



## 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 3, 2019

Dear Superintendent Smith:

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

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

- General assessments in reading/language arts for grades 3-8 (Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and the ESSA**
- General assessments in science in grades 5 and 8 (Illinois Science Assessment (ISA)): **Does not meet requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA**
- General assessments in high school mathematics and reading/language arts (SAT): **Partially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and the ESSA**
- Alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) for grades 3-8 and high school in reading/language arts and mathematics (Dynamic Learning Maps)

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

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

(DLM) Year-End Model): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB**

- AA-AAAS for grades 3-8 and high school in science (DLM Science): **Partially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB**

The components that **substantially meet requirements** means that these components meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. The components that **partially meet requirements** do not meet a number of the requirements of the statute and regulations and/or 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 component that **does not meet requirements** does not meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations and will require substantial work to revise the assessment system design in order to meet requirements. The Department understands that the ISA is being administered for the last time in the 2019-2019 school year. ISBE must have a new or substantially revised general science assessment in place to begin administering in the 2019-2020 school year. That assessment will need to be submitted for a complete peer review after it has been administered the first time.

Please note that the assessment requirements for ESEA, as amended by the NCLB, were in effect through the end of the 2016-2017 school year. The ISBE peer review was conducted under the requirements of this statute. Beginning in the 2017-2018 school year, the assessment requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, will apply to State assessments. Department staff carefully reviewed the evidence and peer review recommendations in light of the updated requirements for State assessments under the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. As a result of this additional review, I have determined that the ISBE administration of the DLM assessments needs to meet one additional requirement related to alternate academic achievement standards. This requirement is listed under critical element 6.3. Under the orderly transition authority in section 4(b) of the ESSA, I am granting ISBE until December 15, 2020, to submit evidence of an AA-AAAS that meets this ESSA requirement. I have also determined that the ISBE needs to meet two additional requirements, one related to accessibility and one related to equal benefits afforded to all students. These requirements can be found under critical elements 4.2 and 5.1 and 5.2 and 5.3 respectively.

The specific list of items required for ISBE to submit is enclosed with this letter. The Department has placed 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 outlining when it will submit all required additional documentation for peer review. 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 IDEA Part B grant award.

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

Thank you for your ongoing commitment to improving educational outcomes for all students. I look forward to our continued partnership as we move ahead with this critical work. I appreciate the work you are doing to improve your schools and provide a high-quality education for your students. If you have any questions, please contact Brenda Calderon at: [OSS.Illinois@ed.gov](mailto:OSS.Illinois@ed.gov).

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank T. Brogan  
Assistant Secretary  
for Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Rae Ann Clementz, 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
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A plan and a timeline to address the alignment issues identified in the existing alignment studies, particularly in mathematics.</li> </ul> <p>For the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of an overall test design and test blueprints that measure the depth and breadth of the State’s grade-level academic content standards in science.</li> </ul> <p>For the Illinois Science Assessment (ISA):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound.</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills).</li> </ul>
<b>2.2 – Item Development</b>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of 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.</li> <li>• Evidence of guidelines for item writers with respect to fairness in the development and review process.</li> </ul> <p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that clarifies how the development and review process for Essential Element Concept Maps (EECMs) contributes to a technically sound test item development process.</li> </ul> <p>For the ISA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that reasonable and technically sound procedures were used to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s science academic content standards.</li> </ul>
<b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b>	<p>For all assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) monitors the administration of its assessments to ensure that administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</li> </ul>
<b>2.5 – Test Security</b>	<p>For all assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that ISBE implements an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results, including detection, remediation, and investigation of</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	alleged test irregularities.
<b>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</b>	<p>For the ISA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results (e.g., maintaining item banks in a secure fashion).</li> <li>○ To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence requested in critical element 2.1 related to the SAT will satisfy this critical element.</li> </ul> <p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a plan and timeline to address recommendations of the external evaluation of alignment of the tests.</li> <li>• Evidence identified in critical element 2.1 relative to addressing the full range of the content standards for science.</li> </ul> <p>For the ISA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of adequate alignment with the academic content standards the assessment is designed to measure in terms of content, the full range of academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity (e.g., results from an independent alignment study).</li> </ul>
<b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for high school as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</li> </ul> <p>For the ISA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</li> </ul>
<b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</li> </ul> <p>For the ISA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b>	<p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the science tests are related as expected with similar variables (e.g., other measures of science achievement).</li> </ul> <p>For the ISA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence the State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</li> </ul>
<b>4.1 – Reliability</b>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reliability data for students with disabilities, English learners, and students who received accommodations.</li> </ul> <p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of updated reliability for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the student population overall and each student group once certain conditions have been met (e.g., expansion of the item pool, increase of number of items per testlet, increase in the number of linkage levels).</li> </ul> <p>For the ISA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population.</li> <li>Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments.</li> <li>Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results.</li> <li>For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement.</li> </ul>
<b>4.2 – Fairness and accessibility</b>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the assessment is fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments, including data related to students with disabilities and English learners.</li> <li>Evidence that the State supports and enhances the accessibility of the assessments through appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities, and, to the extent practicable, by incorporating principles of universal design for learning (UDL).</li> </ul> <p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that the assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments. Such evidence may include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Once sufficient data exists, additional analysis by student subgroup to analyze test fairness.</li> <li>Once sufficient data exists, additional item analysis to examine</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>the effects of certain stimuli (e.g., “fictionalized” science stories) and item response characteristics (response order) on test fairness.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Specific criteria used for external test reviewers and test item writers regarding fairness and accessibility.</li> </ul> <p>For the ISA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence that ISBE has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are fair and accessible across student groups in the design and development of its assessments.</li> <li>● Evidence that the State supports and enhances the accessibility of the assessments through appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities, and, to the extent practicable, by incorporating principles of UDL.</li> </ul>
<p><b>4.3 Full Performance Continuum</b></p>	<p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence that clarifies the assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum.</li> </ul> <p>For the ISA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</li> </ul>
<p><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></p>	<p>For the ISA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence 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.</li> </ul>
<p><b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b></p>	<p>For the ISA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence that the State followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results between paper and online versions of the ISA.</li> </ul>
<p><b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b></p>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence of a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system.</li> </ul> <p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence of a plan to monitor the science test before, during, and after the inclusion of Phase II development items to the test item banks, including clear and technically sound criteria.</li> </ul> <p>For the ISA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence the State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>
<p><b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b></p>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the State’s process for ensuring that students with disabilities are included in the SAT with clear guidelines for accommodations and the receipt of college-reportable scores.</li> <li>• Evidence that children with disabilities are not denied the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>5.2 – Procedures for Including ELs</b></p>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of communicating to districts, schools, teachers, and parents procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s) and the selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> <li>• Evidence that English learners are not denied the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.</li> </ul> <p>For DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that there are procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the assessment system (e.g., accurate recording of the English learner status of students participating in the assessment).</li> </ul>
<p><b>5.3 – Accommodations</b></p>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</li> <li>• As noted above in element 5.1, evidence that children with disabilities are not denied the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment (evidence submitted for element 5.1 will address this concern).</li> </ul> <p>For DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul> <p>For the ISA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that accommodations (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</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>
<p><b>5.4 – Monitoring Testing of Special Populations</b></p>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that it monitors test administration in to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations.</li> <li>○ Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered.</li> <li>○ Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice.</li> <li>○ Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s individualized education programs team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner.</li> <li>○ Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>For Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> </ul> <p>For the ISA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments 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 appropriate and administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</b></p>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State formally adopted challenging academic standards in reading/language arts and mathematics.</li> </ul> <p>For the ISA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades.</li> <li>• Evidence that the State’s academic achievement standards include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) at least three levels of achievement, with two for high</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</p>
<p><b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting (DLM Science)</b></p>	<p>For DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its alternate academic achievement standards in science to ensure they are valid and reliable. Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A plan and timeline to revisit the achievement standards after the incorporation of phase II development.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>For the ISA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State used a technically sound method and process for setting its academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards (additional requirement under section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA)</b></p>	<p>For the DLM reading/language arts, mathematics, and science tests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the DLM alternate academic achievement standards ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act. ISBE should provide this evidence by December 31, 2020.</li> </ul> <p>For the ISA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that reports are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand.</li> </ul> <p>For the DLM Year-End Model:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the availability of reports in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request.</li> </ul> <p>For DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the availability of reports in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request.</li> </ul> <p>For the ISA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents,</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence that the State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student's achievement.</li><li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students.</li><li>○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand.</li></ul></li><li>• Evidence that 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 and communicates that information to districts, schools, and families.</li></ul>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT  
CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## August 2017 State Assessment Peer Review Notes for the PARCC Assessment Consortium RESUBMISSION

(follow up on evidence requested from 2016 Peer Review)



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

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

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

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

<b>SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.2 – Item Development.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>6.4 – Reporting.....</b>	<b>13</b>

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

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results;</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills);</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.</li> </ul>	<p><i>State-specific evidence. Individual states will respond as necessary.</i></p>	<p>The PARCC assessment does not currently assess speaking and listening. While it is the case that States currently have waivers, there is no assurance that the Department will continue to grant waivers for speaking and listening.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b>                  “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.” NOTE—States must individually request a waiver from the requirement of testing the speaking and listening standards.</p>		
<p><b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a plan and timeline for addressing the speaking and listening aspect of the standards such that appropriate assessments will be available to the</li> </ul>		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
PARCC States when their waivers expire.		

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>2.2 – Item Development</b></p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p><b>Document 2.2_PARCC Item Review Committees_9 4 12</b></p> <p>lists available information about PARCC’s initial groups of item reviewers, including self-reported job title, organization, years of teaching experience, experience with special populations of students, geographic settings, and reviewer demographic information.</p>	<p>Document 2.2 provided evidence of representation on Item Review Committees.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b>            “Information about the composition and credentials of content and bias/sensitivity reviewers for the PARCC assessment. Specifically, information about the subject area specialization of content and bias/sensitivity reviewers on this panel (grade level, general or special education specialization, English learner (EL) specialization).”</p>		
<p><b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> <li>• If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul>	<p>HumRRO, <u>Evaluating the Quality and Alignment of PARCC ELA/Literacy and Mathematics Assessments: Grades 3,4,6, and 7</u></p>	<p>The alignment study report notes that Speaking and Listening were not considered in the findings for ELA alignment. See 2.1.</p> <p>Per Recommendations on pages 28-30, PARCC needs a plan for addressing the recommendations resulting from the HumRRO alignment study. However, the report provided to the peers appears to have limited usefulness for improving the assessment. Peers are uncertain why the information is not provided in more detail. For example, item alignment to each standard rather than domain or cluster may be more helpful for developing plans for improving the assessment. PARCC may need to ask the contractors to provide more explicit findings.</p> <p>Peers were unable to find specific information regarding the composition and expertise of the 19 alignment study panel members.</p> <p>Will the PARCC program seek advice from the PARCC Technical Advisory Committee related to the study?</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b>                  “Additional alignment evidence that addresses all remaining grades (grades 3, 4, 6, and 7) in both content areas, and Alignment evidence that supports a test design that assesses the full range of the State’s academic content standards, including speaking and listening, is needed for all tested grades.”</p>		
<p><b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As the plan for speaking and listening is developed, ensure that independent alignment studies will be completed.</li> <li>• Plan and timeline for how PARCC will address the alignment study recommendations for improving the assessments.</li> </ul>		

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>HumRRO, <u>Evaluating the Quality and Alignment of PARCC ELA/Literacy and Mathematics Assessments: Grades 3,4,6, and 7</u></p>	<p>The alignment study notes that “Reviewers found PARCC’s cognitive complexity process and model difficult to understand and apply when confirming the quantitative and qualitative ratings. <u>Additional information about how these ratings are combined as well as information about the acceptable ranges is needed for others to effectively evaluate the cognitive complexity of PARCC’s ELA/literacy passages.</u>” (emphasis added) P. 28</p> <p>The alignment study notes that “Reviewers generally agreed with the cognitive complexity level that PARCC assigned the mathematics assessment items at grades 3, 4, 6, and 7. However, there were some exceptions. We recommend reviewing the cognitive complexity levels for Geometry at grade 3; Measurement and Data at grade 4; and Statistics and Probability, Number and Operations in Base Ten, and Number and Operations – Fractions, all at grade 6.”</p> <p>The report provided to the peers appears to have limited usefulness for improving the assessment. Peers are uncertain why the information is not provided in more detail. For example, item alignment to each standard rather than domain or cluster may be more helpful for developing plans for improving the assessment. PARCC may need to ask the contractors to provide more explicit findings.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b>  “Additional evidence, such as cognitive lab studies, that address the cognitive processes and cognitive complexity required by the standards across grades and content areas.”</p>		
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan and timeline for how PARCC will address the alignment study recommendations for improving the assessments, as regards cognitive processes and cognitive complexity.</li> </ul>		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b></p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p><b>Documents 4.3.1, 4.3.2, and 4.3.3</b> include scale score cumulative frequency distributions for each assessment administered in spring 2015, fall 2015, and spring 2016.</p>	<p>Peers appreciate the cumulative distribution of scale scores to numbers of students. The omission of raw scores is noted.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b>            “Cumulative frequency distributions across raw score/scale scores, that include the number and percent of students scored at each raw/scale score point.”</p>		
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b></p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Document 4.6_PARCC Mode and Device Comparability Study Plan</b> outlines PARCC’s plans to study mode and device comparability in spring 2017.</p>	<p>The Table of PARCC Research Studies 2016 on page 15 show dates in the past. What additional milestones and timelines have been added since November 2016?</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b>                  “A plan and timeline for the State/PARCC to continue studying the issue of mode comparability.”</p>		
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An updated timeline and milestones and any completed study reports to document adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results among modes and devices.</li> </ul>		

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b></p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p><b>Document 6.2.1 PARCC Standard Setting Panels</b> includes available information about standard setting panelists, including self-reported job title, organization, years of teaching experience, experience with special populations of students, geographic settings, and reviewer demographic information.</p> <p><b>Document 6.2.2 PARCC Standard Setting Panel Summary Information</b> includes summary information of the self-reported information contained in Document 6.2.1.</p>	<p>Documents 6.2.1 and 6.2.2 provide evidence the standard-setting panels included members experienced in the areas of special education and EL.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b>  “Additional detailed information about areas of educational specialization for members of each achievement standards-setting panel, especially the specialty areas of special education and ELs.”</p>		
<p><b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;</li> <li>• The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;</li> <li>• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;</li> <li>○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;</li> <li>○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><i>State-specific evidence. Individual states will respond as necessary.</i></p>	<p>PARCC produces item level data that are available to the States. However, States produce the reports.</p>

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b>            “Evidence that MSDE and PARCC provide reports that enable itemized score analyses to local educational agencies and schools”</p>		
<p><b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT  
CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## February 2018 State Assessment Combined Peer Review Notes for the DLM Year-End Assessment Consortium RESUBMISSION



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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT  
CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION**

**Contents**

<b>SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4.1 – Reliability.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>4.4 – Scoring .....</b>	<b>9</b>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION**

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results;</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills);</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.</li> </ul>	<p><u>YE.01</u> (Technical Manual Update YE 2015-16)</p>	<p>DLM provides a brief but adequate explanation for why speaking and listening standards (part of CCSS) were not included in the DLM ELA assessment, to the effect that partner states had not assessed these standards in their general assessments. For all students, therefore, including SWSCD, speaking and listening were to be taught and assessed at the local level (YE 01, pp. 9-10).</p> <p>It might have been useful (but not essential) to include participating state’s waiver letters to support this statement.</p> <p>The supplementary submission evidence did not address part of the summary statement request for additional evidence—specifically, an explanation of why Language is not directly addressed. A brief explanation such as that offered for the question about Speaking and Listening would have been helpful—which the reviewers assume is that in their general assessments, all of the partner states assess Language in the context of Reading or Writing (e.g., as is the case with PARCC).</p>
<p><b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement (from August 2017 Peer Review)</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>4.1 – Reliability</b></p> <p>(from 2016 peer review)</p> <p>For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), WVDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of monitoring and refinement of the diagnostic classification models from subsequent test administrations</li> </ul>	<p>YE 01, pp. 43-46; 48-62.</p> <p>YE 03, pp. 102.</p>	<p>Overall, Peer Reviewers are impressed with the DLM learning and assessment models. Peers are hopeful that the psychometric model, which is less mature, will eventually be refined to a similar level, to capitalize on the advantages of the learning and assessment models.</p> <p>DLM provided detail in the Technical Manual Update YE 2016-17 (YE 01) as evidence of monitoring and refinement of the diagnostic classification models from test administrations subsequent to the initial administration. Given recommendations below, Peer Reviewers would expect that technical manuals in subsequent years continue to address and update evidence of monitoring and refinement of Diagnostic Classification Models.</p> <p>The DLM’s Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) discussed and indicated support for maintaining the current scoring model for 2017-18 while additional research is conducted on different methods for being able to support cross-linkage level inferences (YE 03).</p> <p>On p. 45, there is mention of the fact that non-masters sometimes have a greater than chance likelihood of providing correct responses to items measuring the linkage level, which may indicate that items or LLs as a whole are “easily guessable.” It would be useful to note what is being done to address that. Peer reviewers recommend checking this again with more operational data. If the issue remains, either model or items or both need to be changed.</p> <p>In reference to the issue of Model Fit, peers were satisfied with the methods being followed to ensure that the model fits the data. However, the Peers suggest following the recommendations of the DLM</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
		<p>Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to use a Bayesian estimation procedure to help address some of the methodological issues with the current approach to assessing model fit.</p> <p>Peers recommend that DLM continue to be guided by and to take into serious consideration the advice of the TAC in regards to refinement of the model and generation of data to demonstrate Model Fit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>x_ No additional evidence is required</p>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</b></p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<p>YE 01 (Technical Manual Update YE 2015-16), pp. 10-11, 13-14</p> <p>Appendix A: ELA Text Photograph Guidelines</p>	<p>DLM provides an adequate explanation of the development and selection of reading passages, including steps taken to ensure passages are accessible to SWSCD.</p> <p>The peers found Table 5 (p. 11) very helpful in clarifying internal and external passage review criteria. While not essential to document attention to this CE factor, it would have been of interest to not only cite a source of more information on p. 10 of YE 01 (“For a complete summary of external review of ELA passages, see Results from External Review During the 2014–2015 Academic Year [Clark, Swinburne Romine, Bell, &amp; Karvonen, 2016]”), but to have provided it among sources of evidence.</p> <p>The explanation of steps taken in the selection and/or creation of graphic components was clear and complete. The reviewers appreciated inclusion of the specific guidelines used in selecting photographs for ELA passages.</p> <p>No additional evidence was required regarding steps taken to ensure that assessments are fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement (2017 review)</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION**

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></p> <p>(from 2016 review)</p> <p>For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), WVDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of monitoring procedures used for scoring DLM-YE writing items, including measures of inter-rater reliability.</li> </ul>	<p>Technical Manual Update YE 2016-17 (YE 01), pp. 106-113; 141-142</p>	<p>The sampling for the writing products seems to be small. Peer reviewers urge that an effort be made future studies to increase the number of samples and make sure that they represent the full range of abilities reflected in the underlying population.</p> <p>DLM describes the scoring of writing products by human raters (teachers) using a partially-crossed matrix design (multiple, different raters across products). Agreement was determined to be good to excellent; but see below:</p> <p>To some extent, a conventional treatment of interrater reliability is not applicable to scoring of writing products in DLM because a “high-inference process common in large-scale assessment such as applying analytic or holistic rubrics” is not used (p. 107). Evaluation based on presence of text features requires little/no inference and thus one would expect raters to assign identical scores.</p> <p>Nevertheless, to address questions about interrater reliability, DLM conducted a study in spring 2017 using writing products from that administration. Teachers’ original ratings from the operational administration were compared to the one additional rating or one randomly selected rating from the raters who participated in the study.</p> <p>While DLM points to agreement rates for intraclass correlation (ICC) as falling in the excellent range (<math>\geq .75</math> and Fleiss’s kappa in the good range (.60-.74), these ranges for comparable dichotomous decisions may be modest, but are certainly adequate (typically ICC should be <math>&gt; .80</math> to be considered “excellent”). It would be helpful to compare ranges applied to scoring of low inference items to those more typical of direct assessment of writing. This might be</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>addressed as part of the anticipated continuation of studies on writing score agreement.</p> <p>DLM indicates that they plan to conduct further study of interrater reliability of writing product scoring (p. 142), by expanding the collection and evaluation of written products.</p> <p>It might be useful for DLM to consider including as part of the study of rater agreement those scores assigned by teacher administrators for writing process items (which depend on administrator judgment). Such items were not included in the study in 2017.</p> <p>In addition, peer reviewers recommend some form of real time monitoring of teacher assigned scores by rescoring or second-scoring by a trained administrator of a small sample, rather than relying solely on post-hoc analyses.</p> <p>Raters' demographic may not be representative (YE01 Table 58, p. 110). It is hard to say, since state teacher demographics were not provided, but it seems that the raters in the study were overwhelmingly non-Hispanic white. Peer reviewers would urge that in subsequent studies, in so far as possible, a more diverse pool of raters be identified.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE  
ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## August 2017 State Assessment Combined Peer Review Notes for the DLM Science Assessment Consortium



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE  
ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Contents

<b>SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	3
2.2 – Item Development.....	7
2.3 – Test Administration .....	10
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration.....	10
2.5 – Test Security .....	16
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....	18
<b>SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....</b>	<b>20</b>
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	20
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	23
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure .....	25
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables.....	28
<b>SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER .....</b>	<b>30</b>
4.1 – Reliability.....	30
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	33
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	35
4.4 – Scoring .....	36
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms .....	37
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment .....	38
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance.....	39
<b>SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS .....</b>	<b>40</b>
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities .....	40
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	44
5.3 – Accommodations.....	46
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations.....	48
<b>SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .</b>	<b>51</b>
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students .....	51
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....	53
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards .....	55
6.4 – Reporting.....	56

