114, 142-143, 125 File 07: Appendix C.7	While the DLM assessments are customized to each student—who is assigned a series of testlets rather than a fixed test form—each battery selectively represents an approved minimum number of Essential Elements which correspond to state academic content standards. The adaptive delivery method is designed to ensure coverage of the test blueprint (pp. 112-114). However, peers noted that the ELA test blueprint is presented by grade, and it is not clear what the EE coverage for each student might be (see FILE 10: ELA Blueprint—specifically page 2). See comments under 2.1. Peer reviewers were unable to find evidence to explain the comparability of coverage among students, given that each will address different EEs (although distribution of EEs across Conceptual Areas appears to be the same).
	Assessment Forms Yield Consistent Score Interpretations File 06: pp. 101-106, 97-98, 61-64, 69-70, 93-101,161-162)	Because the calibrations were done separately for each linkage level, it was unclear to peer reviewers how estimated parameters were linked to the same scale. Peers felt it would be helpful if clarification were provided as to how item parameters were put on the same scale for a given linkage level.
Section 4.5 Summary Statement		
__X_ No additional evidence is required.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State: • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;	**Comparable Interpretation of Results** File 06: pp. 60-61, 69-70, 69, 61-64	The evidence supports comparable interpretation of results for students taking the general form of testlets, the version for students who are blind or have visual impairment (BVI), and blind/visually impaired students who read braille. The evidence provided focuses on the item writing process and resources (Technical Manual, pp. 69-70) but does not explicitly address the implications for developing alternate versions of testlets that have a considerable visual load—but based on sample items/testlets interspersed in the Technical Manual, it appears that many include images (drawings or photographs). It is not clear how the determination of general forms of testlets that would not introduce accessibility barriers for blind students is made, prior to transcription. Peers suggest including more detail on role/impact of graphic components in items/testlets and how this is addressed in multiple versions of the assessment.
• Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.	**Documented Evidence of Comparability** File 06: pp. 97-98, 101-106, 126, 121, 130- 132, 161-162	As more data become available, peers suggest conducting modality study(ies) comparing test administration modes.

Section 4.6 Summary Statement
__X_ No additional evidence is required.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).	**Monitoring, Maintaining, and Improving Quality of Assessment** File 06: pp. 64-75, 97- 98, 97, 135-136, 136- 139, 231-236,283-284, 279 (Table 108), 280 (Table 109) File 15 File 20: pp. 2-17 File 23 File 14: Appendix B, pp. 62-63 File 15: pp. 24-25, 25-30 File 22	In DLM notes under this section of their submission, they reference State partners' responsibilities for maintenance of EEs (page 15 in Section 4). Peers were unclear as to what this entails. As DLM moves to subsequent years' administrations, peers were interested in knowing how year-to-year equating would be conducted, based on the design features of this assessment. Procedures for obtaining reliability evidence are based on AERA Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (2014); see Technical Manual p. 203. DLM appears to have a solid system in place for identifying and implementing future studies to inform/enhance the assessment; However, it is not sufficiently clear to peers what role state partners play beyond input on topics (since the TAC "provides input on conceptualization, preliminary/exploratory analyses, and final products"), based on evidence provided (FILE 23: TAC Materials). Peers suggest that DLM clarify/provide more detail on roles/responsibilities of partners in future research.

Section 4.7 Summary Statement
__X_ No additional evidence is required.

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

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State's assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that: • Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student's education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards;	**THIS PORTION OF THE CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.**	
• 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;	**THIS PORTION OF THE CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.**	
• Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment;	**Guidelines for choice of assessment** File 06: pp. 252-253 File 07: Appendix C.16, G1 **THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC GUIDANCE IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.**	Technical Manual Appendix C.16 sets forth three basic guidelines for assigning a student to the alternate assessment, as well as extraneous factors that should not come into play; The Technical Manual indicates these are all reinforced during test administrator training and this is borne out in Module 1 (FILE 07 pp. 199-227)

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities;	**Information on Supports and Accommodations** File 06: pp. 125-132, 252-253 File 07: Appendix G.1 File 01: pp. 15-18 **THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC GUIDANCE IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.**	Peers noted that this was well addressed in the Technical Manual pp. 125-132 and Module 3 (FILE 07 pp. 242-278) and in Accessibility Manual (pp. 15-18) in section on DLM accessibility features.
• Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;	**Guidance on Selection of Accommodations** File 01: pp. 11-12, 19-22, 30 File 06: pp. 252-253 File 07: Appendix G.1 File 05: pp. 95-106, 60, 76 **THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC GUIDANCE IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.**	Peers took note of well documented procedures; a particular strength is the DLM practice of allowing test administrators to change PNP selections and evaluate the effectiveness of accommodations determined for each student (see p. 30 of FILE 01 for questions to guide this evaluation).
• Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;	**Disability Categories for Alternate Assessment** File 07: Appendix C.16 **THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC GUIDANCE IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.**	See under Guidelines for choice of assessment, above.
• Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student's achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of	**THIS PORTION OF THE CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.**	N/A

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State's general assessments);		
• The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.	**Promote Access to the General Curriculum** File 06: pp. 255-261, 254-261, 251-252 File 07: Appendix G.1 File 05: pp. 20-22 File 08 File 09 **THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC PROCEDURES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.**	The submission includes ample evidence that the design of the alternate assessment promotes access to grade level content standards.