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Purposes and Intended Interpretations and Uses of Results</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16): pp. 1-13, 20-30, 170-171, 232</p>	<p><b>Purposes and Intended Interpretations and Uses of Results</b></p> <p><b>As a general statement, much of the additional evidence called for throughout this document by reviewers, is a function of the fact that the DLM submission is based on Phase I. Reviewers urge the DLM Consortium to expedite Phase II.</b></p> <p>The Technical Manual Science 2015-16 provides evidence to support a clear statement in the Peer Review Submission of the purpose, and intended interpretations and uses of the results of the DLM Alternative Assessment System in general and as it applies specifically to Science. Figure 2 (SC 06, p.7) helpfully outlines the theory of action for DLM Science.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Test Structure and Blueprints</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 09</u> (Blueprint Science)</p> <p><u>SC 16</u> (Summary of the Science Development Process)</p>	<p><b>Test Structure and Blueprints</b></p> <p>Reviewers understand that the development of the DLM Science Assessment in Phase I occurred without a Learning Map, and that DLM anticipates developing a Learning Map in Phase II (SC 06, p. 136). Since Learning Maps are at the core of assessment development in ELA and mathematics, and at the core of the validity claim for science, it is puzzling to reviewers that the absence of a Learning Map for science is treated in so cursory a fashion, with only a brief reference to its development in the 2016-17 school year (SC 06, p. 3).</p> <p>Test blueprints for Phase I provide detail on the content and structure of the DLM Science testlets; EEs are included at each grade band (Elementary, MS, HS) and Biology end-of-year for all domains:</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>physical (PS), life (LS), and earth and space science (EES).</p> <p>The reviewers found little evidence to support the claim that the EEs assessed represent a “breadth, but not a depth of coverage” (SC 16, p. 5). While evidence is gathered in each of the three science domains, phase I blueprints do not come close to addressing the full range of NGSS.</p> <p>Reviewers understand that the DLM Science Assessment is in an early stage of development, and that additional Essential Elements and testlets will be added in the future. However, reviewers would like to see more detail about a plan to identify additional Essential Elements aligned with the NGSS, to justify the claim of “breadth”.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills);</li> </ul>	<p><b>Representation of Knowledge and Skills in the Assessment and the Standards</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Representation of Knowledge and Skills in the Assessment and the Standards</b></p> <p>SC 06, pp. 16-17 provides an account of the Phase I process of determining commonalities among partner states’ alternate science standards that linked to content in the Framework, noting that “The state partners did not want to develop EEs for every sub-idea in the <i>Framework</i> in the initial phase of this project. Therefore, participating states’ alternate science standards were reviewed rather than their grade-level science standards, as their alternate standards express their intended foci for SCD. DLM staff with expertise in science education and alternate assessments completed a crosswalk of the seven states’ alternate science standards. This information allowed the DLM Science Consortium to map states’ alternate standards to the <i>Framework</i> and NGSS. The DLM Science Consortium identified the most frequently assessed topics across states in the three</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		content domains of physical science, life science, and Earth and space science.” Reviewers would have liked an explanation of how that process supports—or in future will be augmented to support—alignment with participating states’ academic content standards.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Item Pool and Selection Procedures (CAA)</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Item Pool and Selection Procedures (CAA)</b></p> <p>The DLM science assessment is delivered in the form of testlets, either by computer or direct administration by teacher, based on student need. Each testlet contains 3-4 items at the same linkage level for one EE. Adaptation occurs based on performance at linkage level.</p> <p>In Phase I, testlets were written to three linkage levels, with the intent to consider expansion to five levels in the future (to parallel ELA and Mathematics). The reviewers would have liked to have seen more information on how this expansion might occur, and what data has been/is being gathered from the Phase I administration towards that end.</p> <p>At present, it does not appear to reviewers that the size of the item pool is adequate to support the test design, due to a current paucity of items/testlets.</p>
<b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide more detail as to intended processes and timeline to increase the coverage of the NGSS (particularly for MS and HS) sufficiently to support the claim of breadth of coverage.</li> <li>Provide a plan and a timeline to expand the item pool (for coverage of content and expanded linkage levels) to support long-term format/design (beyond Phase I).</li> <li>Preliminary evidence of development of a learning map in science should be submitted in December 2017.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>2.2 – Item Development</b></p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p><b>Item Development and Selection</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16): Chapters I and III</p> <p><u>SC 15</u> (Science Item Writing Handbook)</p> <p><u>SC 10</u> (External Review Report 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 16</u> (Summary of the Science Development Process)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16— Appendices) Note: not listed in submission document, but useful (e.g., Appendix C2: Item Writer Materials List Documentation and Appendix C4: Sample EECM)</p>	<p><b>Item Development and Selection</b></p> <p>The evidence provided contains a clear and fairly detailed account of the item development process, including—but not limited to—selection and training of item writers (pp. 46-50), item and testlet format (pp. 40-45), and delivery modes.</p> <p>DLM included as evidence the Science Item Writing Handbook (SC 15), which captures in some detail aspects of item development to which item writers must attend. The reviewers found Figure 2 (p. 6) helpful as a means of clarifying the content of concept maps (EECMs); it would have been helpful to reference the completed sample EECM in Appendix C 4.</p> <p>Similarly, when resources such as prototypes are mentioned, it would be helpful in this section to include one or more examples (and/or examples of released items to illustrate compete testlets).</p> <p>There appears to be only minimal information on the process used to develop and review EECMs (06, p. 45) and there is no mention of EECM as part of the external review process addressed in SC 10. Persons involved in EECM development are identified only as “science content teams” and those in review as “staff with student population expertise”. Although SC 06 p. 45 also includes the detail that the “EECM science templates were adopted by states in the DLM Science Alternate Assessment Consortium,” there is no mention in that evidence document or any other that the reviewers examined to explain what activities comprised that review and adoption process. Any judgment about sound procedures should include more detail to expand upon that information.</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>DLM Science has addressed the need for alternate testlets (BVI forms) for students unable to participate in online assessment due to visual impairment (see, e.g., SC 15 Appendix F).</p> <p>The accounts of both the initial review processes and those that followed the pilot and field test administrations of Phase I testlets provide sufficient evidence of a thoughtful and rigorous process for identifying and remedying problems amenable to revision as well as those that should lead to rejection of a specific item/task or testlet as a whole.</p>
<b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide additional information to clarify the process of developing and reviewing EECMs for use by item writers to demonstrate that these processes contribute to a technically sound item/testlet development process.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Standardized Administration Procedures</b></p> <p><u>SC 05</u> (Test Administration Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 02</u> (Assessment Coordinator Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 03</u> (Data Steward Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 04</u> (Technical Liaison Manual 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Standardized Administration Procedures</b></p> <p>The evidence provided makes clear all of the steps necessary to conduct standardized test administration of DLM Science (including administration with accommodations). Resources to communicate those steps are role-specific for each of three district-level support roles (Assessment Coordinator, Data Steward, Technical Liaison).</p> <p>The Test Administration Manual (evidently intended for all DLM administrations, not only science) is well organized and contains numerous screen-shots to support instructions and explanations. Periodic “hints” show purposeful attention to the audience. The reviewers noted, however, that while references are made to ELA testlets (e.g. pp. 41-42, 57-59) and mathematics testlets (e.g. pp. 43, 59), and all examples are drawn from these two content areas, there are <u>no</u> references to science. Linkage level descriptions fit those for ELA and M but not science. DLM has not provided any evidence that any addendum to, or revised version of, this document was used for the administration of science testlets. The reviewers did note that in SC 06 (Technical Manual Science 2015-16), p. 109, there is mention of a <i>Science Supplement to the Test Administration Manual</i>. This resource would have been helpful to reviewers.</p> <p>Role-specific resources were also well organized with screen-shots and “hints” to facilitate use. The issue noted above regarding references only to ELA and mathematics also applies to the Assessment Coordinator Manual.</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Training</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16 Appendices)</p> <p>SC 13 (Facilitator Guide for Required Test Administrator Training)</p> <p><u>SC 02</u> (Assessment Coordinator Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 03</u> (Data Steward Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 04</u> (Technical Liaison Manual 2015-16)</p> <p>SC 14 (Supplemental Evidence Related to Test Administration)</p>	<p><b>Training</b></p> <p>SC 06 includes general information on training in 2015-2016, including formats (facilitated training and self-directed training) and qualifying (completion of four modules for new, and one module for returning, administrators, with a requirement of 80% on post-tests before being allowed to proceed with test administration). The peer reviewers were unable to find any information on consequences if a trainee failed to reach that score on one or more post-tests. More detail would be helpful on how training ensures that all teachers of SWSCD will be able to administer DLM (all content areas) to their students.</p> <p>In addition to the four required modules, there is a supplemental science module that available but not required for TAs in states administering science (Appendix H, pp. 421-439). Particularly based on the content of that module, including “important features of Science that are different from other DLM assessments,” the reviewers are puzzled as to why that module was optional.</p> <p>One key difference noted in the Science training module is that most of the supports for ELA and Mathematics are also available for science (and TAs are referred to the support list in Allowable Practices section of TAM, where exceptions are noted). Some explanation of the basis for those exceptions would have been helpful to the reviewers, to evaluate the sufficiency of information provided to TAs.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Technology Requirements</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16 Appendices)</p> <p><u>SC 04</u> (Technical Liaison Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 05</u> (Test Administration Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 02</u> (Assessment Coordinator Manual 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Technology Requirements</b></p> <p>The submission includes adequate information on technology requirements.</p> <p>Attention to technology challenges was illustrated in the 2016 Incident Summary (pp. 143-5 in SC 07, Appendix D13). However, beyond SC 06, Chapter IV p. 114 (Monitoring Testlet Delivery), there was little detail provided in evidence listed in the submission to make clear established contingency plans at the consortium level to address possible technology challenges.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DLM must provide an updated Test Administration Manual, modified or augmented for the science assessment.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

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

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

<p align="center"><b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p><b>Appropriate test administration monitoring procedures</b></p> <p>1) SC 06 Technical Manual Science 2015-16</p> <p>a) Chapter IV: Test Administration</p> <p>i) Monitoring Assessment Administration (pp. 112-114)</p> <p>ii) Consortium Test Administration Observation Protocol (pp. 112-113)</p> <p>iii) Formative Monitoring Techniques (pp. 113-114)</p> <p>iv) Monitoring Testlet Delivery (p. 114)</p> <p>b) Chapter IX: Validity Studies</p> <p>i) Observations of Test Administration (pp. 202-205)</p> <p>2) SC 07 Technical Manual Science 2015-16 - Appendices</p> <p>a) Appendix D.3: Test Administration Observation Protocol</p> <p>b) Appendix D.5: Test Administration Observation Guidance for Local Observers</p> <p>c) Appendix D.6: Monitoring Assessments</p> <p><b>See also additional State evidence</b></p> <p><b>Test administration monitoring</b></p> <p>1) SC 06 Technical Manual Science 2015-16</p> <p>a) Chapter IV: Test Administration</p> <p>i) Administration Errors (p. 128)</p> <p>b) Chapter VII: Assessment Results</p> <p>i) Data Files (pp. 166-167)</p> <p>c) Chapter IX: Validity Studies</p> <p>i) Observations of Test Administration (pp. 202-205)</p> <p><b>See also additional State evidence.</b></p>	<p>DLM has developed and made available to States a protocol to monitor test administration (1.a.i, 1.b.i). DLM has also made guidance resources available to states for this purpose.</p> <p>DLM and SEAs collected a sample (37 observations) of science assessment administration in 2015-2016 and found evidence of high fidelity of test administration protocols and procedures.</p>
---	--	--

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

**Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY**

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.

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>2.5 – Test Security</b></p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Prevention of Irregularities</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16- Appendices)</p> <p><u>SC 05</u> (Test Administration Manual)</p> <p><u>SC 02</u> (Assessment Coordinator Manual)</p>	<p><b>Prevention of Irregularities</b></p> <p>Various sources of evidence outline procedures for keeping test materials secure at various phases of test development and administration, including but not limited to required security agreements for individuals serving in any related role, and storage of materials. The reviewers were unable to find any reference to appropriate disposition of materials (hard copy and/or electronic files) when no longer needed/required (e.g., paper copy of text; SC 05 p. 77).</p> <p>The KITE system is designed to insure access only by authorized users.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detection of test irregularities;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Detection of Irregularities</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16- Appendices)</p>	<p><b>Detection of Irregularities</b></p> <p>Evidence from DLM is sufficient for now in this section, based on limited available data. The reviewers anticipate that DLM will provide an update when more data are available.</p> <p>The planned-for forensic analyses mentioned are all worthwhile/appropriate. The reviewers note, however, that there do not appear to be any planned-for analyses that look specifically at results for evidence of irregularities coming out of the teacher-administered testlets (in which administrator must make judgment about student response).</p> <p>Participating States may provide more evidence.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Remediation Following Incidents</b></p> <p>This portion of the Critical Element is addressed in individual State submissions</p>	<p><b>Remediation Following Incidents</b></p> <p>N/A for DLM</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Investigation of Irregularities</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16-Appendices)</p>	<p><b>Investigation of Irregularities</b></p> <p>Appendix D.9 of the Technical Manual Science 2015-16 provides detailed procedures agreed upon by the members of the DLM Consortium to identify and respond to data security breaches.</p> <p>The submission addresses alleged security breaches detectable through the KITE system (SC 06, 122-124).</p> <p>It is possible that participating States may provide more evidence.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required from the consortium</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</b></p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Integrity of Test Materials</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Integrity of Test Materials</b></p> <p>See comments under 2.5.1 (first bullet): <b>Prevention of Irregularities</b> and 2.5.4 (fourth bullet): <b>Investigation of Irregularities</b></p> <p>Although DLM has carefully considered and implemented means of protecting test materials and data stored/accessed through KITE, more information would be helpful to confirm that there are policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of hard-copy materials and resources related to test development and administration</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Security of Student Data</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16-Appendices)</p>	<p><b>Security of Student Data</b></p> <p>Partner States must submit a Data Use Agreement, which may be modified to include state-specific data security requirements. Besides this “up-front” action, DLM staff review state testing policies during service desk training and provide updates during the state testing windows.</p> <p>It is possible that participating States may provide more evidence.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Protection in Reporting</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Protection in Reporting</b></p> <p>DLM explains in their submission that for results described in technical reports, the consortium does not use a minimum reporting rule. All disaggregated data represents subgroups of students across states.</p> <p>DLM notes that each state has its own set of rules that govern the distribution and use of aggregated score reports.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		Participating States may provide more evidence.
<b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b>		
<u>X</u> 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.

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

### SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Validity Framework and Overall Evaluation</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Validity Framework and Overall Evaluation</b></p> <p>DLM is an alternate assessment system intended for SWSCD; therefore, comments regarding linkage to content standards appear below, under the second factor (bullet 2), rather than the first (which applies to assessments of the general student population).</p> <p>DLM’s submission breaks down the wording of CE 3.1 such that they first respond to the matter of documentation of overall validity evidence for its assessments. This section of their submission is detailed and examines the DLM validity framework in the context of their Theory of Action. Concerns about this CE appear below.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Linkage to Academic Content Standards</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16- Appendices): Appendix G1: CETE Response to External Evaluation</p> <p><u>SC 08</u> (Essential Elements Science)</p> <p><u>SC 10</u> (Eternal Review Report 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 12</u> (External Alignment Study Technical Report)</p> <p><u>SC 20</u> (TAC Materials 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Linkage to Academic Content Standards</b></p> <p>Through multiple phases of review (content team members, external evaluators from member states, etc.), the alignment of EEs (and their related items/testlets) with the <i>Framework</i> and NGSS was verified—in terms of fidelity to the content of the NGSS, including Disciplinary Core Idea and Science and Engineering Practice.</p> <p>For Phase I, the reviewers have concerns that references to the breadth of coverage ignore many of the States’ academic content standards and do not adequately address a balance of content within/across the domains in science.</p> <p>DLM Science utilizes the <i>Framework</i> and NGSS to organize and identify science standards developed into EEs. They indicate in their submission that,</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>“state partners did not want to develop EEs for every sub-idea in the <i>Framework</i> in the initial phase of this project. Therefore, participating 2015-16 states’ alternate science standards were reviewed rather than their grade-level science standards, as their alternate standards express their intended foci for SCD.” (SC 06, pp. 16-17). They also indicate (p. 15) that, “While some of these states had already adopted the NGSS after their publication in 2013, others had not and did not intend to do so.” DLM must demonstrate alignment with a single set of identified standards, and states can choose to participate or not.</p> <p>DLM indicates in a number of evidence documents that the initial set of EEs included in Phase I was based upon those alternate assessment standards in Science which were a focus common to partner states and that their intent is to expand EEs in Phase II. While their account of the crosswalk of existing alternate standards for partner states done in Phase I yielded the EEs assessed in 2015-16, it is unclear how they plan to proceed to reach agreement on other standards appropriate for assessment in Science of SWSCD.</p> <p>The DLM Consortium need to clarify the decision to use only Grade 5 to represent the elementary grade band 3-5. While the NGSS present middle and high school grade band standards, they identify elementary standards under each elementary grade (K through 5). The reviewers would have liked to see more justification for using only Grade 5 standards rather than incorporating some of the standards for earlier grades as part of that grade band (perhaps in the form of items in a testlet for the same EE at grade 5).</p> <p>Another of the reviewers’ concerns/questions regarding reported alignment comes from the CETE</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>Response to External Evaluation. CETE evidently re-analyzed results from the alignment study (originally reported as individual ratings) to “reflect more traditional alignment statistics about pools of EEs” and “remove rater variability.” (p. 3). CETE applied a decision rule that if a majority of panelists rated a relationship in a category that was consistent with the criterion, it was considered met. Thus, if 3 of 5 panelists judged “partial” or “full” alignment, the CE would be designated as aligned. To protect against the perception that data were “massaged” to yield more promising results, it would be helpful to reference specific details in SC 12.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DLM must demonstrate alignment with a single set of identified standards.</li> <li>• A plan and timeline for using the results of the HumRRO study to improve the alignment of testlets and EEs.</li> <li>• A justification for basing the elementary assessment only on grade 5 standards.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 15</u> (Item Writing Handbook July 2015)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16- Appendices)</p> <p><u>SC 21</u> Chapter IX Technical Manual YE 2014-15</p>	<p>Information provided to item writers contributed to ensuring that test content covered the intended cognitive processes. Subsequently, items/testlets were reviewed by multiple teams and at multiple points in time to confirm match between item and intended cognitive process(es) in linkage level.</p> <p>DLM includes in its discussion of validity assumptions, students’ ability to interact with assessment as intended (as independently as they are able), and regardless of health, behavioral, or other constraints. DLM notes that the observation protocol did not capture the reason that the test administrator chose to navigate for the students, and that could not always be inferred from observation (SC 06, p 203). DLM might consider ways to explore this matter further in the future.</p> <p>In addition, some of the test administrator actions deemed “neutral” may or may not be, given that pitch and pace of wording can cue—intentionally or unintentionally. This is an aspect of observational study that should be considered in the future.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p>SC 07 (Technical Manual Science 2015-16— Appendices)</p>	<p>The data provided are suitable for accountability and school improvement purposes. The Performance Profile for each student includes performance level results in science (overall and by domain) and highest linkage level mastered for each EE.</p> <p>It is unclear to the reviewers why aggregate reports (for schools, districts, etc.) do not report by domain.</p> <p>Consortium members decided upon four performance levels (PLDs). Given that the highest LL for science at present is Target, this appears to mean differentiating PLDs by the frequency at which students responded at target LL. This is different than for DLM Reading/Math. There was no discussion about redoing the standard setting if and when the number of linkage levels is expanded. Reviewers believe that it is imperative to accomplish this. The sample student report provided (p. 169, Figure 40) seems misleading, since it implies that it is possible for students to reach advanced level (but not given opportunity to demonstrate that in 2015-16).</p> <p>The DLM submission (SC 06, p.144) indicated that, “Essential Elements (EEs) were designed to be targets reached by the end of the grade band. However, states in the DLM Science Consortium require assessment of science at different grade levels within the grade bands. As such, expectations for students in lower grades within a grade band could reasonably be lower than expectations for students at higher grades within the same band. Therefore, grade-specific achievement standards were the desired outcome. Based on TAC recommendation and a vote by state partners, cut points were set at tested grade levels within the elementary and middle school grade bands (cut points in grades 4, 5, 6, and</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>8).” The reviewers believe that a rationale is needed for establishing grade level performance standards from results based only on items written to Grade 5 content standards.</p> <p>Table 60 on p. 161 (SC 06) provides breakdown of student participants by grade, and shows that students from across grade bands were included for each. The footnote explains inclusion of grades not part of accountability testing, but reviewers were unable to find evidence that only the grades tested for accountability were included as data sources for standard-setting.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that only the grades tested for accountability were included as data sources for standard-setting.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p>	<p>As evidence for this critical element, DLM cites two types of correlational analyses conducted (SC 07, p. 210). For the first, inter-correlations were calculated between DLM content areas for students assessed in English language arts, mathematics and science using total number of linkage levels mastered (with the explanation that while relationships across content areas can provide an indication of how consistently students perform across the different constructs of interest, since these constructs are inherently different (and therefore assessed separately), only moderate relationships are expected. For the second, correlations between student demographic characteristics and assessment results were calculated for students assessed in science, to demonstrate that how students performed on the test was unrelated to demographic characteristics such as gender and race.</p> <p>Evidence of the relationship between student responses on the assessment and other measures is limited, given the scope of Phase I.</p> <p>Recognizing that the submission reflects only the Phase I administration in 2015-16, the reviewers would like to see included other evidence such as the correlations between student performance on DLM science and participating States’ previous alternate assessment or other measure such as teacher ratings, classroom assessments, etc. (for those who have such data available). Future plans include creation of professional development models, and some instructional resources (including practice testlets) already exist and will continue to be augmented. The reviewers would have liked to see discussion of possible analyses of the relationship between use of practice and instructional materials and performance on DLM science, as well as descriptions of possible</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		future studies to look at the impact of professional development as well as possible impact of teacher administration on student performance.
<b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify the external measures to be used in external validity studies and submit a plan and timeline for accomplishing this.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>4.1 – Reliability</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Reliability for Student Population</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Reliability for Student Population</b></p> <p>DLM establishes “up front” their “relatively uncommon operational psychometric methods to provide feedback about student performance” (SC 06, p. 136).</p> <p>As in the DLM R/M submission, for DLM Science all items were assumed to be fungible, or exchangeable, within a linkage level, but the reviewers are unable to find any evidence that this assumption was tested (although DLM refers to their account of item review procedures to support this assumption as well as field test results that provide preliminary supporting evidence. Future students intended to continue to evaluate the fungibility assumption are mentioned in the Technical Manual Science 2015-16.</p> <p>Since one way to demonstrate mastery is to provide correct responses to at least 80% of the items measuring the EE and linkage level (e.g., within one testlet), why would developers create testlets with only 3-4 items for science?</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Overall and Conditional Standard Error of Measurement</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Overall and Conditional Standard Error of Measurement</b></p> <p>DLM indicates that due to the model chosen, they will report classification consistency instead of overall and conditional standard error. Reviewers are concerned that high reliabilities in Table 65 on p. 182 may be an artifact of the low number of items per testlet.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Achievement Levels</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Achievement Levels</b></p> <p>See earlier question/concern about number of performance levels in relation to linkage levels and standard-setting process for determining cut-points for those performance levels</p> <p>Analyses need to be extended to subgroups as more data are available.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Computer Adaptive Tests</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Computer Adaptive Tests</b></p> <p>Analyses need to be extended to subgroups as more data are available.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Updated reliability estimates when DLM expands the item pool, expands the number of items per testlet, and increases the linkage levels.</li> <li>By December 2017, DLM must submit results of model evaluation.</li> <li>Analyses need to be extended to subgroups as more data are available.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</b></p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 01</u> (Accessibility Manuel 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 15</u> (Science Item Writing Handbook 2015)</p> <p><u>SC 21</u> (Chapter IX Technical Manual YE 2014-15)</p> <p><u>SC 05</u> (Test Administration Manual 2015-16)</p>	<p>External review of testlets for accessibility is described in the Technical Manual Science 2015-16 (pp. 58-63). Accessibility review criteria for external reviewers seem somewhat limited (e.g., does not include high word-load, confounding reading and science; avoids multiple-meaning words (e.g., “sets” in released Elementary testlet).</p> <p>DLM does not indicate if any direction is given to item writers in regard to the ordering of response options or inadvertent cuing. These are matters that can potentially impact fairness and accessibility.</p> <p>The EE Concept Maps include accessibility flags indicating that content may require an alternate approach for some students. This demonstrates attention at an early stage in the item development process to accessibility.</p> <p>Training delivered through KITE includes a module devoted to accessibility.</p> <p>The reviewers question if any research has been done into the impact of the fictionalization of “science stories” on fairness and accessibility. Do students uniformly understand and identify with person(s) represented in a fictional situation? (See 06, p 43 for explanation of “science story”). It would be worthwhile to compare performance on items that are story/scenario-based versus those that are not.</p> <p>The section of the Technical Manual Science 2015-16 on Observations of Test Administration (pp. 202-205) is cited as evidence of data collection to evaluate whether students were able to respond to tasks irrespective of constraints (sensory, mobile, etc.); however, there is nothing in this section to link</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>frequencies to students with such constraints, making use of this as evidence of attention to fairness and accessibility questionable. The reviewers would like to see such information collected in the future.</p> <p>The submission also mentions the use of cognitive labs to evaluate whether students were able to respond to tasks irrespective of constraints; however, the reviewers were unable to find any documentation of cognitive labs for science—only those done in 2014-15 for ELA/Mathematics (Chapter IX Technical Manual YE 2014-15). It would be desirable to collect data from cognitive labs on science testlets in the future.</p>
<b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Justification of the adequacy of accessibility review criteria for external reviewers.</li> <li>• Evidence of direction to item writers regarding the ordering of response options or inadvertent cuing.</li> <li>• A plan for research on the impact of fictionalization of science stories for this population, and study of performance on items that are story/scenario based and those that are not.</li> <li>• As the number of test takers increases, the disaggregation by groups (other than gender) needs to be included in reporting.</li> <li>• Report on Cognitive Lab results for science testlets.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b></p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p><u>SC.06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p>	<p>Insofar as Phase I of DLM Science included only three linkage levels, the reviewers are not sure how to respond to assertions that the assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum—that is, the continuum represented by Linkage Levels from initial to successor OR merely initial to target (performance levels of emerging-approaching target-at target-advanced) that were developed for ELA and Mathematics. See comments under Section 3.3.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 05</u> (Test Administration Manual 2015-16)</p>	<p>Linkage level mastery is determined based on percentage of items correct in a given testlet; answer keys are screened for accuracy as part of item development and scoring is automated for computer-delivered items. Support for fidelity in recording responses to teacher-administered responses is intended to ensure accurate assignment of responses (and the evidence those item-level responses collectively provide of mastery of the linkage level).</p>
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</b></p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p><u>SC.06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC.07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16-- Appendices)</p>	<p>Rather than utilizing multiple assessment forms, DLM Science assessments are customized (based on an entry-level screening—the “First Contact Survey”—and then adjusting based on linkage level performance testlet by testlet. The adaptive delivery method is designed to ensure coverage at different linkage levels of the nine EEs at each grade band in Phase I (10 for Biology EOY). It is not clear how this will be modified once an expanded science blueprint is available and supported by a larger pool of testlets across more EEs (such that not every student will be assessed in the same EEs or with the same testlet at a given linkage level). Reviewers will want to see an explanation of content coverage under an expanded blueprint.</p> <p>DLM indicates in their submission that “comparability of inferences across administration years is ensured by maintaining consistent scoring methods and item review procedures from year to year.” However, the reviewers are unclear how routing among more EEs within the 3 domains even though they may be at the same LL allows, without further investigation, the assertion of comparability of inferences. DLM should update evidence of comparability after increasing the number of EEs and linkage levels.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b></p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Design &amp; Processes to Support Comparability</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Design &amp; Processes to Support Comparability</b></p> <p>The submission provides a clear and adequate explanation of the assessment design, such that students are routed through a series of testlets rather than taking a fixed form of the assessment. This is the same process, regardless of modality.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Evidence of Comparability</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Evidence of Comparability</b></p> <p>DLM makes note of various studies that are not yet feasible based on insufficient sample sizes. The reviewers agree more evidence of comparability of meaning and interpretation of assessment results is desirable and should be forthcoming in the future.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b></p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p><u>SC 19</u> (Scope of Work)</p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16); see especially p. 125 and pp. 250-51</p> <p><u>SC 12</u> (External Alignment Study Technical Report)</p> <p><u>SC 20</u> (TAC Materials 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 17</u> (Science External Alignment Study RFP)</p>	<p>DLM identifies a number of important and meaningful technical analyses that will be ongoing for future administrations. There was no mention made of analyses of the relationship between instructional practice in science for SWSCD and the results of DLM science, which might be conducted through educator responses to surveys around the time of the testing window. Are there any plans for such?</p> <p>It is only here, in this section of the DLM submission, that the reviewers found mention of the fact that “Phase II development work is not expected to impact operational assessments for several more years.” Given that, it would be helpful for DLM to include as evidence a timeline of intended future activities and the likely consequences/impacts for the assessment program. Specifically, for how many additional years beyond the first operational year will the assessment include the same testlets/same EEs (and/or the same EEs but with existing testlets augmented with additional items, something that was indicated by DLM as a possible future endeavor)?</p> <p>What steps, if any, have been considered to avoid “teaching to the test” since specific content will be known by teachers administering the assessment?</p> <p>Which future studies can take place simply on the basis of a widening group of participating students (leading to sufficient numbers in subgroups) as more states elect to implement DLM Science?</p>
<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include as evidence a timeline of intended future activities and the likely consequences/impacts for the assessment program.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards;</li> </ul>	<p>DLM indicates that this portion of the Critical Element is addressed in individual State submissions</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs;</li> </ul>	<p>DLM indicates that this portion of the Critical Element is addressed in individual State submissions</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Guidelines for choice of general or alternate assessment</b></p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16— Appendices)</p> <p><u>SC 01</u> (Accessibility Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual 2015-16)</p> <p>There may be additional evidence of state-specific guidance in individual state submissions.</p>	<p><b>Guidelines for choice of general or alternate assessment</b></p> <p>The DLM Consortium provides clear participation guidelines/criteria (Technical Manual Appendix D.7). The submission goes on to elaborate upon extraneous factors that should not guide a participation decision. This information is included in test administrator training modules.</p> <p>DLM notes that States are encouraged to use DLM guidelines and resources in conjunction with others describing their general assessment options</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		(with/without accommodations) to promote appropriate assessment assignment for each student.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Information on Supports and Accommodations</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16—Appendices)</p> <p><u>SC 01</u> (Accessibility Manual 2015-16)</p> <p>There may be additional evidence of state-specific guidance in individual state submissions</p>	<p><b>Information on Supports and Accommodations</b></p> <p>DLM clearly and substantially addresses supports and accommodations in the Technical Manual Science 2015-16 (pp. 114-121) and Module 2 of required test administrator training (SC 07, Appendix H.1). Their submission provides an explanation of how teachers use the Accessibility Manual to familiarize themselves and the IEP team with available accommodations.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Guidance on Selection of Accommodations</b></p> <p><u>SC 01</u> (Accessibility Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16—Appendices)</p> <p><u>SC 05</u> (Test Administration Manual 2015-16)</p> <p>There may be additional evidence of state-specific guidance in individual state submissions</p>	<p><b>Guidance on Selection of Accommodations</b></p> <p>The reviewers note well documented guidance regarding the selection of accommodations (particularly the SC 01 Accessibility Manual pp. 17-21) and training Module 2 (SC 06 Technical Manual Science 2015-16 Appendix H.1)</p> <p>DLM makes clear in their submission the opportunity for test administrators to change PNP selections to ensure effective administration.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Disability Categories for Alternate Assessment</b></p> <p>SC 07 (Technical Manual Science 2015-16—Appendices)</p> <p>There may be additional evidence of state-specific guidance in individual state submissions</p>	<p><b>Disability Categories for Alternate Assessment</b></p> <p>Participation Guidelines are provided in Appendix D.7.</p> <p>The reviewers were unable to locate any explicit instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in IDEA; however,</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
		<p>besides the three necessary participation criteria, Appendix D.7 lists factors not allowed as a consideration for determining participation in DLM Alternate Assessment, the first of which is “a disability category or label.”</p> <p>DLM also indicates that participating states will determine whether IEP teams must select alternative assessment for all subjects or separately for each subject.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments);</li> </ul>	<p>DLM indicates that this portion of the Critical Element is addressed in individual State submissions</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Promote Access to the General Curriculum</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16— Appendices)</p> <p><u>SC 14</u> (Supplemental Evidence Related to Test Administration)</p> <p><u>SC 08</u> (Essential Elements Science)</p> <p>There may be additional evidence of state-specific guidance in individual state submissions</p>	<p><b>Promote Access to the General Curriculum</b></p> <p>The submission includes evidence that the design of the alternate assessment promotes access to grade level content standards. However, given the limited number of EEs identified for Phase I of DLM Science (which reflected the somewhat limited scope of science instruction common to the member states), the reviewers question the adequacy of that access. The reviewers understand that plans are underway to identify additional EEs that align with academic achievement standards for general education students and that one of innumerable goals of DLM science is to expand instructional opportunities in science for SWSCD (which, based on survey data from field test administrators presented in the SC 06 Technical Manual (pp. 199-200; Opportunity to Learn Survey) was quite limited</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>at the time those data were collected. While this assessment has increased, and will continue to increase the opportunity of SWSCD to demonstrate what they know about science content, reviewers believe that at present, DLM Science does not go far enough in promoting access to the general education curriculum, and thus limits the efficacy of these procedures.</p> <p>It is commendable that science instructional activities were developed for educators beginning to use the DLM Science EEs (see Technical Manual Science 2015-16 pp. 228-229). These eight activities were made available to teachers on the DLM science resources page (3 for elementary, 3 for MS, and 2 for HS).</p> <p>In evidence submitted under Section 5.4, the DLM Consortium does not elaborate on issues/concerns related to what—in the submission—is referred to as “the gap that exists for some students between assessment and instruction.” While there are plans by DLM to monitor this in future years (SC 06, pp. 250-251), the reviewers question whether it might be advisable for DLM to play a more direct role in monitoring to ensure this.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement There may be additional evidence of state-specific guidance in individual state submissions</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required from the consortium.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> </ul>	<p><b>Determining Appropriateness of Accommodation for ELs</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 01</u> (Accessibility Manual 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Determining Appropriateness of Accommodation for ELs</b></p> <p>DLM has procedures in place for determining accommodations appropriate for all SWSCD including ELs.</p> <p>Participating ELs eligible/monitored account for less than 1% of SWSCD consortium-wide (based on state-specific eligibility criteria for ELs) (SC 06, p. 162). However, the DLM Consortium acknowledges that for 97% of the tested population, EL status is “Unknown”. An explanation for the absence of students’ EL status, particularly in light of the fact that these data were provided for 99.99% of participants in ELA/Math (2014-15 Technical Manual), and a plan for addressing this in the future is necessary. Also, reviewers urge that the DLM Consortium provide guidance on the collection of these data.</p> <p>ELs who meet criteria to participate in DLM Science may have translation provided outside the system (01, p. 14).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Information on Supports and Accommodations for all students/ELs</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 01</u> (Accessibility Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 05</u> (Test Administration Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16— Appendices)</p>	<p><b>Information on Supports and Accommodations for ELs</b></p> <p>Evidence provided is adequate for this factor (in particular SC 05 p. 54).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Guidance on Selection of Accommodations for ELS</b></p>	<p><b>Guidance on Selection of Accommodations for ELS</b></p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p><u>SC 01</u> (Accessibility Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16—Appendices)</p> <p><u>SC 05</u> (Test Administration Manual 2015-16)</p>	<p>Test administrators are instructed to make sure that supports provided during assessment are consistent with those provided during instruction and make clear that for ELs, this includes linguistic supports.</p> <p>DLM notes that test administrators are able to change PNP selections based on changing needs and preferences.</p> <p>Consortia-level evidence provided in the submission is adequate for this factor; states will provide additional evidence if there are state-specific policies on translation for ELs with significant cognitive disabilities.</p>
<b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An explanation for the absence of 97.39% of students' EL status (information required under Section 612 of the IDEA), and a plan for addressing this in the future.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>5.3 – Accommodations</b></p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Ensuring Availability of Appropriate Accommodations</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 01</u> (Accessibility Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 05</u> (Test Administration Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16—Appendices)</p>	<p><b>Ensuring Availability of Appropriate Accommodations</b></p> <p>DLM makes a wide range of supports (which in the context of peer review guidance are referred to as accommodations) based on decisions made by IEP teams for individual students.</p> <p>DLM provides adequate documentation of availability of accommodations as well as flexible features of administration.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);</li> </ul>	<p><b>Availability of Accommodations for ELs</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 01</u> (Accessibility Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 05</u> (Test Administration Manual 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Availability of Accommodations for ELs</b></p> <p>DLM provides an adequate explanation of their approach to assessment of ELs with significant cognitive difficulties (noting in their submission that approximately 1% of students who take DLM science assessments are also EL, although 97.39% of the data are missing). Following TIP guidelines (allowable/not allowable translation), the test administrator may provide translation (SC 06, p. 110) as a permissible support outside of the KITE system.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Appropriateness and Effectiveness of Accommodations</b></p> <p><u>SC 01</u> (Accessibility Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 18</u> (First Contact: A Census Report)</p> <p><u>SC 05</u> (Test Administration Manual 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Appropriateness and Effectiveness of Accommodations</b></p> <p>DLM accommodations derived from multiple sources including feedback from partner states and expert judgment, such that these accessibility features and supports enable access to assessment content while avoiding altering the construct being assessed (SC 06, pp. 114-121). Other sources of information included results from over 50,000 First Contact Survey responses and test administration observation studies (SC 01, p. 16). DLM notes in their submission the lack of published research on accommodations for SWSCD and the added challenge of computer-</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>based assessment for that student population.</p> <p>Attention to individual needs is reflected in the expectation that students will be assessed using their normal response mode, and that tools/manipulatives may be modified (e.g., replacing image with physical object) as appropriate. Student familiarity with delivery via KITE is aided by availability of simulated student accounts with various PNP features enabled, and via practice testlets (SC 05, pp. 32-34).</p> <p>Evidence that accommodations allow for meaningful interpretation of results and comparison of scores for students participating with/without accommodations comes from teacher survey (SC 06, pp. 205-06).</p> <p>DLM indicates that research is ongoing on use and effectiveness of accommodations and validity of inferences that may be made about test scores under accommodated conditions (SC 06, pp. 250-51).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Exceptional Accommodation Requests</b></p> <p>DLM indicates that this portion of the Critical Element is addressed in individual State submissions</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required from the consortium</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b></p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Accommodations and Participation Decisions are Consistent with State Policy</b></p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16— Appendices)</p> <p><u>SC 01</u> (Accessibility Manual 2015-16)</p> <p>DLM notes: THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC PROCEDURES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS</p>	<p><b>Accommodations and Participation Decisions Are Consistent with State Policy</b></p> <p>Although the DLM provides adequate information on participation and accommodations, the consortium does not monitor these aspects of test administration, but instead leaves to each state to use DLM guidelines (as well as any supplementary guidelines they may have) to design and implement a monitoring process.</p> <p>The reviewers suggest it might be appropriate/advisable for member states to report back to the Consortium the results of state-level monitoring to ensure that inclusion and accommodations decisions are consistent with their own state policies. Sharing such information could usefully inform the practices of all member states and strengthen the program.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Inclusion and Accommodation Decisions Are Appropriate to Address Student Needs</b></p> <p><u>SC 01</u> (Accessibility Manual 2015-16)</p> <p>DLM notes: THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC PROCEDURES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS</p>	<p><b>Inclusion and Accommodation Decisions Are Appropriate to Address Student Needs</b></p> <p>DLM provides guidance on the selection of accommodations based on student needs and preferences to which states may refer when developing their own plans and standards for monitoring to ensure appropriateness of participation and accommodations.</p> <p>See reviewers’ suggestion under 5.4.1 above.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Accommodations are Consistent with Those During Instruction/Practice</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Accommodations are Consistent with Those During Instruction/Practice</b></p> <p>DLM recommends that accommodations used during the assessment are consistent with those provided</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p>DLM notes: THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC PROCEDURES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS</p>	<p>during instruction (SC 01, pp. 17-21). States develop their own plans for monitoring this practice.</p> <p>The Consortium also collects indirect evidence of consistency between accommodations for assessment and instruction through a teacher survey (SC 06, pp. 132-134). It appears that this survey only involved collection of responses to three items using a 4-point Likert-type scale (strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree) with no evidence that teachers had the opportunity to provide elaboration (e.g., comments that could be coded/collated). Given the results of the survey (nearly 74% agree/strongly agree that student was able to use accessibility features, 71.3% agree/strongly agree that accessibility features during assessment were similar to those used in instruction), the reviewers are not comfortable with DLM’s statement on p. 134 that, “These data support the conclusions that the accessibility features of the DLM alternate assessment were effectively used by students, emulated accessibility features used during instruction, and met student needs for test administration.” The reviewers would like to see further inquiry into these matters to ascertain why the for the approximately one in four teachers indicated that accommodations and accessibility features did not meet students’ needs.</p> <p>DLM identifies three categories of support, the first of which is supports activated by PNP and delivered via KITE system. Although the DLM Consortium makes no mention of this option for further research to demonstrate monitoring of accommodations, it seems to the reviewers that it would not be difficult to track use of those supports.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Accommodations are Consistent with IEP or 504 Team</b></p> <p>SC 02 (Assessment Coordinator Manual 2015-16)</p> <p>DLM notes: THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC PROCEDURES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS</p>	<p><b>Accommodations are Consistent with IEP or 504 Team</b></p> <p>While DLM does not directly monitor consistency of assessment accommodations with those identified by students IEP Team or 504 team, the KITE Educator Portal offers two mechanisms (extracts) for creation of reports that can facilitate such monitoring.</p> <p>Given the importance of ensuring compliance with this guidance, it might be useful for DLM to strongly encourage use of those extracts.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Fidelity of Test Administration</b></p> <p>SC 06 Technical Manual Science 2015-16</p> <p>DLM notes: THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC PROCEDURES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS</p>	<p><b>Fidelity of Test Administration</b></p> <p>Evidence appears to be adequate for this section.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The reviewers would like to see further inquiry into these matters to ascertain why approximately one in four teachers indicated that accommodations and accessibility features did not meet students’ needs, and plans to address this.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</b></p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities;</li> </ul>	<p>This critical element (all factors) is addressed in individual state submissions</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply;</li> </ul>		<p>N/A</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>		<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required from the consortium (N/A for consortium).</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b></p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p><u>SC 11</u> (Standard Setting Technical Report 2016)</p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p>	<p><u>Method:</u> For Science, DLM utilized the same methodology (range-finding and pinpointing) used to set standards for DLM in ELA and mathematics in 2014-15.</p> <p>Vertical articulation was conducted to ensure cut points progressed logically as content expectations increased by grade level.</p> <p>DLM developed and implemented a multi-phased training process for panelists including online training prior to the standard setting workshop, additional training onsite, staff guidance and monitoring.</p> <p>Not included in listed evidence, but worth noting as a commendable practice is that panelists had access to sample testlets for any EE/linkage level assessed in a grade and upon request, these could be displayed in the online content management system (SC 11, p. 28).</p> <p>The reviewers have some question/concern about implications for standard setting in 2015-16 of the introduction of additional EEs in the future, as well as the possible shift from three to five linkage levels. It would be useful to include information about any discussion that may have taken place in that regard.</p> <p>SC 11, p. 9 contains the statement that, “Although science state partners voted on acceptance of final cut points, individual states had the option to adopt the consortium cut points or develop their own independent cut points.” This does not appear to be discussed further in the submission, raising a question about the methods/process that partner states might use to develop cut points (thus satisfying Department guidance).</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p><u>Panelists</u>: DLM panelist recruitment ensured representation from member states, all with considerable experience in science and/or special education; it was noted that nearly half of those involved had prior experience with standard setting activities (SC 11, pp. 23-24).</p> <p>Although reviewers recognize that panel membership may reflect teaching populations from member states, reviewers suggest that the Consortium endeavour to balance representation by race and gender better.</p>
<b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide justification for the make-up of the standard-setting panel, and a plan to improve representation by race and gender in future standard-setting activities.</li> <li>• Provide a plan and timeline for future standard-setting that may be necessitated by an increase in EEs and/or linkage levels.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 12</u> (External Alignment Study Technical Report)</p>	<p>DLM’s alternate academic achievement standards are based on Essential Elements, which parallel performance expectations set forth in the NGSS. Performance descriptors incorporate both disciplinary core ideas and science and engineering practices.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required from the consortium .</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Reporting Results</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16— Appendices)</p> <p>DLM notes: THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC REPORTING IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS</p>	<p><b>Reporting Results</b></p> <p>Participating states are provided with student data files in a timely manner. States are then responsible for reporting results on student achievement and participation (e.g., those students who were eligible but did not participate in testing). DLM also provides to states a guide to scores and reports (SC 07, Appendix F.2)</p> <p>Resources related to scoring and reporting are available to on the DLM website (including report prototypes for individual score reports and class, school, district, and state aggregated reports (SC 06, p. 170).</p> <p>DLM submission also indicates that streamlined quality control procedures and automated data checks have been taken to deliver results in a timely manner in non-standard setting years.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Reports to Districts and Schools</b></p> <p><b>Assessment results reported to support appropriate uses of results</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16— Appendices)</p> <p><u>Interpretive Guides</u></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16— Appendices)</p>	<p><b>Reports to Districts and Schools</b></p> <p><b>Assessment results reported to support appropriate uses of results</b></p> <p>The individual student reports for science used the same template as used for ELA and mathematics; these were developed with input from all stakeholder groups who will need/want to understand and use results. Sample reports are included in evidence (Appendix F.3, F.4)</p> <p>As part of their validity studies during development of the ELA and mathematics assessments, DLM conducted a study of design and use of score reports (SC 06, pp. 211-217). There was no indication of any intention to repeat this study or conduct a related</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>DLM notes: THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC REPORTING AND INTERPRETIVE GUIDES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS</p>	<p>study based on the score reports for science. Although changes in the report content/format were small ones intended to accommodate differences between subjects, the reviewers imagine that such a study would be useful, if only to verify/validate the clarity and effectiveness of DLM Science reports.</p> <p>Even more critical may be a repeat of survey reported for ELA/mathematics on use of reports to inform instruction. The survey referenced in the submission is based on DLM ELA/mathematics, not science. Given the reported paucity of attention to science instruction for SWSCD, the ability of teachers to use assessment results to inform instruction would seem to be an important concern that should be addressed.</p> <p>DLM does mention a survey planned for the 2017 administration of the science assessment (SC 06, p. 220) that will serve as a source of consequential validity data—but this is a survey of test administrators regarding their perceptions of the assessment contents (whether the test measures important academic skills/high expectations)—and not their anticipated uses of assessment data to drive instruction.</p> <p><u>Interpretive Guides</u></p> <p>DLM notes that while in 2015-16, science state partners chose to utilize the guides developed previously for ELA and mathematics, additional versions of guides are being developed to include science-specific examples of reports. This ties into issues/concerns raised immediately above.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;</li> <li>○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;</li> <li>○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Delivery of Student Reports</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Delivery of Student Reports</b></p> <p>Overall, DLM provides sufficient evidence to address most aspects of this factor. As noted above, it will be helpful to provide as soon as feasible, science-specific information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret test results and address academic needs of students.</p> <p>The submission does not explicitly address the availability of student reports in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request. However, while in 2015-16 Individual Student Score Reports were produced in English, the Parent Interpretive Guide was available on the DLM website in a Spanish version. The DLM Consortium notes that all consortium scoring and reporting resources were provided in MS Word so member states can edit/provide resources in alternate formats, as necessary.</p> <p>Although the DLM Consortium did not direct peer reviewers to individual state submissions here, the reviewers would expect individual states to elaborate on this topic further, for example, how the reports are provided in other languages as needed.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Process and Timeline</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p>DLM notes: THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC PRACTICES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS</p>	<p><b>Process and Timeline</b></p> <p>Process and Timeline information in the submission reflects the process for 2014-15—that is, only for ELA and mathematics. More information, related specifically to the science assessment, is needed to confirm that participating states followed a practical process/timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals.</p> <p>The DLM Consortium mentions that they have taken</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		steps to support states in the timely reporting during non-standard setting years (SC 06, pp. 171-174). Some elaboration on when/on what basis standard setting would be conducted again would be helpful.
<b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Particularly in light of the fact that the DLM Consortium identifies “improving instruction” as one of three key purposes of the assessment, as soon as possible the DLM staff should conduct a survey on the use of science reports to inform instruction and submit the results by December 2017.</li> </ul>		