Section 5.1 Summary Statement
__X_ No additional evidence is required.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State's assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum: • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);	**Determining Appropriateness of Accommodation** File 06: pp. 181-183 File 01: pp. 13-30 **THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC GUIDANCE IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.**	There are procedures in place for determining accommodations that are appropriate for all SWSCD including ELS (File 01, pp. 13-30). ELs with significant cognitive disabilities may have translation provided outside the DLM system (p. 16, 17). Detail is provided in Testlet Information page (TIP) about any exceptions to allowable translation (e.g, a vocabulary item); test administrators are also permitted to translate words and provide synonyms and definitions in preferred language (FILE 05 p. 48-49).
• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;	**Information on Supports and Accommodations** File 06: pp. 125-132, 252-253 File 07: Appendix G.1 File 05: pp. 35-36, 48-49 File 01 **THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC GUIDANCE IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.**	Evidence provided is adequate for this factor.
• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.	**Guidance on Selection of Accommodations** File 06: pp. 125-132, 252-253 File 01: pp. 15-18, 30 File 05: p. 159, 60 **THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL**	Consortia-level evidence provided by DLM is adequate for this section. States must provide additional 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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC GUIDANCE IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.	
Section 5.2 Summary Statement		
__X_ No additional evidence is required.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.3 – Accommodations The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State: • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504;	**Evidence of appropriate accommodation availability** File 06: pp. 125-132, 254 File 01: pp. 11-12, 15-18 File 05: pp. 51-53	Based on detail in the Technical Manual and Accessibility Manual, test administrators are trained annually on IEP decision-making, which drives selection of accommodations on the assessment.
• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);	**Evidence of appropriate accommodations for English learners** File 06: pp. 120-121, 181-183	Translation is available as an accommodation, appropriately implemented by the test administrator, given the small % of students with significant cognitive disabilities who are EL (no translated forms)
• 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;	**Appropriateness and effectiveness of accommodations** File 06: pp. 125-132, 143-147, 126-130, 130-132, 127-128, 217-218, 270-271, 283-284 File 05: pp. 159, 55, 150-151 File 01: p. 30 File 21	Decisions on supports are well-grounded to support flexibility and equity of use, along with multiple means of engagement, representation, action and expression (pp. 130-132). Other key principles include student use of normal response mode and familiar, individualized manipulatives as required. One commendable feature is use of released testlets on which students can practice, in order to determine which accommodations will be most useful for him/her (KITE User Guide, pp. 150-151). Submission indicates plans (and rationales) for continuing research to improve use and effectiveness of accommodations; please note that rather than this detail appearing in File 06, pp. 217-18 as noted under DLM evidence, it actually appears on p. 150.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.	**Exceptional accommodations requests:** **THIS PORTION OF THE CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.**	N/A

Section 5.3 Summary Statement
__X_ No additional evidence is required.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are: • Consistent with the State's policies for accommodations;	**Accommodations and participation decisions are consistent with state policy** File 01: pp. 11-12, 15-18 File 07: Appendix C.16 **THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC PROCEDURES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.**	DLM provides guidelines through which state consortium members can monitor participation and accommodation assignment.
• Appropriate for addressing a student's disability or language needs for each assessment administered;	**Appropriateness of accommodations and participation decisions for addressing student needs** File 01: pp. 11-12, 15-18 **THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC PROCEDURES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.**	Similarly, DLM provides guidance on the selection of accommodations based on student needs and preferences (Accessibility Manual pp. 11-2 and 15-18).
• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;	**Consistent with accommodations during instruction and/or practice** File 01: pp. 11 – 12, 19-22 File 06: pp. 136-150, 283-284 **THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC PROCEDURES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.**	DLM recommends that accommodations for use during assessment be consistent with those implemented in instructional contexts, but this must be monitored by each state. However, the consortium does collect indirect evidence of consistency between accommodations for assessment and instruction via a survey (Technical Manual p. 150).
• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student's IEP Team or 504 team	**Consistent with accommodations identified by team**	DLM offers, via the KITE Educator Portal, the means by which state and local educators may

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner;	File 02: pp. 44-46 **THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC PROCEDURES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.**	produce lists of students' accommodations on their PNP profile. States may use this information for monitoring.
• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.	**Administered with fidelity to procedures** File 06: p.p. 124, 225-229 **THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC PROCEDURES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.**	Along with SEA and LEA staff, DLM staff participates in monitoring the use of accommodations (Technical Manual p. 124).