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

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## March 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

# STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

## Contents

<b>SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	4
2.2 – Item Development.....	8
2.3 – Test Administration.....	11
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration.....	14
2.5 – Test Security .....	17
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....	21
<b>SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....</b>	<b>25</b>
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	26
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	30
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure .....	34
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables.....	40
<b>SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER .....</b>	<b>42</b>
4.1 – Reliability.....	42
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	45
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	47
4.4 – Scoring .....	49
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms .....	52
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment .....	53
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance.....	55
<b>SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS .....</b>	<b>58</b>
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities .....	59
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	63
5.3 – Accommodations.....	66
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations.....	70
<b>SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .</b>	<b>72</b>
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....	73
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards .....	76
6.4 – Reporting.....	80

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

### SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results;</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills);</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.</li> </ul>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b>  <b>Evidence #2.1.1: SAT® Suite Technical Manual (October 2017)</b>            The technical manual describes the test design and test development process for the SAT assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 1 - 20 provide an overview of the assessment, including a description its purpose, test format and content, scores derived from the assessment and the intended use of results.</li> <li>• Pages 27 - 52 provide a detailed description of test development procedures.</li> <li>• Additionally, see the evidence presented in response to section 3 and 4 regarding the technical quality of the SAT.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.2: College Board + Connecticut; SAT® Suite of Assessments: Alignment to Connecticut Standards (October 2016)</b>            The College Board conducted an alignment study to determine how the SAT and its related assessment aligned to the Connecticut state standards. This document provides detailed information regarding the study findings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 16 - 101 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to the state’s standards for English Language Arts and Math in grades 11 and 12.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.3: College Board + Delaware; SAT® Suite of Assessments: Alignment to Delaware Standards (October 2016)</b>            The College Board conducted an alignment study to determine how the SAT and its related assessment aligned to the Delaware state standards. This document provides detailed information regarding the study findings.</p>	<p><b>Purposes and intended interpretations</b>  <b>Overall, peers would like to see more claims and evidence regarding how states are incorporating SAT scores into their high school accountability system. What studies or information is being collected?</b></p> <p>Pg 9 “Because it is more closely aligned to both high school instruction and post-high school requirements, the SAT serves as evidence of the hard work students have performed in high school” . Peers would like to see evidence for this claim.</p> <p><b>Test Designs and Blueprints</b>            2.1.8 Test Specs – detailed specs provided, when considered in conjunction with the individual states’ standards, does offer evidence of assessments that test whole range of standards, up to the limitations described in the “Connection to Content Standards.”</p> <p><b>Connection to Content Standards</b>            Mathematical practices described on page 43. Math content appears to be focused on linear, quadratic, and other polynomial function families. No mention of logarithmic or exponential families that are in the CCSS. Check Table A-3.11 Exponential functions listed in Table A-3.11. There does not appear to be an alignment to the state’s academic content standards in math.</p> <p>States are advised to document plans to assess the full breadth of the adopted standard, including for ELA use of technology, conducting research, speaking, and listening, which are not addressed by the SAT suite. Other standards not included in the SAT are described in the Alignment document 2.1.3 (e.g., Delaware)</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>• Pages 16 - 106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to the state’s standards for English Language Arts/Literacy and Math in grades 11 and 12.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.4: College Board + Maine; SAT® Suite of Assessments: Alignment to Maine Standards (October 2016)</b> The College Board conducted an alignment study to determine how the SAT and its related assessment aligned to the Maine state standards. This document provides detailed information regarding the study findings.</p> <p>• Pages 16 - 106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to the state’s standards for English Language Arts/Literacy and Math in grades 11 and 12.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.5: College Board + Michigan; SAT® Suite of Assessments: Alignment to Michigan Standards (2015)</b> The College Board conducted an alignment study to determine how the SAT and its related assessment aligned to the Michigan state standards.</p> <p>This document provides detailed information regarding the study findings.</p> <p>• Pages 16 - 106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to the state’s standards for English Language Arts/Literacy and Math in grades 11 and 12.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.6: College Board + New Hampshire; SAT® Suite of Assessments: Alignment to New Hampshire Standards (October 2016)</b> The College Board conducted an alignment study to determine how the SAT and its related assessment aligned to the New Hampshire state standards. This document provides detailed information regarding</p>	<p>SAT indicated there was an independent alignment study conducted in 2016, but this study was not provided for review.</p> <p>Connecticut – non-third party alignment (conducted by College Board, Oct. 2016) study of CT’s 2010 standards: acknowledges which standards are not assessed, namely, speaking and listening, construction mathematical representations.</p> <p>Delaware - non-third party alignment (conducted by College Board, Oct. 2016) study of DE’s 2010 standards: acknowledge which standards are not assessed, namely, speaking and listening and standards related to technology use.</p> <p>Illinois – (2010) acknowledges which standards are not assessed, namely, speaking, listening, presentations, capitalization, spelling, construction mathematical representations.</p> <p>Maine: (2010) standards not addressed: speaking, listening, presentations, capitalization, spelling, constructing mathematical representations, as well as “advanced” standards, such as vectors, matrices, using probability to make decisions.</p> <p>Michigan: acknowledges which standards are not assessed, namely, speaking, listening, presentations, capitalization, spelling, construction mathematical representations.</p> <p>New Hampshire: standards not addressed: speaking, listening, capitalization, spelling, and several writing standards in history/social studies, science, and technical subjects. Mathematical modeling is covered</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>the study findings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 16 - 106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to the state’s standards for English Language Arts/Literacy and Math in grades 11 and 12.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.7: College Board + Illinois; SAT@ Suite of Assessments: Alignment to Illinois Standards (October 2016)</b></p> <p>The College Board conducted an alignment study to determine how the SAT and its related assessment aligned to the Illinois state standards. This document provides detailed information regarding the study findings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 16 - 106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to the state’s standards for English Language Arts/Literacy and Math in grades 11 and 12.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)</b></p> <p>This document provides details regarding how our test is constructed and includes test blueprints, evidentiary foundation, and examples of text complexity and sample questions. While we recommend that reviewers consider the entire development process.</p>	<p>differently than stated in NH standards.</p> <p><b>Item Descriptions for ELA and Mathematics</b></p> <p>The content specs and blueprint sections of Tech Manual Appendix 3 contain long lists of statements that could be used to infer what the items ask of students.</p> <p>Test specs document supplies the same descriptive information as Appendix 3, albeit with sample items. General descriptive information is given for broad swaths of item types.</p> <p>Detailed item descriptions, test development procedures and guiding principles, and sample items (2.1.8, Sections III and IV). “Important Features” details the type of skills, thinking, expected to be assessed by items.</p>
<b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills);</li> </ul>		

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

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2.2 – Item Development</b></p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b></p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 28 – 34 describe the processes used to ensure the fairness of the assessment.</li> <li>• Pages 27 - 52 provide a detailed description of test development procedures.</li> <li>• Pages 108 - 114 describe the evidentiary foundation for the decisions made about the content included in the SAT.</li> <li>• Pages 120 - 133 describe the College Board pilot study of the predictive validity of the SAT.</li> <li>• Pages 133 - 135 describe how the SAT assesses student readiness for college.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board SAT Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire and Illinois</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 7 - 8 in each of the alignment documents contain a section called The Alignment conducted their alignment study.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please refer to the sections identified as evidence in support of Critical Element 2.2.</li> </ul>	<p>Is there information regarding the demographic characteristics of the item writers and reviewers? Do the states that use this assessment as an accountability assessment have teachers on the committees?</p> <p>Who are the “independent experts’ active in the field” and what is the set of criteria they use to judge an item?</p> <p>Where are the item writer guidelines that are described on page 41 (PDF page 50) of the technical manual? Is there diversity in the item writer pool or the review process?</p> <p>Tech Manual, Page 32 –lists typically classroom teachers. Is that enough to show representation from different ethnic and socio-economic groups to screen for sensitivity and fairness. Are there tables of the reviewers? For items, passages, forms?</p> <p>Page 32, 46. “The guidelines provided to our fairness reviewers as they review test questions and stimuli are summarized in this chapter.” The guidelines were not provided for review for verification of the process/procedures used.</p> <p>Evidence provided for cognitive complexity is minimal</p> <p>Lists 2.1.2 – 2.1.7 – state alignment documents. State alignment documents do not address cognitive processes alignment</p> <p>Lists 2.2.1 – this document discusses the predictive validity of the old test and proposed revisions to the SAT</p> <p>Lists 2.2.2 – this document is a study focused on the validity of using the SAT for college admission decisions. It does not address cognitive processes</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		Lists 3.2.2 – Summary of cognitive lab. More details about the methodology, content, and interpretations are needed to provide a convincing argument that the high level cognitive processes purported to be assessed are indeed drawn upon by students as they engage with the SAT.
<b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:            Evidence of reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of guidelines for item writers in fairness within the development and review process.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>• Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments;</li> <li>• If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b>  <b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b>          • Pages 53 - 59 describe the standardized test administration procedures for standard administrations and for administration of the test with accommodations.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.1: The SAT School Day Supervisor Manual (Spring 2017)</b>          This manual provides instructions for supervisors who are responsible for overseeing the administration on how to prepare for test day, protocol for reporting test irregularities, and guidance on how to maintain test security.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.2: The SAT School Day Test Room Manual (Spring 2017)</b>          This manual provides instructions for associate supervisors (also referred to as test room coordinators) who will proctor the exam. This manual contains test day scripts for standard test administrations.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b>          This manual provides instructions for supervisors who will be responsible for registering students for testing accommodations and managing nonstandard test administrations.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.4: SAT School Day Test Center Supervisor Training (2016)</b>          This PowerPoint deck contains the basic information presented to all Test Center Supervisors in online and in-person training sessions and reviews policies, procedures and best</p>	<p>Documentation in the administration manuals appears to be sufficient, except for accommodation administration.          2.1.1 establishes standardized procedures and 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3, &amp; 2.3.4 communicate these procedures</p> <p>Communication procedures appear to be sufficient across the different administration manuals for assessments administered to the general population. Training webinar slides are also informative for accommodations and how to get them approved.          3.5 – Accommodations Webinar; however, this does not adequately address how to administer read aloud or scribe accommodations  <b>2.3.3:</b> detailed instructions and procedures          2.3.5: training for testing with accommodations</p> <p>Does College Board collect information to ensure that school officials in every state have been trained and can administer the assessment under standardized conditions?</p> <p>Rosters may be maintained at the state level. Should SAT get a copy?</p> <p>2.3.7 There is no agreement in this form that the individual has participated in any training. No evidence that training occurred.</p> <p>There was no verification of training participation.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>practices related to SAT test administration. This deck may have been customized for state partners based on particular local requirements. Please refer to the submissions of our state partners for additional information and evidence of test center supervisor training.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.5: SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017)</b> This PowerPoint deck contains the basic information presented to all SSD supervisors via online and in-person training sessions and reviews the policies and procedures related to nonstandard SAT administrations. This deck may have been customized for state partners based on particular local requirements. Please refer to the submissions of our state partners for additional information and evidence of accommodations training.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.7: SAT Testing Staff Agreement</b> Prior to test day, all testing staff must sign this agreement to signify that they accept the conditions and requirements of SAT administration.</p>	
<b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Provide evidence to address policies and procedures for standardized test administration that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, specifically administration with accommodations, that is, read aloud and scribe;</li> <li>• Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s assessment receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments, including verification of training.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

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

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

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b> The below information lists the resources the College Board provides to the states to support uniform standardized test administration procedures across districts and schools.</p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 55 describes the roles and responsibilities of different test administration staff, delineates the qualifications testing staff should possess, and explains the training testing staff should receive.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.1: The SAT School Day Supervisor Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 4 - 32: The College Board provides guidance on the number of staff needed to proctor and examination, how to set up test administration rooms and seating plans to facilitate implementation, and how to use the Supervisor irregularity form. The manual also includes a suggested timeline for when proctors and other test administration staff should be trained.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.2: The SAT School Day Test Room Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 3 - 12 include information on how to monitor test administration and report testing irregularities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p>	<p>The Technical Manual describes detailed requirements of test administrators (see p. 53), including qualifications, timing, test materials, and observation during testing. Specifications provided for accommodations and handling of materials. security procedures provided. Irregularity reports must be completed by administrators.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

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
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 13 - 23 include information on how to monitor the test administration and report testing irregularities that may take place during a nonstandard test administration.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.4: SAT School Day Test Center Supervisor Training (2016)</b>                      This PowerPoint deck contains the basic information presented to all Test Center Supervisors in online and in-person training sessions and reviews policies, procedures and best practices related to SAT test administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 9 - 36 review all of the actions that should take place before, during, and after the test administration. This section of the presentation clearly delineates the responsibilities of test center supervisors, proctors, monitors, and other staff.</li> </ul>	
<b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>2.5 – Test Security</b></p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> <li>Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> </ul>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b>  <b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 58 - 59 describe the procedures the College Board has designed to maintain test security at all times.</li> <li>Pages 66 - 68 describe the College Board’s post-test analysis, which is conducted as a component of the company’s test security procedures.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.1: The SAT School Day Supervisor Manual (Spring 2017)</b>  This manual provides guidance for supervisors who are responsible for overseeing the administration on how to maintain test security:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 8 – 9 describe the information supervisors should communicate to staff in order to maintain test security. Seating policies, devised to reduce the possibility of cheating, are described in this section.</li> <li>Pages 12 – 13 describe how supervisors should prepare student for test day and includes information on items and behaviors that are not allowed in the test area.</li> <li>Pages 14 - 26 provide instructions on how to receive and securely store materials until test day, and how to report on test administration irregularities.</li> <li>Pages 39 - 40 include a sample irregularities report that supervisors use to begin investigation of test administration issues.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.2: The SAT School Day Test Room Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 1 - 12 provide instruction on standardized</li> </ul>	<p><b>Prevention of assessment irregularities</b>  Manuals provide sufficient documentation of recommended procedures. States should supply evidence that proctors have been trained. Perhaps local policies for checking in on test rooms that procedures have been implemented according to the documentation.</p> <p><b>Detection of irregularities</b>  2.3.1 pp. 39-40: form to report irregularities  2.1.1 pp. 66-68: statistical analysis for irregularities  2.3.4 pp. 23-30</p> <p>Unclear how states participate in monitoring, auditing, and evaluating these procedures,</p> <p><b>Investigations of irregularities</b>  SAT internal processes are described in 2.5.2 and 2.5.3; however, 2.5.3 is very high level and points to confidential procedures for investigating suspect scores.  2.5.3 - 2.5.2: How and Why ETS Questions Scores (College Board Program) in cases not due to test irregularities  Unclear how states participate in monitoring, auditing, and evaluating these procedures</p> <p>Should the state documentation also contain procedures for how local incidents are investigated and remediated?  Generally, scores are canceled with the student’s knowledge, and there are various options offered to the student to remedy their records. See 2.5.2 for many details.  2.5.3 –no specifics for remediation are provided.  Unclear how states participate in monitoring, auditing, and evaluating these procedures</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>testing procedures devised to maintain security during test administration. Information in this section includes how to maintain security in the testing room and report administration irregularities.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b>            • Pages 13 - 23 provide instruction on standardized testing procedures devised to maintain security during nonstandard test administrations. Information in this section includes how to maintain security in the testing room and report administration irregularities.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.4: SAT School Day Test Center Supervisor Training (2016)</b>            • Pages 23 - 30: The College Board trains test administration staff (including supervisors, coordinators, and administrators) on how to report and address irregularities they may encounter on test day.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.5.1: SAT School Day Registration and Questionnaire Guide (2017)</b>            This brochure provides important information for students so that they may prepare for test day.            • Pages 15 – 21 provide information on test security procedures, what will be allowed into testing rooms, and how to report suspicious behavior.            • Pages 25 – 26 and 27 - 30 describe processes that may take place in order to conserve test integrity and maintain test security.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.5.2: Why and How ETS Questions Scores (College Board Programs) (2016)</b></p>	<p>2.5.2 &amp; 2.5.3 – ETS procedures for handling irregularities</p> <p>Does SAT conduct any analysis on the irregularity reports or conduct any statistical analysis on potential irregularity issues? This evidence was not provided. Substantial evidence provided illustrated proactive steps to prevent issues but not much about post-irregularity issues. The ETS report indicates it does review individual student level cheating issues. Peers are unclear about how College Board reviews potential school-wide, district-wide, or state-level issues? Are there any reports or analysis done for the state at a school/district level?</p> <p>SAT did not provide specifics on remediation- what does the state do and how does SAT inform the SEA?</p> <p>The state documentation will need to include procedures on how local incidents are investigated and remediated?</p> <p>Individual states should provide evidence that these procedures are implemented and how they deal with detected irregularities (whether detected at test time or during post-test analysis at ETS).</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>This document describes the ways that ETS, our testing subcontractor, investigates cases that may affect the validity of test scores.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.5.3: Investigation and Remediation of SAT Irregularities (2018)</b></p> <p>This document provides a high level overview of the procedures the College Board undertakes to investigate irregularities and remediate any recurring issues.</p>	
<p><b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>Evidence of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration with documentation of training.</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities but no specific data was provided to verify this process.</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> </ul>		