Section 5.4 Summary Statement
_X__ No additional evidence is required.

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

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

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

Section 6.1 Summary Statement
__x_ No additional evidence is required from DLM consortium-state specific.

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.	**Technically Sound Method** File 14: pp. 19-20, 23- 24, 26-27, 31-32, 38-39, 33-34, 34-35, 34, 41, 53-57, 57-58, 44-49, 60-64, Appendix G, Appendix B, 62063 File 06: pp. 203-204	Submission provides a clear explanation of application of well-established standard setting procedures to the unique features of the DLM assessment (FILE 14, pp. 19-20)
	Panelist experience and expertise File 14: pp.28, 30-31, 70-74, 51, Appendix L (201)	Standard-setting involved a range of participants, including TAC and state partners, and SEA staff, who reviewed and approved cuts. Panelist characteristics are well-defined in terms of professional role, experience with SWSCD, race, gender, geographic representation (FILE 14, pp. 30-31) Peer reviewers noticed, however, that representation was skewed toward females and Caucasians. While that may reflect the population that participants were drawn from, it would have been useful to make this clear. DLM should make an effort to better balance participation in the future.

Section 6.2 Summary Statement
__X_ No additional evidence is required.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards The State's academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State's academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce. If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State's grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.	**Challenging Alternate Academic Achievement Standards** File 06: pp.17-19, 26-27, 38-41 File 15: pp. 23-24 File 18: pp. 63-67 File 06: pp. 163-164, 179- 180, 165	Evidence demonstrates that EEs (extended content standards) were developed based on CCSS and later aligned with CETE learning maps. Performance level descriptors were developed through a process informed by research and professional judgment.
	Differentiated content across grades File 06: pp. 10-13, 26-27, 179-180	PLDs are clearly based on grade level content (FILE 06, pp. 179-80) and are aligned across grades to ensure increasing complexity.

Section 6.3 Summary Statement
_X__ No additional evidence is required.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.4 – Reporting The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including: • The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;	**Reporting Results** File 06: pp. 165, 93-195, 282-283 File 07: Appendix E.7 **THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE- SPECIFIC REPORTING IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.**	States are provided with detailed data files and resources to SEA staff on how they can be used (FILE 07, Appendix E7). It might be useful to peer reviewers to be able to access examples of the additional resources mentioned in Appendix E7 that are available to states on their website—even if limited to including static documents. Peers noted that the screenshot provided on p. 192 of FILE 07 gives some idea of a wide array of resources available to member states.
• The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;	**Assessment results reported to support appropriate uses of results** File 06: pp. 161- 162, 190- 193, 238-239, 244- 246 File 07: Appendix E.2, E1 **THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE- SPECIFIC REPORTING IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.**	Submission notes indicate "preliminary evidence indicates that teachers are able to use ISRs to guide instructional planning" and reference FILE 06 pp. 244-246. Some indication of plans to obtain follow-up information would be useful.
• The State provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results.	**Interpretive Guides** File 06: pp. 191-192 File 07: Appendices E.3, E.9, E.10, E.4, E.5 File 20 **THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE- SPECIFIC INTERPRETIVE GUIDES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.**	The last page of FILE 20 provides screenshot of a list of scoring and reporting resources available to states on the DLM website; access to these documents would enhance this submission.
• The State provides for the production and	**Delivery of Student Reports**	Overall, DLM provides ample evidence to address

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student's achievement; ○ Report the student's achievement in terms of the State's grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors); ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; ○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;	File 06: pp. 203-209, 238-239, 191-192, 265-274 File 07: Appendix E3 **THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE- SPECIFIC INTERPRETIVE GUIDES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.**	most aspects of this factor. Peer reviewers noted how detailed the score report is and wonder whether reliability evidence supports this much detail in score reporting. Peer reviewers ask DLM to consider conveying to parents that there is some error in scores (to address the reliability of information regarding a student's achievement).
• 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	**Process and Timeline** File 06: pp. 190-193, 267 File 07: Appendix E6 **THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE- SPECIFIC INTERPRETIVE GUIDES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.**	Evidence from DLM is sufficient for this section.

Section 6.4 Summary Statement
__X_ No additional evidence is required from the consortium.

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