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

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</b></p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results;</li> <li>To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> <li>To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.</li> </ul>	<p>general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:  <b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 58 - 59 describe the procedures the College Board has designed to maintain test</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.1: The SAT School Day Supervisor Manual (Spring 2017)</b>  This manual provides guidance for supervisors who are responsible for overseeing the administration on how to maintain test security:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 12 – 13 describe how supervisors should prepare student for test day and includes information on items and behaviors that are not allowed in the test area.</li> <li>Pages 14 - 26 provide instructions on how to receive and securely store materials until test day, and report on test administration irregularities.</li> <li>Pages 39 - 40 include a sample irregularities report that supervisors use to begin investigation of test administration issues.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.2: The SAT School Day Test Room Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 1 - 12 provide instruction on standardized testing procedures devised to maintain security during test administration. Information in this section includes how to maintain security in the testing room and report administration irregularities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 13 - 23 provide instruction on standardized testing procedures devised to maintain security during nonstandard test administration. Information</li> </ul>	<p><i>College Board Information Security Policy (2014)</i> is a confidential document. It is in the process of being updated.</p> <p><i>College Board Guidelines for the Release of Data (2009)</i> is in the process of being updated.</p> <p>In the 2009 College Board guidelines for the release of data, it states the College Board owns the data. Is this still true for states that administer the SAT statewide?</p> <p>More information is needed to describe the process used if a data breach occurs and what steps are taken.</p> <p>Updated guides for the security policy and release of data would be useful and are needed.</p> <p>How does the SAP protect the integrity of its test materials in development, administration, and storage and use of results?</p> <p>No evidence was provided regarding the security measures used to protect the item bank or test bank.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence related to test security before and during test administration is submitted</li> <li>Two documents, not submitted, are in process of being updated: College Board Information Security Policy and College Board Guidelines for the Release of Data. These should be submitted for review when updated.</li> </ul> <p>2.1.1, pp. 58-59</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Peers had difficulty understanding evidence 2.6.2 – high level, vendor-developed overview of Axway products. How are these applicable to and used within the SAT program?</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>in this section includes how to maintain security in the testing room and report administration irregularities.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.4: SAT School Day Test Center Supervisor Training (2016)</b>                      • Pages 23 - 30: The College Board trains test coordinators, and administrators) on how to report and address irregularities they may encounter on test day.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.5.1: SAT School Day Registration and Questionnaire Guide (2017)</b>                      This brochure provides to students information about how the College Board secures their data and personally identifiable information.                      • Pages 26 – 36 describe the College Board privacy policy as it relates to students. This section also provides information regarding instances where scores may be canceled due to testing irregularities or misconduct, and how students may securely send their scores to colleges and university systems.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.6.1: Description of Test Management and Reporting System (2017)</b>                      This document provides an overview of the security of the College Board online test management and reporting system.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.6.2: Axway Secure Transport Data Sheet (2017)</b>                      The College Board provides data files to the state using an SFTP ad-hoc file transfer process provide by Tumbleweed, a secure managed file transfer (MFT) site managed by Axway. This data sheet, created by Axway, provides a high-level overview of all of their Secure Transport products, including</p>	<p>SAT did not address the Minimum N.                      Each state has individual reporting requirements.</p> <p>Note: some of the suggested documents relate to cheating, not securing student data.</p> <p>Information on paper storage and retrieval secure handling was not discussed sufficiently. How is security handled as tests are transported from SAT to the schools? Printing, shipping to schools?</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>their web-based SFTP service.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.6.3: Description of Confidential College Board Information Security Policy (2017)</b> The College Board has created a high level policy document that describes the processes in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of student level data. The policy is confidential, so this summary provides high level information regarding what the policy contains.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.6.4: College Board Privacy Policy (January 15, 2016)</b> This policy is currently accessible at <a href="http://www.collegeboard.org/privacy-policy">www.collegeboard.org/privacy-policy</a>. The document, as it appeared on this site on August 31, 2017, is submitted as evidence. It describes the College Board Data Privacy policy and privacy statements.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.6.5: College Board Guidelines for the Release of Data (2009)</b> This white paper describes the guidelines for the release of data obtained from test results to third party research institutions. Page 14 lists no releasable data elements for the SAT.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.6.6: ETS Legal Privacy and Security Notice</b> ETS manages the online test rostering system for the SAT. This document provides ETS' legal privacy and security notice.</p>	
<b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data during test development, administration, and storage and use of results;</li> <li>• To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
reporting of scores for all students and student groups.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• College Board Information Security Policy and College Board Guidelines for the Release of Data should be submitted for review when updated.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY**

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> <li>• If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math, no evidence will be provided related to a specific state’s alternate assessment.</b></p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 1 - 20 provide an overview of the assessment, including a description its purpose, test format and content, scores derived from the assessment and the intended use of results.</li> <li>• Pages 107 - 139 examine the validity of the SAT and includes information on the evidentiary foundations behind the test content, concordance between the current and previous version of the SAT, and the relationship between SAT scores and first-year grade point average, as well as the relationship between SAT scores and college and career readiness benchmarks.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tables A-3.1 – A-3.15 in Appendix 3 (pages 11-35) provide test content specifications and content domains and descriptions.</li> <li>• Appendix 5 (pages 37 – 65) provides additional detail regarding how statistical indices were computed.</li> <li>• Appendix 6 (pages 66 – 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> <li>• Appendix 7 (pages 321 - 396) displays the results of analyses performed to evaluate the validity of the SAT.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.1: An SAT Validity Primer (January 2015)</b></p>	<p>What studies has or will College Board conduct regarding the results of the assessment about high school instruction? Or how states will be using the results in their accountability system? Predictive validity of college readiness is one thing but for the purposes of states, the question is also “how do we get students to be college career ready?” What inferences are states making about schools and school instruction if they have many students who are college ready or few students who are college ready and what evidence will be collected around these claims?</p> <p><b>Documentation of Independent Alignment</b></p> <p>Alignment studies indicated that the standards were not completely aligned, Please provide additional evidence as requested for in critical element 2.1. Pg. 11 in the Delaware study states, “the redesigned assessments are not mysterious or tricky. They are completely transparent.” They focus on the knowledge and skills that are worthy of practice.” Again, there is little evidence to support this claim without an independent alignment study or access to a test form or test items.</p> <p>SAT does not assess Speaking and Listening. Thus states should supply plans for how those domains are or will be assessed if Speaking and Listening is part of the state standards. Also, since the essay is optional, what evidence does the state supply to show that the full breadth of the writing standards are assessed?</p> <p>Per 2.1.2 – 2.1.7 introduction note, an independent review of alignment of the SAT to the CT standards was proposed for 2016; document 2.1.2 indicates a revision in January 2018, but this revised document was not included.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>This paper provides validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores and important college outcomes. The evidence provided in this paper is based on a previous version of the SAT. Pages 131 – 135 of the <i>SAT Suite Technical Manual</i> describe how the new version of the SAT correlates with the previous version of the assessment.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.2: The Redesigned SAT® Pilot Predictive Validity Study: A First Look (2016)</b>            This white paper provides preliminary validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores resulting for the redesigned SAT and important college outcomes. The College Board is in the process of completing a validity study to replicate the findings of this white paper with a large, nationally representative sample. The study will examine students in the entering college class of fall 2017, the first full cohort to be admitted to college with the new SAT. For more information regarding this planned study, please refer to page 152 of the SAT Technical Manual.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire and Illinois</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 7 - 9 of each document describe how alignment between the standards and the assessment is determined.</li> <li>• Pages 16 - 106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to each respective state’s English Language Arts/Literacy and Math standards for grades 11 and 12.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.1.1: SAT Practice Test 8 (2017)</b>            This practice test is a version of a form that was used for a 2016 SAT test administration. The sample test includes the optional essay, answer key, answer sheet</p>	<p>The third party independent alignment review mentioned in the documentation as planned for 2016 was not provided.</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	and instructions on how to score the test	
<b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity. An independent alignment review is needed.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math: Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 1 - 20 provide an overview of the assessment, including a description its purpose, test format and content, scores derived from the assessment and the intended use of results.</li> <li>• Pages 107 - 139 examine the validity of the SAT and includes information on the evidentiary foundations behind the test content, concordance between the current and previous version of the SAT, and the relationship between SAT scores and first-year grade point average, as well as the relationship between SAT scores and college and career readiness benchmarks.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tables A-3.1 – A-3.15 in Appendix 3 (pages 11 – 35) provide test content specifications and content domains and descriptions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)</b></p> <p>This document provides information on the evidentiary foundations of the English Language Arts and Math domains of the SAT, the test specifications that describe how the SAT measures those content domains and a description of our test development processes.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.1: An SAT Validity Primer (January 2015)</b></p> <p>This paper provides validity evidence on the</p>	<p>Lists 2.1.2 – 2.1.7 – state alignment documents. The DE doc does not address cognitive processes alignment</p> <p>Lists 2.2.1 – this document discusses the predictive validity of the old test and proposed revisions to the SAT</p> <p>Lists 2.2.2 – this document is a study focused on the validity of using the SAT for college admission decisions. It does not address cognitive processes</p> <p>Lists 3.2.2 – Summary of cognitive lab study – why is this document marked as a draft? It is very short, does not give the items used in the study, nor does it name the cognitive processes each item was intended to evoke. It does not make explicit what evidence led to which conclusions. Plus, the number of items used in this study is very small (i.e., 10 math and 13 ELA). More details about the methodology, content, and interpretations are needed to provide a convincing argument that the high level cognitive processes purported to be assessed are indeed drawn upon by students as they engage with the SAT. This statement seems to contradict the summary.</p> <p>Cognitive study seemed like a summary of the study without any analysis. What were the specific interview questions? Besides vocabulary and wording being difficult, how did the students perform on the items they thought were hard or easy? How did the students perform? How did this research influence item development? Any ELL or special education students included? How does this study validate the intended and appropriate cognitive processes based on the states’ academic content standards?</p> <p>3.2.2, p. 4, cog lab study: <b>Conclusion</b> states, “The cognitive processes lab study conducted using TAPs provided important feedback to College Board content experts during the development of questions</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>relationship between SAT scores and important college outcomes. The evidence provided in this paper is based on a previous version of the SAT. Pages 131 – 135 of the <i>SAT Suite Technical Manual</i> describe how the new version of the SAT correlates with the previous version of the assessment.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.2: The Redesigned SAT® Pilot Predictive Validity Study: A First Look (2016)</b> This white paper provides preliminary validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores resulting for the redesigned SAT and important college outcomes. The College Board is in the process of completing a validity study to replicate the findings of this white paper with a large, nationally representative sample. The study will examine students in the entering college class of fall 2017, the first full cohort to be admitted to college with the new SAT. For more information regarding this planned study, please refer to page 152 of the SAT Technical Manual.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire and Illinois</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 7 - 9 of each document describe how alignment between the standards and the assessment is determined.</li> <li>• Pages 16 - 106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to each respective state’s English Language Arts/Literacy and Math standards for grades 11 and 12.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.2.1: Summary of Validity Evidence for Cognitive Processes (2018)</b> This document provides an overview of how the</p>	<p>for the SAT. Since the newly-designed question types presented in the study were ultimately incorporated into the Redesigned SAT, the study also provides important validation of the cognitive processes students use when approaching these and other questions now on the test.” However, data and analysis in support of this statement was not provided.</p> <p>2.2.1-Tech Manual, pp. 132-3: “the results of this pilot study showed that new SAT scores remain as predictive of college success as old SAT scores. This is important to note as the redesign of the SAT was first and foremost focused on more closely aligning the content and skills tested on the SAT with those content and skills that research indicates are critical for college success. In making these important changes to the test, that the strong predictive validity was also maintained is an important accomplishment of the redesign.” However, there was no evidence that the development and selection of 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 provided.</p> <p>3.2.1 – lists much of the alignment evidence provided by ETS, however, it’s not clear that these were conducted by external content experts to align with cognitive processes.</p> <p>3.2.2 (Revised) – Report provides some evidence that test-takers are not using intended cognitive processes, especially in mathematics, for some items. Limited number of items.</p> <p>More evidence needed to indicate that the items are really tapping into the cognitive processes as</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>evidence listed above is pertinent to the claim that the SAT assesses the intended cognitive processes related to English Language Arts/ Literacy and Math in grades 11 and 12</p> <p><b>Evidence #3.2.2: CONFIDENTIAL Summary of Cognitive Laboratory Study for the Redesigned SAT Conducted on March 16, 2013 (2018)</b></p> <p>This white paper summarizes the results of a study using Think-aloud Protocols conducted during the design process for the Redesigned SAT. The study provided evidence for how students were approaching and interpreting items in English Language Arts, Literacy, and Math.</p>	<p>indicated by the states' content standards.</p> <p>Cognitive processes study was conducted in 2013; updated study addressing more of the items, should be conducted to address alignment with state standards</p>
<b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State's academic content standards.</li> </ul>		

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

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b></p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 39 - 45 describe how test items are created and reviewed. This section describes the statistical indices computed to determine the appropriateness of items for use in operational forms of the SAT (i.e. equated p-values, r-biserials, and Mantel-Haenszel DIF.</li> <li>• Pages 47 - 49 describe how the College Board develops the optional SAT Essay test, which is administered by some of our state clients to assess student writing skills.</li> <li>• Pages 75 - 106 describe various psychometric analysis and their results. These procedures include scaling procedures, equating, analysis of normative information, reliability analysis and additional psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> <li>• Pages 107 - 139 examine the validity of the SAT, including the relationship between SAT scores and first-year grade point average as well as the relationship between SAT scores and college and career readiness benchmarks.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 5 (pages 37 – 65) provides additional detail regarding how statistical indices were computed.</li> <li>• Appendix 6 (pages 66 – 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> <li>• Appendix 7 (pages 321 – 396) displays the results of analyses performed to evaluate the validity of the</li> </ul>	<p>Benchmarks for Math and ERW were established using the previous version of the SAT. (page 144 of the technical manual). These Benchmarks are purported to indicate 75% probabilities of earning a C or better in an introductory college level course</p> <p>The sample score report, Evidence 5.1.4, was the evidence used to provide an overview of how scores and sub scores are reported. How does this relate back to the state standards and how can teachers use it? The sub score names on the score report do not match the sub domains of the content standards</p> <p>There are also studies linking the old SAT scores to the new SAT scores (concordance studies, p. 124 of the technical manual), but this text states explicitly that the scores are not interchangeable – likely due to different underlying structures of the old and new tests (e.g., relative weights of different content, etc.). With this in mind, the evidence of the use of SAT scores to predict college success seems adequate. But this does not indicate how the internal structure aligns to the state standards.</p> <p>3.3.2-3.37. Analyses of internal structure-item correlations and dimensionality of assessment are not consistent with standards and interpretation of results. The intercorrelations reveal a very large, but not perfect, correlation among sub scores of items. This is not strong evidence that the sub scores are measuring different underlying factors.</p> <p><b>2.1.1:</b> pp. 44, 45: description of DIF Analyses, with results in the appendix. <b>2.1.1.a,</b> pp. 50-63: results of DIF analyses indicate low or no DIF and does not include students with disabilities.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>SAT.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)</b>                      This document provides details regarding how our test is constructed and includes test blueprints, evidentiary foundation, and examples of text complexity and sample questions. While we recommend that reviewers consider the entire document as evidence in support of this critical element, the following sections should be of particular interest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 41 – 69 provide test specifications and blueprints for the SAT Evidence-Based Reading and Writing test including scores and sub-scores consistent with the sub-domain structures of the academic content standards on which the interpretations and uses of results are based.</li> <li>• Pages 70 - 81 provide test specifications for the optional SAT Essay test.</li> <li>• Pages 132 – 158 provide test specifications and blueprints for the SAT Math test including scores and sub-scores consistent with the sub-domain structures of the academic content standards on which the interpretations and uses of results are based.</li> <li>• Pages 198 – 206 provide an overview of SAT development process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.1: Scaling for the SAT Suite of Assessments (2017)</b>                      • Pages 66 – 74 describe the characteristics of SAT sub-score scaling</p> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.2: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report- Connecticut (April</b></p>	<p>DE, ME, and MI included correlations among sub scores on correlations between the Reading Test Score, the Writing and Language Test Score, the Evidence-Based Reading and Writing (ERW) Section Score, and the Dimension Scores on Essay. This provides evidence that these scores are only moderately correlated and measuring somewhat different constructs.</p> <p>However, no evidence was provided of a dimensionality (or factor) analysis of the SAT. There was no evidence provided that the sub scores are based on analyses.</p> <p>As states use the SAT as their accountability measure, the interpretations of the scores may be different than the originally intended use of SAT scores. Will College Board be studying this and produce research that is useful for states if they begin making claims that have not been previously studied on the SAT?</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>2017)</b>            This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 Connecticut SAT school day administration. The report includes a variety of test analysis based on the data gathered from the test administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 15 - 28 provide Scale Score Moments, Intercorrelations and Reliability for the two SAT Forms administered on test day. The tables in this section provided information for by form and disaggregated by various subgroups.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.3: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report- Delaware (April 2017)</b>            This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 SAT school day administration. The report includes a variety of test analysis based on the data gathered from the test administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 15 – 22 provide Scale Score Moments, Intercorrelations and Reliability for the two SAT Forms administered on test day. The tables in this section provided information for by form and disaggregated by various subgroups.</li> <li>• Page 60 provide tables demonstrating correlations of three essay dimension scores and correlations between the Reading Test</li> </ul> <p>Score, the Writing and Language Test Score, the Evidence-Based Reading and Writing (ERW) Section Score, and the Dimension Scores on Essay.</p> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.4: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report – Maine (April 2017)</b>            This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 SAT school</p>	

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>day administration. The report includes a variety of test analysis based on the data gathered from the test administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 15 – 21 provide Scale Score Moments, Intercorrelations and Reliability for the two SAT Forms administered on test day. The tables in this section provided information for by form and disaggregated by various subgroups.</li> <li>• Page 60 provide tables demonstrating correlations of three essay dimension scores and correlations between the Reading Test Score, the Writing and Language Test Score, the Evidence-Based Reading and Writing (ERW) Section Score, and the Dimension Scores on Essay.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.5: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report – Michigan (April 2017)</b>  This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 SAT school day administration. The report includes a variety of test analysis based on the data gathered from the test administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 15 – 29 provide Scale Score Moments, Intercorrelations and Reliability for the two SAT Forms administered on test day. The tables in this section provided information for by form and disaggregated by various subgroups.</li> </ul> <p>Page 75 provide tables demonstrating correlations of three essay dimension scores and correlations between the Reading Test Score, the Writing and Language Test Score, the Evidence-Based Reading and Writing (ERW) Section Score, and the Dimension Scores on Essay.</p> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.6: SAT Suite of Assessments</b></p>	

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>Administration Report – New Hampshire (April 2017)</b>                      This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 SAT school day administration. The report includes a variety of test analysis based on the data gathered from the test administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 15 – 21 provide Scale Score Moments, Intercorrelations and Reliability for the two SAT Forms administered on test day. The tables in this section provided information for by form and disaggregated by various subgroups.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.7: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report – Illinois (April 2017)</b>                      This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 SAT school day administration. The report includes a variety of test analysis based on the data gathered from the test administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 18 – 26 provide Scale Score Moments, Intercorrelations and Reliability for the two SAT Forms administered on test day. The tables in this section provided information for by form and disaggregated by various subgroups.</li> </ul>	
<b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide 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.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b>  <b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b>            • Pages 114 - 135 include information on concordance between the current and previous version of the SAT, the relationship between SAT scores and first-year grade point average, and the relationship between SAT scores and college and career readiness benchmarks.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.1: An SAT Validity Primer (January 2015)</b>            This paper provides validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores and important college outcomes. The evidence provided in this paper is based on a previous version of the SAT. Pages 131 – 135 of the <i>SAT Suite Technical Manual</i> describe how the new version of the SAT correlates with the previous version of the assessment.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.2: The Redesigned SAT® Pilot Predictive Validity Study: A First Look (2016)</b>            This white paper provides preliminary validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores resulting for the redesigned SAT and important college outcomes. The College Board is in the process of completing a validity study to replicate the findings of this white paper with a large, nationally representative sample. The study will examine students in the entering college class of fall 2017, the first full cohort to be admitted to college with the new SAT. For more information regarding this planned study, please refer to page 152 of the SAT Technical Manual.</p> <p><b>Evidence #4.7.1: Excerpt from TAC</b></p>	<p>The documentation showing the predictive relationships between the SAT and college success is adequate, particularly when taken with the evidence for the concordance studies between the old and new versions of the SAT.</p> <p><b>2.2.1:</b> Validity Primer provides strong predictive validity evidence, for a previous version of the SAT. Must rely on how well the old and new version correlate. <b>2.2.2:</b> Predictive validity study on new SAT provides evidence that new SAT has similar predictive validity, as claimed.</p> <p>College Board should consider conducting studies comparing other assessment programs like NAEP, SBAC or PARCC.</p> <p>SAT may wish to consider high school teacher grades and GPA as part of the evidence for this element to address career ready students and not just college bound students.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>presentation regarding Validity Research</b>                      The College Board presents validity evidence to the Technical Advisory Committees of our state partners. These slides are an excerpt from these presentations and covers information regarding College Board past, current and future validity studies.</p>	
<p><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables , not necessarily associated with college success only.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4.1 – Reliability</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and SWD, EL, and forms administered with accommodations. and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement.</li> </ul>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b>  <b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 75 - 106 describe various psychometric analysis and their results. These procedures include scaling procedures, equating, analysis of normative information, reliability analysis and additional psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 6 (pages 66 - 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #4.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report Table of Contents</b>  This document displays the contents of a typical post-administration Test Analysis Report for the national administration of the SAT. The College Board provides state level administration reports to its state partners.  Please refer to evidence #3.3.2 – 3.3.7 for the state specific administration reports.</p>	<p>There was very little analysis, interpretation of the data, lack of data for EL and SWD provided for this critical element.</p> <p>Tables were available for all demographic groups , but did not provide any information on students with disabilities, EL, or tests administered with accommodations.</p> <p><b>Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population-</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was no information provided for EL and SWD.</li> </ul> <p><b>Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments</b>  Average CSEMs are reasonable to slightly large: most are 6 to 8% of score range.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b></p> <p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population for students with disability, EL, and students who received accommodations.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT 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.

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</b></p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 21 - 26 provide an overview of College Board test development processes related to fairness.</li> <li>• Pages 27 - 52 provide a detailed description of test development procedures, including a description of item content and fairness reviews, item pre-testing and analysis, and information on the types of accommodations that are available to students.</li> <li>• Pages 60 - 74 describe the scoring procedures for the SAT, a description of how results are reported, and the item analysis that is performed on the operational items, including Differential Item Functioning (DIF) and Key Validation. The required qualifications for human scorers are also included in this section.</li> <li>• Pages 75 - 106 describe various psychometric analyses which are performed to identify any possible bias or inconsistent interpretations of assessment results across student groups.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 6 (pages 66 - 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <p>This manual provides instructions for supervisors who will be responsible for registering students for testing accommodations and managing nonstandard test administrations.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.5: SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017)</b></p>	<p>2.3.3 and 2.3.5 relate to fairness with respect to test administration, but not design, development, or analysis.</p> <p>Peers could not evaluate the criteria for fairness since the College Board did not provide the guidelines used for training experts. No items or training materials were provided.</p> <p>Design and Development</p> <p>2.1.1, page 22 “all questions are reviewed by external, independent reviewers who are asked to evaluate each question according to a set of criteria for content accuracy and fairness.” Who are the experts and what are the demographics of the reviewers?</p> <p>2.1.1, pp. 27-43: listed the test design procedures to ensure fairness, including item review for bias. The writers were instructed to read and use the white paper. It wasn’t evident that this was included in training.</p> <p>4.2.1: Universal Design was listed, but nothing was provided to verify its use. SAT provided comment in its listing that “College Board assessment writers are instructed to reference this paper regarding Universally Designed Assessment when creating assessment items for the SAT.” However, the peers noted there is no indication of this as part of the training and no verification this process was followed. Are items rejected during item review process that may indicate these practices are not implemented?</p> <p><b>Analysis</b></p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p>This PowerPoint deck is presented to SSD supervisors via online training sessions and reviews the policies and procedures related to nonstandard SAT administrations.</p> <p><b>Evidence #4.2.1: Creating Better Tests for Everyone Through Universally Designed Assessments (2004)</b></p> <p>College Board assessment writers are instructed to reference this paper regarding Universally Designed Assessment when creating assessment items for the SAT.</p>	<p>2.1.1.a, pp. 50-63: results of DIF analyses indicate low or no DIF, however, no DIF evidence was provided for SWD, El and no interpretation provided.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence for the 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, including the lack of any data related to students with disabilities and ELs.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b></p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b></p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 75 - 106 describe various psychometric analyses to study how the SAT assesses student performance across the full performance continuum.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 6 (pages 66 - 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #4.3.1: SAT Effectiveness at Representing Test Taker Achievement across the Performance Spectrum (2017)</b></p> <p>This document provides data regarding the SAT’s effectiveness at representing test taker achievement.</p>	<p>The graphs of different score distributions indicate that scores were earned across the continuum. Stated in 4.3.1, p. 3: “The normal curve with the corresponding mean and standard deviation is superimposed on each graph for comparison. The histograms show a reasonable spread of scores across the entire scale score range. The results reflect tests that well match the test taking population.”</p> <p>2.1.1.a: pp. 216 – 221 &amp; 4.3.1: CSEMs are almost identical across the score range, indicating similar precision across the spectrum (for low-, medium-, and high-achieving students).</p> <p>2.1.1a. Who is in the test taking population? Are all students who took the test represented, including students with disabilities and Els? Are students who received the SAA accommodation included in this test taking population?</p>
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 2 - 4 describe the scores derived from the assessment and the intended use of results.</li> <li>• Page 48 - 49 describes the inter-rater reliability statistics related to the essay portion of the assessment.</li> <li>• Pages 60 - 74 describe the scoring procedures for the SAT, a description of how results are reported, and the item analysis that is performed on the operational items, including Differential Item Functioning (DIF) and Key Validation. The required qualifications for human scorers are also included in this section.</li> <li>• Pages 75 - 106 describe scaling procedures, equating, analysis of normative information to support appropriate interpretations of the common score scales, reliability analysis and additional psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> <li>• Pages 133 - 135 describe the processes that were used to develop and validate the SAT benchmarks for college and career readiness.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 5 (pages 37 - 65) provides the essay scoring rubric and data to support the item analysis findings summarized in the technical manual.</li> <li>• Appendix 6 (pages 66 – 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.1: Scaling for the SAT Suite of Assessments (2017)</b></p> <p>This document describes the methodology and</p>	<p>The sample score report, Evidence 5.1.4, was the evidence used to get an overview of how scores and sub scores are reported.</p> <p>The subdivisions of the SAT do not map easily onto the Domains and Strands of the content standards.</p> <p>The state-specific alignment documents show how the standards fall into the different reported sections of the SAT</p> <p>Documentation provides evidence of scoring procedures and scoring involving human judgment; however, 3.3.3, 3.3.4, 3.3.5 do not provide I-RR; 3.3.7 does – how is this I-RR interpreted by states and ETS?</p> <p>The low IRR brings into question the validity of the scores for the essay test. What are SAT plans to address this issue?</p> <p>States that use the essay test should review and consider improvements in this section.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>scale development process for the SAT Suite of Assessments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 8 - 11 provide a description of the scores derived from the SAT and an overview of how the scores were developed.</li> <li>• Pages 16 – 24 describe how the scaling study was designed.</li> <li>• Pages 25 – 40 describe the characteristics of SAT scaling.</li> <li>• Pages 66 – 74 describe the characteristics of SAT subscore scaling.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.3: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report – Delaware (April 2017)</b>            This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 SAT school day administration, and includes information on the inter-rater reliability of the essay test included in the SAT. Please refer to pages 51 of 68 – 63 of 68 for information on inter-rater (single rater) reliability, percentages of agreement, correlation coefficient, and kappa statistics.</p> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.4: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report – Maine (April 2017)</b>            This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 SAT school day administration, and includes information on the inter-rater reliability of the essay test included in the SAT. Please refer to pages 51 of 68 – 63 of 68 for information on inter-rater (single rater) reliability, percentages of agreement, correlation coefficient, and kappa statistics.</p> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.5: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report – Michigan (April 2017)</b>            This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 SAT school</p>	

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	day administration, and includes information on the inter-rater reliability of the essay test included in the SAT. Please refer to pages 65 of 84 – 79 of 84 for information on inter-rater (single rater) reliability, percentages of agreement, correlation coefficient, and kappa statistics.	
<b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide evidence of established and documented standardized essay scoring procedures and protocols that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of adequate inter-rater reliability.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</b></p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 39 - 49 describe how the test is constructed to ensure multiple forms of the assessment are comparable</li> <li>• Pages 82 - 90 describe equating procedures and results for the SAT.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 6; Tables A-6.3.2 through A-6.3.5 (pages 72 - 78) show data and sample sets related to the equating procedures described in pages 82 - 90 of evidence 2.1.1.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.2: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report- Connecticut (April 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 2 provides an executive summary which describes the number of forms used in the April 2017 administration of SAT SD in Connecticut.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.5: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report- Michigan (April 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 2 provides an executive summary which describes the number of forms used in the April 2017 administration of SAT SD in Michigan.</li> </ul>	<p>Documentation adequately provided for this critical element</p> <p>Peers noted it would have been helpful for an opportunity to review the forms or an independent audit of the multiple test forms.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b></p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math. The SAT has been administered in English and as a pencil and paper assessment.</b></p>	<p>This critical element does not apply to this review.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b></p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 1 - 20 provide an overview of the assessment, including a description its purpose, test format and content, scores derived from the assessment and the intended use of results.</li> <li>• Pages 107 – 135 examine the validity of the SAT and includes information on the evidentiary foundations behind the test content, concordance between the current and previous version of the SAT, and the relationship between SAT scores and first-year grade point average, as well as the relationship between SAT scores and college and career readiness benchmarks.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tables A-3.1 – A-3.15 in Appendix 3 (pages 11 - 35) provide test content specifications and content domains and descriptions.</li> <li>• Appendix 5 (pages 37 - 65) provides additional detail regarding how statistical indices were computed.</li> <li>• Appendix 6 (pages 66 – 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> <li>• Appendix 7 (pages 321 – 396) displays the results of analyses performed to evaluate the validity of the SAT.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 198 – 206 provide an overview of SAT development process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.1: An SAT Validity Primer</b></p>	<p>4.7.1: “Initial findings from this large-scale study will be available in 2019.”</p> <p>No evidence of independent studies of alignment</p> <p>No evidence of states’ systems for monitoring and improving related to examples of evidence related to critical element</p> <p>Since states are using SAT as an accountability measure, evidence and claims will result in different needs which results in different studies to support this use.</p> <p>The College Board should plan to study the use of the SAT for state accountability vs. a predictive test for college admission.</p> <p>Evidence from the 2019 study and TAC recommendations may provide some information in meeting this element.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>(January 2015)</b>                      This paper provides validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores and important college outcomes. The evidence provided in this paper is based on a previous version of the SAT. Pages 131 – 135 of the <i>SAT Suite Technical Manual</i> describe how the new version of the SAT correlates with the previous version of the assessment.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.2: The Redesigned SAT® Pilot Predictive Validity Study: A First Look (2016)</b>                      This white paper provides preliminary validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores resulting for the redesigned SAT and important college outcomes. The College Board is in the process of completing a validity study to replicate the findings of this white paper with a large, nationally representative sample. The study will examine students in the entering college class of fall 2017, the first full cohort to be admitted to college with the new SAT. For more information regarding this planned study, please refer to page 152 of the SAT Technical Manual.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire and Illinois (2015 - 2018)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 7 - 9 of each document describe how alignment between the standards and the assessment is determined.</li> <li>• Pages 16 - 106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to each respective state’s English Language Arts/Literacy and Math standards for grades 11 and 12.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.1.1: SAT Practice Test 8 (2017)</b>                      This practice test is a version of a form that was used for a 2016 SAT test administration. The</p>	

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>sample test includes the optional essay, answer key, answer sheet and instructions on how to score the test.</p> <p><b>Evidence #4.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report Table of Contents</b>                      This document displays the contents of a typical post-administration Test Analysis Report for the national administration of the SAT. The College Board provides state level administration reports to its state partners. Please refer to evidence #3.3.2 – 3.3.7 for the state specific administration reports.</p> <p><b>Evidence #4.7.1: Excerpt from TAC presentation regarding Validity Research (February 2017)</b>                      The College Board presents validity evidence to the Technical Advisory Committees of our state partners. These slides are an excerpt from these presentations and covers information regarding College Board past, current and future validity studies.</p>	

**Section 4.7 Summary Statement**

No additional evidence is required or

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Evidence of a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system

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

### **SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards;</li> <li>• States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs;</li> <li>• Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment;</li> <li>• Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities;</li> <li>• Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;</li> <li>• Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic</li> </ul>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math, so no evidence will be provided related to a specific state’s alternate assessment. The state will determine which students take the general or the alternate assessment. Below we provide documentation regarding the accommodations that the College Board provides for administrations of the general assessment.</b></p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 49 – 52 describe the types of available allowable accommodations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <p>This manual provides instructions for supervisors who will be responsible for registering students for testing accommodations, and managing the test administration for students who require testing accommodations.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.5: SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017)</b></p> <p>This PowerPoint deck is presented to SSD supervisors via an online training session and reviews the policies and procedures related to SAT administrations for students who require testing accommodations.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.1: Pages from the College Board Students with Disabilities website. (accessed September 1, 2017)</b></p> <p>This document provides images of the College Board web pages regarding the accommodations request and approval process. This information is available through the College Board website -</p>	<p><b>Participation Requirements for Students with Disabilities</b></p> <p>There is an online request system for accommodations for students with disabilities listed on page 58 of the technical manual.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All evidence is specific to the SAT; evidence required by states is not provided in this document.</li> </ul> <p>The evidence of the process used by the states lacks clarity, such as does the state upload a file detailing accommodations for efficient and effective data reporting? It is unclear based on the screen shots in the PowerPoint (2.3.5 webinar) whether this process is used.</p> <p><b>Decisions by IEP team based on individual need</b></p> <p>Since 1/1/2017, students receive the same accommodations on the SAT as they do routinely use in assessment situations based on the accommodations provided on the IEP. The request must still be submitted on the SAT online system as a simplified request.</p> <p>Some accommodations are listed on page 59(2.1.1) but a complete list and instructions for administering the accommodations are not provided.</p> <p>5.1.1 and 5.1.2 contains screens from the webpages, where more instructions are listed in detail for each type of accommodation and how to request it. The College Board stated that the accommodation list is not complete. A complete list of the approved accommodations should be provided.</p> <p>Clarity needs to be provided with respect to the</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments);</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<p><a href="https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities">https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities</a></p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.2: College Board Typical Accommodations (accessed October 2, 2017)</b> This document provides information regarding typical testing accommodations available for SAT test administrations. This information is available through the College Board website - <a href="https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities/typical-accommodations">https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities/typical-accommodations</a>.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.3: Support for Students with Temporary Physical/ Medical Conditions</b> This form is used to request testing support for students with temporary impairments (caused by injury, accident, etc) who cannot postpone their tests.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.4: Reports for Students who Test with State Allowed Accommodations</b> Students who test using state allowed accommodations will receive test results that are marked with an “SAA” label. These screen shots show how the designation appears on their reports.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.5: Parent Consent Form Templates</b> The College Board provides a template that district and school administrators may use to attain parental consent to administer the SAT with testing accommodations to particular students. This resource is optionally used by our state partners.</p>	<p>flow of information between ETS and the SAT about requesting accommodations, particularly when these are not on an IEP and if the request is denied. How is this information provided to the state?</p> <p><b>Guidelines for IEP Team Decision-making, including accommodations</b> The SAT did not provide any evidence on the IEP team decision-making process for selection of accommodations.</p> <p><b>Accessibility Features and Selection of Appropriate Accommodations</b> Evidence appears to be adequate for this piece of the critical element.</p> <p><b>Parent Notification</b> Evidence 5.1.5 is the parent notification form for requesting accommodations that are not SAT identified. SAT has a form to request accommodations that will exclude the student’s score for college. Is SAT providing any guidance to states/IEP team use on score reporting for state approved accommodations and its impact on use of non-reportable scores for college admission purposes?</p> <p>Peers were not provided information about what information parents receive about SAT accommodations. There is a statement on the request form that the score may be non reportable, but there is no detail to explain to parents on the accommodation use. The student score report indicates that the score is non reportable due to SAA accommodations</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>What do states share with parents about accommodations and possible implications on score reporting to colleges?</p> <p>States may provide this information but SAT did not provide information for the parent.</p> <p>States will need to provide information on accommodations if SAT does not provide. An accommodation manual detailing the selection, use, and reporting of test accommodations and implications would be beneficial for parents and teachers.</p>

<b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b>
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>Provide evidence of guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards;</li> <li>• States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs;</li> <li>• Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment;</li> <li>• Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;</li> </ul>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> <li>• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;</li> <li>• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>	<p>The College Board's policies and procedures are designed to ensure that appropriate testing accommodations are made available to students with disabilities, including English learners with a diagnosed disability. Students who are approved for and using testing accommodations at their school through a current Individualized Education Program (IEP) 504 Plan, or Formal Written Plan will have those same accommodations automatically approved for taking the SAT®, PSAT™10, PSAT/NMSQT®, SAT Subject Tests™, and AP® Exams. Please refer to the evidence provided in response to critical elements 5.1 and 5.3 for additional information regarding College Board accommodations processes.</p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 50 - 51 describe the types of accommodations available to English learners.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <p>This manual provides instructions on how to administer the SAT to English Learner students who are required to test with additional supports such as glossaries or translated instructions. Refer to pages iv, vi, and 30 for those instructions.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.2.1: College Board-Approved Word-to-Word Glossaries for the SAT® Suite of Assessments (2017)</b></p> <p>This document lists the word-to-word glossaries that the College Board has approved for use with the SAT by English Learner students. The state education agency decides which students can use these language supports. These supports do not require an accommodations request and provide</p>	<p>There was no guidance provided on the selection process for the two accommodations provided. The test directions may be read, but are the questions also read for the mathematics?</p> <p>Directions for administration of the two accommodations all EL may use (2.3.3, pp iv, vi, 30) and (5.2.2). There is a separate request for additional time for EL under 5.2.2.</p> <p><b>Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s)</b></p> <p>States are advised to produce the evidence on accommodations. SAT supplies options for ELs, but LEAs decide which students receive these accommodations.</p> <p>Although all ELs may use word-word dictionaries and translated directions (2.1.1, pp. 50-51), there are no procedures provided to determine whether an EL should be assessed with these accommodations.</p> <p>Accessibility tools and features are not addressed, but accommodations are listed on page 60. 1/1/2017 – state-funded daytime administrations – instructions in several native languages provided; glossaries available too.</p> <p>SAT appears to delegate this to the state by stating only two questions to be answered: Is the requested accommodation(s) in the student’s plan? Has the student used the accommodation(s) for school testing? (see Evidence 5.1.1) It is not clear if there is a different system for EL or SWD?</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>college reportable scores to students.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.2.2: College Board translated instructions for the SAT (2017)</b></p> <p>The College Board provides translated test instructions to English language learners in the following languages: (a) English, (b) Arabic, (c) Chinese, (d) Haitian Creole, (e) Polish, (f) Russian, (g) Portuguese, (h) Spanish, and (i) Vietnamese. The state education agency decides which students can use these language supports. These supports do not require an accommodations request and provide college reportable scores to students.</p>	<p>The evidence (2.3.5 webinar) suggests that extended time for ELs is a state accommodation only which has implications for score reporting and perhaps unintended consequence for the student because the score may not be reported for college admission.</p> <p>What is the decision-making process, how is this communicated to the EL team, how is this reported back to the state?</p> <p>It should be clear if this is used for a state test, which accommodations are provided and reported, who makes the selection decision, and how this is reported back to the state?</p> <p>Clarity between SAT and State guidance is needed for this element.</p> <p>Please provide the report regarding the effectiveness of the extended time accommodation for ELs.</p> <p>More evidence regarding the inclusion of ELs and accommodations is needed.</p>

**Section 5.2 Summary Statement**

No additional evidence is required or

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

Evidence of communicating 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.

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

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>5.3 – Accommodations</b></p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504;</li> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);</li> <li>Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> <li>Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math, so no evidence will be provided related to a specific state’s alternate assessment. The state will determine which students take the general or the alternate assessment. Below we provide documentation regarding the accommodations that the College Board provides for administrations of the general assessment. The processes described below apply to students with disabilities who are native English speakers and those who are English language learners.</b></p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 49 – 51 describe the types of available allowable accommodations, including a description of the supports available for English learners.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.5: SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017)</b></p> <p>This PowerPoint deck is presented to SSD supervisors via an online training session and reviews the policies and procedures related to SAT administrations for students who require testing accommodations. All students with documented disabilities, including English learners, can request and are approved for disability accommodations.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.1: Pages from the College Board Students with Disabilities website. (accessed September 1, 2017)</b></p> <p>This document provides images of the College</p>	<p>SAT did not provide any information to ensure that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL)</p> <p>SSD and State Allowed Accommodations are treated differently by the College Board but it is not clear how this impacts state accountability requirements that ensure access for all students.</p> <p>No evidence of any College Board studies on their accommodations and the impact on student scores to validate the accommodations. Although the College Board indicated a study on extended time will be conducted, no evidence of a plan and timeline was provided to verify this statement.</p> <p>There was no data provided on the types and frequency of accommodation approval requests.</p> <p>Pg. 25. Technical manual: “the vast majority of students who are approved for and using testing accommodations at their school through a current IEP or 504 plan have those same accommodations automatically approved for taking the College Board assessment.” How many students automatically qualify and get approved? How many students do not qualify automatically and get approved or not approved? How is the decision made?</p> <p><b>Ensures Availability/Appropriateness/Selection for SWD and EL</b></p> <p>States should supply evidence of how LEAs select accommodations for SWD and EL.</p> <p>There was no evidence provided to address whether the accommodations do not alter the construct being assessed, and allow meaningful</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Board web pages regarding the accommodations request and approval process. All students with documented disabilities, including English learners, can request and are approved for disability accommodations. This information is available through the College Board website - <a href="https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities">https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities</a></p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.2: College Board Typical Accommodations (accessed October 2, 2017)</b> This document provides information regarding typical testing accommodations available for SAT test administrations. This information is available through the College Board website - <a href="https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities/typical-accommodations">https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities/typical-accommodations</a>.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.3: Support for Students with Temporary Physical/ Medical Conditions</b> This form is used to request testing support for students with temporary impairments (caused by injury, accident, etc.) who cannot postpone their tests.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.4: Reports for Students who Test with State Allowed Accommodations</b> <b>Student who test with State Allowed Accommodations receive a non-college reportable score. This document shows the online and paper-based score report that these students obtain. In adherence to applicable state and federal accessibility laws, College</b></p> <p>Board reports and resources are designed to meet accessibility standards including Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.</p>	<p>interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who</p> <p>Is the read-aloud test format available for the Reading test? How is this not interfering with the tested construct?</p> <p>Per the sample score report for tests given with State Allowed Accommodations (5.1.4), scores may not be used for college admission or scholarship purposes, indicating they are not valid for these decisions. Where are the studies providing evidence that accommodated forms scores are valid for other uses such as tracking college and career readiness?</p> <p><b>Process for exceptional accommodation request</b> Special cases addressed in 2.3.5 include changes to previously requested accommodations and transfer students. Slide 4, 2.3.5 indicates that SAT reviews requests for other accommodations. SAT has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed but data was not provided on the impact such accommodations may have on score</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>Evidence #5.1.5: Parent Consent Forms Templates</b></p> <p><b>The College Board provides to its state clients templates that they may use to obtain parental consent for students to test with College Board approved accommodations or State Allowed Accommodations. The template is included here as evidence of supports the College Board provides to the state.</b></p>	<p>reportability for state accountability vs. SAT college reporting.</p> <p>The SAT did not provide evidence that the accommodations 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.</p>

**Section 5.3 Summary Statement**

No additional evidence is required or

The following additional evidence is needed/provide

Ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:

- 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 but data was not provided and/or does this impact the score as reportable or non reportable.

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

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b></p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math, so no evidence will be provided related to a specific state’s alternate assessment. The state will determine which students take the general or the alternate assessment. Below we provide documentation regarding the accommodations that the College Board provides for administrations of the general assessment. Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <p>This manual provides instructions for supervisors who will be responsible for registering students for testing accommodations and managing the test administration for students who require testing accommodations.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.5: SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017)</b></p> <p>This PowerPoint deck is presented to SSD supervisors via an online training session and reviews the policies and procedures related to SAT administrations for students who require testing accommodations.</p>	<p><b>State Policies Consistency</b> What are state allowed accommodations that may not be accepted by SAT?</p> <p>Does College Board collect any information from states to ensure students receive the appropriate accommodations on the assessment? Is there any information on how many students do not receive or are denied accommodations via College Board’s process that should receive accommodations per state policy? Any studies?</p> <p><b>Consistent with instruction and IEP team process</b> There is no evidence that SAT communicates about the accommodations use with IEP teams or the state.</p> <p><b>Administered with fidelity to TA procedures</b> Is there any data to show that SAT has collected information from local test administrators regarding faithful implementation for special populations? The irregularities forms and procedures were included, but they seem to apply to the general population more than the special populations and accommodations. What training is provided to scribes and readers? This is critical training; slide 41 says training must be provided, but there is no further information.</p> <p><b>Process used to monitor compliance by districts with data to verify</b> No State or SAT monitoring information is provided-either before, during, or post administration.</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>Evidence that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul>		

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

### **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
------------------	--	--

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b></p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math, so no evidence will be provided related to a specific state’s alternate assessment.</b></p> <p><b>The College Board provides the below documentation to our state partners as support resources to be used during their standard setting process.</b></p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 120 - 133 describe how the benchmarks were determined and how they are related to college outcomes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board SAT Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire, and Illinois</b></p> <p>Each of these College Board produced documents contains a detailed alignment between the state standards and the SAT. Please refer to Critical Element 2.1 for the relevant sections. These documents were provided to each panelist as a reference that could be used during the Achievement standards setting process.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)</b></p> <p>Panelists were provided with this document as a reference that could be used during the standards setting process.</p> <p><b>Evidence #6.2.1: Final Report on the 2016 SAT Multi-State Standard Setting.</b></p> <p>This report summarizes the procedures used to obtain recommended cut scores from the standard setting panels, as well as the final cut</p>	<p><b>Method and Process</b></p> <p>Standard setting panels were rather small and lacked diversity, particularly in math. There was no EL representation on either standard setting panel.</p> <p>Process for setting achievement levels and descriptors appears to be sufficiently documented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6.2.1 references 4 states –does not include IL and MI.</li> <li>• Used Modified Angoff, p. 5</li> <li>• Description of Essay standard setting process is not included; only DE and ME did this standard-setting. What will other states do? P.73, Appendix J</li> <li>• P. 36 indicates that Math is aligned to CCSS; does not state the same for ERW</li> <li>• ALDs written by SME in 4 states – but no process described (p.4)</li> </ul> <p>2.1.1 pp, 120-135: setting benchmarks</p> <p>6.2.1, for CT, DE, ME, NH: standards setting procedures for the four states were documented. .</p> <p>Will the College Board be conducting any validity evidence on the achievement standards since states are using different points on the scale to make similar inferences (i.e., the group of states vs. Illinois)?</p> <p>IL and MI need to provide evidence of the standards setting process used.</p> <p>Is SAT going to provide evidence of validity of the different cut scores for IL. There was no information on the IL process for standard setting. The peers located the cut score for proficient but there was no process or ALD development provided. Page 10-11. 3.3.7.How is the different cut scores</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence									
	scores that were agreed upon by the four states: Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, and New Hampshire. First, an overview of the standard setting meeting is presented, followed by a detailed description of the procedures and results.	addressed with 4 state participation in the standard setting? <table border="1"> <tr> <td>State</td> <td>EWR</td> <td>MSS</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IL</td> <td>540</td> <td>540</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DE</td> <td>480</td> <td>530</td> </tr> </table>	State	EWR	MSS	IL	540	540	DE	480	530
State	EWR	MSS									
IL	540	540									
DE	480	530									

**Section 6.2 Summary Statement**

No additional evidence is required

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Evidence of a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards for IL and MI.

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

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math, so no evidence will be provided related to a specific state’s alternate assessment. The College Board provides the below documentation to our state partners as support resources to be used during their standard setting process.</b></p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 21 - 26 describe the processes used to ensure the fairness of the assessment.</li> <li>• Pages 27 - 52 provide a detailed description of test development procedures.</li> <li>• Pages 108 - 114 describe the evidentiary foundation for the decisions made about the content included in the SAT.</li> <li>• Pages 120 - 133 describe how the benchmarks were determined and how they are related to college outcomes.</li> <li>• Pages 133 - 135 describe how the SAT assesses student readiness for college.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board SAT Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire, and Illinois</b></p> <p>Each of these College Board produced documents contains a detailed alignment between the state standards and the SAT. Please refer to Critical Element 2.1 for the relevant sections. These documents were provided to each panelist as a reference that could be used during the Achievement standards setting process.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)</b></p> <p>Panelists were provided with this document as a reference that could be used during the standards setting process.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.1: An SAT Validity Primer (January 2015)</b></p> <p>This paper provides validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores and important college outcomes. The</p>	<p><b>Challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards</b></p> <p>The description of process to develop ALDs is lacking in 6.2.1. The process is not described.</p> <p>Evidence that academic achievement standards are challenging was not provided.</p> <p>Will the College Board be conducting any validity evidence on the achievement standards since states are using different points on the scale to make similar inferences (i.e., the group of states vs. Illinois)?</p> <p>It is not clear how the ALDs represent the State’s academic content standards, the evidence shows alignment with the SAT benchmarks.</p> <p>Page 36.Appendix C. SAT states there is alignment with the state academic standards but there is no evidence or documentation provided to verify the statement.</p> <p>Page 45. 6.2.1. ALDs designed to describe SAT performance but not the state academic achievement standards or the depth of the coverage. An independent alignment study may address this element.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence	
	<p>evidence provided in this paper is based on a previous version of the SAT. Pages 131 – 135 of the SAT Suite Technical Manual describe how the new version of the SAT correlates with the previous version of the assessment.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.2: The Redesigned SAT® Pilot Predictive Validity Study: A First Look (2016)</b></p> <p>This white paper provides preliminary validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores resulting for the redesigned SAT and important college outcomes. The College Board is in the process of completing a validity study to replicate the findings of this white paper with a large, nationally representative sample. The study will examine students in the entering college class of fall 2017, the first full cohort to be admitted to college with the new SAT. For more information regarding this planned study, please refer to page 152 of the SAT Technical Manual.</p> <p><b>Evidence #6.2.1: Final Report on the 2016 SAT Multi-State Standard Setting.</b></p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td> <p>This report summarizes the procedures used to obtain recommended cut scores from the standard setting panels, as well as the final cut scores that were agreed upon by the four states: Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, and New Hampshire. First, an overview of the standard setting meeting is presented, followed by a detailed description of the procedures and results.</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p>This report summarizes the procedures used to obtain recommended cut scores from the standard setting panels, as well as the final cut scores that were agreed upon by the four states: Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, and New Hampshire. First, an overview of the standard setting meeting is presented, followed by a detailed description of the procedures and results.</p>	
<p>This report summarizes the procedures used to obtain recommended cut scores from the standard setting panels, as well as the final cut scores that were agreed upon by the four states: Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, and New Hampshire. First, an overview of the standard setting meeting is presented, followed by a detailed description of the procedures and results.</p>			
<p><b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b></p>			
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of how the academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</li> </ul>			

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;</li> <li>• The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;</li> <li>• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;</li> <li>○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;</li> <li>○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The following documents are reference materials provided by the College Board to educators to support their use of the College Board reporting platform.</p> <p>In adherence to applicable state and federal accessibility laws, College Board reports and resources are designed to meet accessibility standards including Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.</p> <p><b>Evidence #6.4.1: K–12 Educator Brief: The College and Career Readiness Benchmarks for the SAT® Suite of Assessments (April 2016)</b> This brochure explains how the SAT benchmarks were derived and how to interpret SAT test results. It also provides a set of frequently asked questions regarding the assessment reporting.</p> <p><b>Evidence #6.4.2: K-12 Educator Brief: The SAT® Suite of Assessments: Using Scores and Reporting to Inform Instruction (2015)</b> This educator brief provides an overview of the different reports available to teachers, and how these reports can be used for curricular and intervention purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 23 - 41 display and explain the uses for sample reports available through the College Board reporting portal.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #6.4.3: SAT Understanding Scores 2017 (2017)</b> This brochure provides information to educators regarding scoring benchmarks, how the assessment is scored and how to access score reports on the College Board reporting portal. It also provides a guide on how to interpret student score reports.</p> <p><b>Evidence #6.4.4: Professional Development</b></p>	<p>The College Board indicated it is developing a Spanish Language version of Evidence #6.4.3 for the 2018-19 school year but the peers did not receive any evidence to support the statement.</p> <p>SAT supplies the tools for reporting including assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address needs based on the SAT framework but not the state standards.</p> <p>States should supply evidence of such reports as generated and published.</p> <p>For the individual student reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No State evidence for each of these criteria is provided. Not clear if there is state material that accompanies the SAT score reports. What reports are delivered to parents – same as student reports?</li> <li>• SAT information is provided, but not connected to requirements for States.</li> <li>• How are achievement standards (PLDs )reflected on SAT reports??</li> <li>• If SAT is given in grade 11 for these states, all the SAT material only indicates that the SAT is grade 11 and grade 12 – how do states address grade 11 vs. 12 for reporting purposes?</li> <li>• An individual score report was not provided for review to address the reporting requirements.</li> </ul> <p>When do parents receive the reports with a guide to interpret the test results? Do teachers receive reports in time and with resources to help guide instruction? There is no information on the timeline for parent delivery.</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Module #6: Using Scores and Reporting to Inform Instruction (2015)</b>                      This PowerPoint presentation can be used to train educators on how to access, interpret and apply score report results to inform classroom instruction.</p> <p><b>Evidence #6.4.5: Facilitator Guide to Professional Development Module #6: Using Scores and Reporting to Inform Instruction (2015)</b>                      This guide is a companion to the PowerPoint presentation and is intended as a support resource for administrators or district trainers who will be training their educators on how score reporting.</p> <p><b>Evidence #6.4.6: Educator Online Reporting Screen Shot Demo (February 2017)</b>                      This PowerPoint shows the different reports that available through the College Board online reporting system.</p>	<p>Educators also have a dashboard for requesting a variety of reports.</p> <p>There is no process and timeline for delivery to parents for individual reports.</p> <p>There is no information on availability of alternate formats of the reports available upon request.</p>

**Section 6.4 Summary Statement**

No additional evidence is required or

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

Evidence of reporting that 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 provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that:
  - Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;
  - Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);
  - Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;
  - Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;

The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.

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

## March 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes

(Resubmission PARCC+DLM)  
(New Submission SAT+Science)



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 Illinois Resubmission  
(PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)

Contents

<b>SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS .</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students ....	4
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards .....	7
1.3 – Required Assessments .....	10
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments .....	12
1.5 – Participation Data .....	14
<b>SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS .....</b>	<b>15</b>
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	16
2.2 – Item Development.....	17
2.3 – Test Administration .....	19
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration.....	23
2.5 – Test Security .....	25
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....	31
<b>SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....</b>	<b>34</b>
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	34
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	35
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure .....	36
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables.....	37
<b>SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER .....</b>	<b>38</b>
4.1 – Reliability.....	39
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	41
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	42
4.4 – Scoring .....	44
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms .....	46
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment .....	47
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance.....	48
<b>SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS .....</b>	<b>49</b>
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities .....	50
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	57
5.3 – Accommodations.....	61
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations.....	67
<b>SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .</b>	<b>70</b>
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students .....	71
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....	74
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards .....	78
6.4 – Reporting.....	81

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As 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 Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)

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

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As 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 Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</b></p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State.</p>	<p><b>SAT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>isbe.net.</b> Illinois adopted the Common Core Standards for ELA and the Illinois Learning Standards in Math in 2010 on June 24, 2010.</li> <li>• IL ELA Standards IL Math Standards. IL submitted this link. IL ELA and Standards IL Math Standards- IL submitted Webpage dedicated to ELA and math; specific mention, p.6 ELA introduction, and p.4 Math introduction of inclusion of EL and SWD.</li> </ul> <p><b>DLM Science</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>isbe.net. Fact Sheet: Illinois Learning Standards in Science, states that these became effective February 2014</b></li> </ul> <p><b>ISA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In February 2014, Illinois adopted the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS).</li> <li>• <b>FAQ, 1.8.2018:</b> In a public school district, ISA will be administered to students enrolled in grade 5 and grade 8 at their respective grade level. The high school assessment for students enrolled in grades 9-12 will be course-based and correspond to the content of Biology I.</li> </ul>	<p><b>SAT</b> Evidence sufficient</p> <p><b>DLM Science</b> No evidence submitted that ISBE adopted science Essential Elements.</p> <p><b>ISA</b> Evidence sufficient</p>
<p><b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for <b>SAT and ISA</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:  <b>DLM Science</b> Submit evidence that ISBE adopted DLM science Essential Elements.</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</b></p> <p>The State’s academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science specify what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school to succeed in college and the workforce; contain content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.</p>	<p><b>SAT</b>  <b>Learning Standards:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IL ELA and Standards IL Math Standards. IL submitted Webpage for ELA and math</li> </ul> <p><b>DLM-Science</b></p> <p>IL submission states: “DLM developed the Essential Elements for science in December 2014. Thirty- four essential elements were approved for use on science assessment blueprints.”</p> <p><b>ISA</b>  <b>IL Submitted:</b>          Illinois Science Standards          ISA Fact sheet:          Section 1.Appendix D: State Goals for Learning          Illinois Science Standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>nextgenerationscience.org:</b> The Next Generation Science Standards Executive Summary describes the work that the National Academy of Sciences, Achieve, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and the National Science Teachers Association, including states involvement, and that three dimensions are included in each standard – (1) disciplinary core ideas (content), (2) scientific and engineering practices, and (3) cross-cutting concepts.</li> <li>Section 1.Appendix D: State Goals for Learning – This link does not open</li> </ul>	<p><b>SAT</b>          Evidence sufficient</p> <p><b>DLM Science</b></p> <p>No documents describing the process and who was involved in DLM development of Science Essential Elements was submitted.</p> <p><b>ISA</b>          Evidence sufficient</p>
<p><b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for <b>SAT and ISA</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <b>DLM Science</b>	Submit evidence for 1.2.	

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As 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 Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

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

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As 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 Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p align="center"><b>1.3 – Required Assessments</b></p> <p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments (based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate academic achievement standards-AAAS) in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12);</li> <li>• Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12).</li> </ul>	<p>ED reviewed the following school code:</p> <p><b>(105 ILCS 5/2-3.64a-5) (Text of Section from P.A. 100-7) Sec. 2-3.64a-5. State goals and assessment.</b></p> <p><b>SAT</b> The State Board of Education shall annually assess schools that operate a secondary education program, as defined in Section 22-22 of this Code, in English language arts and mathematics. The State Board of Education shall administer no more than 3 assessments, per student, of English language arts and mathematics for students in a secondary education program. One of these assessments shall include a college and career ready determination that shall be accepted by this State's public institutions of higher education, as defined in the Board of Higher Education Act, for the purpose of student application or admissions consideration.</p> <p><b>DLM-Science</b></p> <p><b>PARCC- No additional evidence needed</b></p>	<p><b>SAT</b> It is unclear from the legislation whether all students are required to take the same assessment. ISBE must provide evidence of policies and procedural guidance to LEAs regarding the high school assessment requirements and whether the SAT is the mandatory college and career ready assessment or is meeting the purpose of the ELA and Math assessment in high school. Please send us a document that clarifies the school code.</p> <p><b>DLM- Science</b> For students best served by an alternate assessment, The Dynamic Learning Maps Alternate Assessment DLM-AA is provided in grades 5, 8 and 11</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
	<p><b>ISA</b></p> <p>Beginning no later than the 2017-2018 school year, the State Board of Education shall annually assess all students in science at one grade in grades 3 through 5, at one grade in grades 6 through 8, and at one grade in grades 9 through 12.</p>	<p><b>ISA</b></p> <p>ISBE notes the Illinois Science Assessment is given to students in grades 5, 8 and in high school biology I courses. No additional evidence is needed.</p> <p>Department staff note the ISBE stipulates in their ESSA State Consolidated Plan that the SAT is the required high school assessment for all students.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY—staff note verify high school assessments and science stemming from prior review/monitoring</b></p>		
<p><u>_x_</u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p><b>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</b></p> <p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system;</li> <li>• For English learners (EL):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment;</li> <li>○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>SAT</b></p> <p><b>DLM-Science</b></p> <p><b>PARCC</b></p> <p>105 ILCS 5/2-3.64 Beginning no later than the 2014-2015 school year, the State Board of Education shall annually assess all students enrolled in grades 3 through 8 in English language arts and mathematics and in high school in English language arts and mathematics.</p> <p><b>ISA</b></p> <p>- No evidence provided</p>	<p>ISBE notes Illinois School Code 105 5/2-3.64 requires all students in grades 3-8 and high school to be assessed with the State academic assessments. This includes students who have a disability. Students who are identified as having an IEP can have accommodations that are appropriate to the student as determined by the IEP team(CFR 300.320(a)(6)(i)).</p> <p>Note the state code cited compliance with NCLB for excluding students from assessments, but the ESEA as amended by the ESSA introduces new changes in accountability system for ELs.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY staff note verify for all assessments</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> No additional evidence is required for SAT</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>_x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:            ISA/ DLM Science Provide evidence of policies for including all students.            PARCC Confirm that policies for inclusion of English Learners in State assessments are implemented as described in the ISBE ESSA Consolidated State Plan. Provide evidence that these policies for including all students are contained within communications to LEAs and schools in the State.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p align="center"><b>1.5 – Participation Data</b></p> <p>The State’s participation data show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system. In addition, if the State administers end-of-course assessments for high school students, the State has procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates on each required assessment and provides the corresponding data.</p>	<p><b>SAT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reviewed SAT participation summary and</li> </ul> <p><b>DLM-Science</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reviewed DLM- YE participation summary</li> </ul> <p><b>PARCC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reviewed PARCC assessment summary</li> </ul> <p><b>ISA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reviewed 1.5 Appendix A</li> </ul>	<p><b>SAT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Participation Data not available</li> </ul> <p><b>PARCC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Participation data not available</li> </ul> <p><b>DLM-Science</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Participation data not available</li> </ul> <p><b>ISA</b></p> <p>Participation rates provided by grade span and disaggregated my major subgroups.</p>
<p align="center"><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY—verify for all assessments</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirm the data for assessment participation in all subjects is accurately reported in the Consolidated State Performance Report for 2016-17. This should also include the data on participation in the States alternate assessments.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

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

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As 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 Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results;</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills);</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.</li> </ul>	<p><b>ISA</b>                      IL Submitted:                      Embedded Test Maps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gr. 5 (2.1 Appendix A)</li> <li>• Gr. 8 (2.1 Appendix B)</li> <li>• HS Biology (2.1 Appendix C)</li> <li>• Not computer adaptive</li> <li>• Single select multiple choice items and extended response items based on science phenomena.(2.1 Appendix D)</li> </ul>	<p><b>ISA</b>                      The evidence provided does not support the critical element. The evidence submitted appears to be Individual Student Reports, not test blueprints or “test maps.” The notes refer to blueprints being developed but none were listed as evidence here.</p> <p>(Peers noted that the items per domain were presented on isbe.net within the 2018-ISA-101 PPT presentation, but this is not a sufficient blueprint)</p> <p>Issues are raised by IL in the notes column, names are mentioned with no affiliations or titles and acronyms are used and not defined.                      Examples include: 2<sup>nd</sup> Bullet, Pam’s Notes? Swea Hart?, (p.5), Amy Metcalf?, (p.6), TSS?, (p. 7)</p> <p>The ISRs, 2.1, A, B, C do state purpose of tests, though not using direct language (i.e., “The purpose of the ISA is to...”)</p> <p>IL submitted list of tasks and timeline for test development on index form; unclear if the personal (Pam’s) notes submitted are official documents.</p>
<p><b>see prior DLM/PARCC consortium reviews</b></p>		
<p><b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale for the <b>ISA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit evidence for bullets 1, 2, 3 in this critical element.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>2.2 – Item Development</b></p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p><b>ISA</b>                      IL submission states: “See process notes in CE 2.1.”                      “The items utilized on the ISA were utilized operationally by the District of Columbia Office of the State Superintendent of Education (DCOSSE) on their science assessment. Illinois reviewed item statistics before placement onto the ISA. Illinois’ science coordinator, with over 15 years of experience in science large scale assessment design and implementation, selected the items for the ISA.”</p>	<p><b>ISA</b>                      The process notes in CE 2.1 were lacking in specifics and there was mention of several issues.</p> <p>There is no information in these that describes the item development process. Is there a technical manual for this test?</p> <p>One person in IL selected items for this assessment. Having one person select items for an assessment is not reasonable or technically sound. Reviews typically include the following key roles: IL science teachers who are representative of the state’s demographics, psychometrician(s), content specialists, and internal and external advisory panels. States typically employ a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to assist in these areas, as well.</p>
<p><b>see prior DLM/PARCC consortium reviews</b></p>		
<p><b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale for the <b>ISA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submit evidence that reasonable and technically sound procedures were used to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on IL’s science academic content standards (e.g., include key roles in the review process).</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments;</li> <li>If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul> <p><b>For all the entire assessment system, ISBE must provide:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Evidence of implementation of training resources provided by the Consortia for test administration, including administration with accommodations.</b></li> <li><b>Documentation of the fidelity of implementation of training provided by PARCC and DLM.</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>SAT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.3.1 The SAT School Day Supervisor Manual, 2.3.2 The SAT School Day Test Room Manual, 2.3.3 The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual. Manuals provide procedures for standardized administration of SAT.</li> </ul> <p><b>DLM-Science</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ISBE DLM webpage and DLM Illinois webpage: DLM Test Administration Manual for reading, math, science and technology-use</li> <li>Dynamiclearningmaps.org</li> </ul> <p><b>PARCC-Statement submitted:</b>  “PARCC provided training to educators on test security and administration policies and procedures sixty days prior to test administration. Participation in the training was tracked via a report sent monthly to the SEA. Training was also provided via modules online and through ISBE provided webinars. School test coordinators were provided guidance to develop a training plan for all staff involved in test</p>	<p><b>SAT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IL did not provide evidence of schedules for training for all staff involved in test administration, ensuring participation in training, and tracking of signed assurance forms</li> <li>2.3.5 – Accommodations Webinar. Focus is on accommodations application process; this does not address how to appropriately administer read aloud and scribe accommodations and other accommodations.</li> <li>If IL plans to use the online SAT, which should be available next year, IL will need to provide evidence of technology-based procedures indicated in this critical element.</li> </ul> <p><b>DLM Science</b>  Evidence sufficient</p> <p><b>PARCC</b>  Although IL submitted evidence that there are training modules for test administration and a statement asserting that training was provided, no evidence was submitted that training using these modules was actually implemented, and if implemented, was done so with fidelity.</p> <p>The manuals did have a section on “Guidance for</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of State-level plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>	<p>administration.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Online Training Modules (2.3 Appendix A) Online Modules</li> <li>Spring Test Coordinator Manual (2.3 Appendix B)</li> <li>Test Administration Manuals (2.3 Appendix C: 1- 8)</li> </ul> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of training content presented; lists of educators who completed training submitted to IL by end of year; access to student login information is contingent upon completion of training requirements.</li> <li>Chapter X: Training and Professional Development</li> <li>Training Content (2.3 Appendix D)</li> <li>Facilitated and Self-Directed Training (2.3 Appendix E)</li> <li>Completion of all modules (2.3 Appendix F)</li> <li>Training for LEA staff (2.3 Appendix G)</li> </ul> <p><b>ISA</b> ISBE submitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Systems User Guide – 2016 (2.3 Appendix A) Test Administration Section (2.3 Appendix B)</li> <li>2016 ISA Webinar Materials</li> <li>Microsoft PowerPoint 97-2003 Presentation</li> <li>Webinar Recording –</li> <li>Supplemental Packet -- See 4/ 6 and 4/7, 2016 Webinar FAQs for highlighted answers regarding accommodations.</li> <li>General Information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Illinois Science Assessment related</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Troubleshooting Computer-Based Testing” which was specifically requested by the USED.</p> <p><b>DLM</b> Evidence sufficient DLM training is online and access to the assessment is contingent on completion of training.</p> <p><b>ISA</b> Found the Users Guide very informative (2.3 Appendix A). Lots of information in Webinar recording (number of items on the assessments at the different grade levels and the testing times). The FAQs document answered many questions Peers had about the test development process in terms of working with the District of Columbia.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>However, it is not clear how these documents are disseminated, to whom, and what are the training requirements</li> <li>2.3 A – Systems User Guide for ISA</li> <li>slides from various webinars about specific</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>documents are posted on the ISA website maintained by ISBE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Additional ISA Webinars</li> <li>○ Examples of Webinars with ISA information and procedures:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Webinar 1 May 27, 2016 (2.3 Appendix C)(pp 13-24)</li> <li>Webinar 2 May 6, 2016 (2.3 Appendix D)(pp 9-18)</li> <li>Webinar 3 April 29, 2016 (2.3 Appendix E)(pp 5-15)</li> <li>Webinar 4 April 15, 2016 (2.3 Appendix F)(pp 5-16)</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Technology Requirements</li> </ul>	<p>issues citing various issues and directives – these appear to be for coordinators vs test administrators. Is all this information in one location? What training is provided to coordinators and test administrators?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.3 B - 2 pages. A Test Administration Manual was not submitted, what is provided to test administrators? What training is provided to them?</li> <li>• The ISA Accessibility and Accommodations guidance on isbe.net states that: “Students with EL Plans may have the test read aloud or translated into a native language. However, all answers must be in English and transcribed into ISBE-Learn for scoring. Again, failure to do so will result in no results for the student and the student will count as not tested for participation, as no scale score will be generated.” This practice gives rise to several test administration concerns that must be addressed, including:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What training is provided?</li> <li>○ How are standardized administration procedures ensured?</li> <li>○ What licensure/experience requirements are in place for transcribers?</li> <li>○ Is the student’s response in a native language and transcribed into English by the test administrator?</li> <li>○ Is the student supposed to respond in English and the test administrator enters the response?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Though evidence should not be submitted through hyperlinks, Peers located the following on isbe.net: TEST COORDINATORS AND</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		ADMINISTRATORS <a href="#">2018 ISA 101 Presentation, Systems User Guide, ISBE-Learn Tutorial-TA Guide, ISBE-Learn Tutorial Website, Professional Testing Practices for Educators, Accommodations &amp; Accessibility Features, ISA Accessibility Features, Irregularity Form, Reader Scripts</a>
<p><b>from 2016 review</b>                      For all the entire assessment system, ISBE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of implementation of training resources provided by the Consortia for test administration, including administration with accommodations.</li> <li>• Documentation of the fidelity of implementation of training provided by PARCC and DLM.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of State-level plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for <b>DLM Science and DLM YE</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>for SAT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide evidence of schedules for training for all staff involved in test administration, ensuring participation in training, and tracking of signed assurance forms.</li> <li>• Provide evidence that test administrators are trained to appropriately administer read aloud and scribe accommodations and other accommodations.</li> </ul> <p><b>for PARCC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit evidence that training was implemented with fidelity.</li> </ul> <p><b>for ISA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit evidence that test administrators receive training on test administration and standardized provision of test accommodations, procedures for tracking test administrator participation in training, and summary evidence that only trained test administrators proctored the assessment.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p align="center"><b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p><b>SAT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SAT school day registration questionnaire</li> <li>- Why and How, ETS questions scores</li> <li>- The SAT school day test manual</li> </ul> <p><b>DLM-Science</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monitoring test delivery</li> <li>- PARC escalation protocol</li> </ul> <p><b>PARCC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Form to report a test irregularity or breach</li> <li>- Escalation protocols for states</li> <li>- Scripts</li> </ul> <p><b>ISA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reviewed Appendices 2.4 A-C</li> </ul>	<p><b>SAT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Evidence sufficient</li> </ul> <p><b>DLM-Science</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It was unclear whether the PARCC escalation procedures noted in the DLM science index also applied for this exam.</li> </ul> <p><b>PARCC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Evidence sufficient</li> </ul> <p><b>ISA</b></p> <p>ISBE submitted a document for procedures for handling test irregularities. Note that appendices B and C are for PARCC or DLM and do not apply to ISA. ISBE noted Illinois does not monitor assessments in LEAs for ISA. ISBE will need submit evidence of the state’s procedures for monitoring test administration and a summary of the results of the state’s monitoring findings.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY—verify for all assessments</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>_x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>ISA/ DLM Science</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Evidence of the state’s procedures for monitoring test administration and a summary of the results of the state’s monitoring findings.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>2.5 – Test Security</b></p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> </ul>	<p><b>SAT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>2.1.1: SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017)</b>, pp. 58-59 describe the procedures the College Board has designed to maintain test security at all times; pp. 66-68 describe the College Board’s post-test analysis, which is conducted as a component of the company’s test security procedures.</li> <li>• <b>2.3.1: The SAT School Day Supervisor Manual (Spring 2017)</b> This manual provides guidance for supervisors who are responsible for overseeing the administration on how to maintain test security; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ pp. 8-9 describes information supervisors should communicate to staff to maintain test security, including seating policies devised to reduce the possibility of cheating.</li> <li>○ Pp. 12-13 describe how supervisors should prepare student for test day and includes information on items and behaviors that are not allowed in the test area.</li> <li>○ Pp.14-26 - instructions on how to receive and securely store materials until test day, and report on test administration irregularities.</li> <li>○ Pp. 39-40 sample irregularities report that supervisors use to begin investigation of test administration issues.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>2.3.2: The SAT School Day Test Room Manual (Spring 2017)</b>, pp. 1-12 instruction on standardized testing procedures to maintain security during test administration, how to maintain security in the testing room and report administration irregularities.</li> </ul>	<p><b>SAT</b></p> <p>In 2.3.4 SAT School Day Test Center Supervisor Training (2016), pp. 23-30: The College Board claims that it trains test administration staff (including supervisors, coordinators, and administrators) on how to report and address irregularities they may encounter on test day. However, there is no evidence of direct training in the submission. The Peers located only training materials.</p> <p>ISBE did not submit documentation that the state implements SAT policies and procedures.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Evidence # 2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b>, pp.11-21-how to monitor the test administration and report testing irregularities that may take place during a nonstandard test administration.</li> <li>• <b>2.3.4 SAT School Day Test Center Supervisor Training (2016)</b>, pp. 23-30: The College Board trains test administration staff (including supervisors, coordinators, and administrators) on how to report and address irregularities they may encounter on test day.</li> <li>• <b>2.3.4 SAT School Day Registration and Questionnaire Guide (2017)</b>. This brochure provides important information for students so that they may prepare for test day. Pp. 15 – 21-information on test security procedures, what will be allowed into testing rooms, and how to report suspicious behavior, pp. 25-26, 27-30-processes that may take place in order to conserve test integrity and maintain test security.</li> <li>• <b>2.5.1 Why and How ETS Questions Scores (College Board Programs) 2016</b>. This document describes the ways that ETS, the testing subcontractor, investigates cases that may affect the validity of test scores.</li> </ul> <p><b>DLM-Science</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.5 Appendix B, pp. 122-135; description of observation surveys for research implemented. P. 135 – “Feedback collected about the assessment’s administration is used to support continuous improvement of the training and resources provided as well as to plan upgrades to the system to improve the assessment experience.”</li> <li>• <b><i>IV.5.B. ADMINISTRATION ERRORS</i></b></li> </ul>	<p><b>DLM Science</b> Science Technical Manual (2.4 Appendix C)(pp 112-114)</p> <p>DLM requires that state partners review and update their breach response communication plan annually. It did not submit evidence that this was done.</p> <p>No evidence provided related to policies and</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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).</p>	<p>“Monitoring of testlet assignment uncovered a few incidents that affected student assignment to tests, including misrouting errors due to a local caching server issue and scoring errors, which may have indirectly affected routing because the thresholds are based on percentage of items answered correctly within a testlet.”</p> <p><b>PARCC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.5 Appendix A: PARCC Irregularity Report</li> </ul> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.5 Appendices B and C – these are proposed plans.</li> </ul> <p><b>PARCC Irregularity Report</b> (2.5 Appendix A) <b>DLM Data Security Breach</b> (2.5 Appendix B) <b>DLM State Response Communication Plan</b> (2.5 Appendix C)</p> <p>Page 9, Index: “ISBE review test irregularity reports that are submitted by LEAs during and after test administration. Once the irregularity is reviewed, then ISBE will contact the identified individual who reported the irregularity with further guidance and instructions to remediate the irregularity.”</p> <p>Page 9, Index: “PARCC and DLM have a required form for districts to submit to report any irregularities.”</p> <p><b>ISA</b> ISBE provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Generate Access Codes (2.5 Appendix A)</li> <li>ISA is delivered via a secure portal (ISBE-Learn). Students will be assigned an access code</li> </ul>	<p>procedures that are implemented by IL to identify security and irregularity issues outside of the vendor’s online administration system.</p> <p><b>PARCC</b> Evidence sufficient but some type of summary report of irregularities or data breaches would have been helpful</p> <p>No evidence was provided that there is remediation following incident(s).</p> <p><b>DLM</b> Some type of summary report of irregularities or data breaches would have been helpful</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.5 Appendices B and C – these are proposed plans. No evidence that they were finalized</li> <li>No evidence of remediation following incident</li> </ul> <p><b>ISA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ISA is delivered online via a secure portal and students are assigned individual access codes, which are secure.</li> <li>Professional Test Practices for Educators</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>to log-in to the portal to assess. The access codes are secured in the test administration platform (ISBE Teach). Access to ISBE Teach is via a secure user login. User accounts are maintained by each LEAs.</p>	<p>includes sections on test security. However, this appears to be written for a paper-pencil test and does not reference online assessments and security practices related to this type of administration. There is no detail about how test administrators receive training.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 5 in 2.5 Appendix A delineates reporting procedures for test irregularities, sanctions for test irregularities, and a test security agreement that must be signed.</li> <li>• The ISA Accessibility and Accommodations guidance on isbe.net states that:                     <p>“Students with EL Plans may have the test read aloud or translated into a native language. However, all answers must be in English and transcribed into ISBE-Learn for scoring. Again, failure to do so will result in no results for the student and the student will count as not tested for participation, as no scale score will be generated.” This practice gives rise to several test administration concerns that must be addressed, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What training is provided?</li> <li>○ How are standardized administration procedures ensured?</li> <li>○ What licensure/experience requirements are in place for transcribers?</li> <li>○ Is the student’s response in a native language and transcribed into English by the test administrator?</li> <li>○ Is the student supposed to respond in English and the test administrator enters the response?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Not submitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requirements for annual training, detection of test irregularities, investigation of test</li> </ul>

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As 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 Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		irregularities, and remediation following test security incidents.
<p><b>from 2016 review</b>                      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).</p>		
<p><b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>for SAT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide documentation that the state implements SAT policies and procedures related to this critical element.</li> </ul> <p><b>for DLM Science</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit evidence that ISBE implements appropriate policies and procedures to identify security and irregularity issues and remediation beyond the vendor’s online administration system.</li> </ul> <p><b>for PARCC and DLM YE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that ISBE implements test security policies/procedures; investigation of possible test irregularities; and remediation following incident(s), e.g. frequency of incidences and remediation taken.</li> </ul> <p><b>for ISA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that ISBE implements test security policies/procedures; investigation of possible test irregularities; and remediation following incident(s), e.g. frequency of incidences and remediation taken.</li> <li>• Evidence that the transcriber has received sufficient training to document test security.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</b></p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results;</li> <li>To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> <li>To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.</li> </ul>	<p><b>SAT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>2.6.1: Description of Test Management and Reporting System</b>, provides overview of the security of the College Board online test management and reporting system.</li> <li><b>2.6.2: Axway Secure Transport Data Sheet (2017)</b>. The College Board provides data files to the state using an SFTP ad-hoc file transfer process provide by Tumbleweed, a secure managed file transfer (MFT) site managed by Axway. This data sheet, created by Axway, provides a high-level overview of all of their Secure Transport products, including their web-based SFTP service.</li> </ul> <p><b>DLM Science</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>2.6 Appendix C, Science Technical Manual, pp. 124-125</b>. DLM utilizes a secure file transfer protocol (SFTP) entitled the Hawk Drive. Illinois utilizes a two level security protocol for student level data. LEAs must request access to Illinois Web Application System. After access is granted, then the educator must request access to web application programs (Student Information System, Entity Profile System, or Assessment) in order to access student level data, district level data, or the general population science assessment.</li> </ul>	<p><b>SAT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two documents, not submitted, are in process of being updated: College Board Information Security Policy and College Board Guidelines for the Release of Data. These should be submitted for review when updated.</li> <li>2.6.2 – high level, vendor-developed overview of Axway products. Which are applicable to SAT?</li> <li>Information on paper storage and handling printing and shipping to schools is lacking.</li> <li>ISBE did not provide information on the minimum N-size used for reporting.</li> <li>No information was provided regarding security measures used to protect the item bank.</li> </ul> <p><b>DLM Science</b></p> <p>IL did not provide information on the minimum N-size used for reporting.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>For all components of the State assessment system, ISBE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<p><b>PARCC and DLM</b>            Student Data Privacy            Illinois School Student Records Act 5 ILCS 140</p> <p><b>ISA</b>  <b>IL submitted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IWAS Application System (2.6. Appendix A)</li> <li>• Data is accessed through a secure user portal. Illinois utilizes secure user portals for all aspects of ISA. Illinois preloads LEA administrators and identified ISA test coordinators into ISBE Teach. LEA staff create accounts for additional test coordinators and test administrators. Illinois purges user accounts from ISBE Teach at the end of each test cycle.</li> <li>• The data platform utilized or ISA is the standard platform used by Illinois for other assessment programs, data collection, and data reporting that includes our Illinois School and District Report Cards.</li> </ul>	<p><b>PARCC and DLM</b>            Evidence sufficient on student level data privacy. Peers thought the 4-minute video was well done.</p> <p>However, not clear how the training on Data Privacy is disseminated and how those who take courses are tracked.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IL School Student Records Act submitted</li> <li>• Isbe.net has a series of tabs with information about components of data privacy: Student Data Safeguarding, Student Data Privacy for Parents, District personnel and Data Users, Student Data Privacy Training, Resources for Student Data Privacy</li> </ul> <p><b>ISA</b>            While access to the online assessments is one important aspect of data integrity and privacy, it is not sufficient to ensure data integrity and privacy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.6 A: IWAS Application System-this is a screenshot of a sign-in page</li> <li>• No evidence was provided regarding minimum N-size for reporting.</li> <li>• No evidence was provided to ensure that student data storage is secure.</li> <li>• No evidence was provided to ensure that item banks are maintained in a secure fashion.</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>from 2016 review</b>                      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</p>		
<p><b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>for SAT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit documents when updated: College Board Information Security Policy and College Board Guidelines for the Release of Data.</li> <li>• Submit information related to printing and shipping of test materials to LEAs/schools.</li> <li>• Submit evidence that IL will apply its minimum N-size used for SAT reporting.</li> </ul> <p><b>for DLM Science</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit evidence of a minimum N-size used for reporting</li> </ul> <p><b>for PARCC and DLM YE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit evidence on how the training on Data Privacy is disseminated and how those who take courses are tracked.</li> </ul> <p><b>for ISA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit evidence of a minimum N-size for reporting.</li> <li>• Submit evidence that student data storage is secure.</li> <li>• Submit evidence that item banks are maintained in a secure fashion.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> <li>• If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul>	<p><b>ISA</b>  <b>IL submitted:</b>                      Embedded Test Maps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gr. 5 (2.1 Appendix A)</li> <li>• Gr. 8 (2.1 Appendix B)</li> <li>• HS Biology (2.1 Appendix C)</li> <li>• Not computer adaptive</li> <li>• Single select multiple choice items and extended response items based on science phenomena.(2.1 Appendix D)</li> </ul>	<p><b>ISA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No documentation of alignment; only a statement: “DC items verified alignment to Next Generation Science Standards”</li> <li>• A timeline of tasks related to test development from Jan. – April 2016</li> </ul> <p>The USED Non-Regulatory Guidance document includes possible sources of evidence to consider. ISBE may also want to consult the IL Technical Advisory Committee in this regard.</p>
<p><b>see prior DLM/PARCC consortium reviews</b></p>		
<p><b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:  <b>for ISA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit overall validity evidence to address Critical Element 3.1, including results from an independent alignment study.</li> </ul>		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As 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 Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>ISA                      IL submitted:                      Embedded Test Maps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <input type="checkbox"/> Gr. 5 (2.1 Appendix A)</li> <li>• <input type="checkbox"/> Gr. 8 (2.1 Appendix B)</li> <li>• HS Biology (2.1 Appendix C)</li> <li>• Not computer adaptive</li> <li>• Single select multiple choice items and extended response items based on science phenomena.(2.1 Appendix D)</li> </ul>	<p>ISA                      No evidence submitted pertaining to this Critical Element.</p> <p>Evidence that ISBE should consider including Depth of Knowledge expectations (both in the test blueprints as well as the independent alignment study).</p> <p>The USED Non-Regulatory Guidance document includes possible sources of evidence to consider, as well.</p>
<p><b>see prior DLM/PARCC consortium reviews</b></p>		
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:                      for ISA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit evidence for Critical Element 3.2 (e.g., DOK evidence referenced in Peer notes).</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p><b>ISA</b>  <b>IL submitted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ISA Psychometric Analysis Report (3.3 Appendix A)</li> <li>The final report will come by March 31, 2018. Additional interrater scoring studies are being conducted.</li> </ul>	<p><b>ISA</b>                      The ISA Final Psychometric Analysis Report is due out by March 31, 2018. Peers strongly recommend that the analyses conducted for the final psychometric report target the 2016-17 school year, which may reflect implementation improvements.</p> <p>3.3 Appendix A, Draft ISA Psychometric Analysis Report: (1) item analysis and distractor analysis, (2) checking validity and reliability, and (3) DIF analysis.</p> <p>Peers have concerns about the documentation presented in 3.3 Appendix A, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is some evidence of unidimensionality, yet score reporting is done at the domain level; ISBE should address the discrepancy between the test structure and the score reporting structure.</li> <li>The number of items on the assessments are quite low; if ISBE desires to report a multi-dimensional test structure, additional items should be included that might support this effort.</li> </ul>
<p><b>see prior DLM/PARCC consortium reviews</b></p>		
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:  <b>for ISA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submit final psychometric report that includes evidence of 3.3, founded in the ISA test results from the 2016-17 school year.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>ISA IL submitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ISA Psychometric Analysis Report (3.4.Appendix A)</li> </ul>	<p>ISA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No criterion-related evidence is submitted.</li> <li>Possible sources of comparison may include correlations among/between other content area assessments in the Illinois State Assessment Program (ISAP)</li> </ul>
<p><b>see prior DLM/PARCC consortium reviews</b></p>		
<p><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: for ISA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submit final psychometric report that includes evidence of 3.4, once completed.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>4.1 – Reliability</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement.</li> </ul>	<p><b>ISA</b>  <b>IL submitted:</b>                      ISA Psychometric Analysis Report (3.3 Appendix A).The final report will come by March 31, 2018. Additional interrater scoring studies are being conducted.</p>	<p><b>ISA</b>                      Although a draft report was submitted, the documentation did not document adequate reliability. As mentioned above, the Peers strongly recommend that the analyses conducted for the final psychometric report target the 2016-17 school year, which may reflect implementation improvements.</p> <p>Peers have several concerns related to the draft report submitted in the area of reliability including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the ISA built upon raw score points? The scale being employed should be explicit in the technical report (for example, the SEM are not possible to interpret without this information).</li> <li>• Conditional SEM results not provided; it’s not feasible to analyze the precision of estimates around the cut score for this reason.</li> <li>• Reliability coefficients are not adequate for statewide assessments; Cronbach’s alpha results should generally be in the .90 range.</li> <li>• The inter-rater reliability (IRR) results presented demonstrate that procedures for hand-scoring constructed response items requires further elaboration and improvement (i.e., training, exemplars, scoring rubrics, remediation of errant raters, procedures when raters are non-adjacent, etc.).</li> </ul> <p>The DIF results presented appear to be generally positive.</p>
<p><b>see prior DLM/PARCC consortium reviews</b></p>		
<p><b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:  <b>for ISA</b></p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submit final psychometric report that includes evidence of 4.1, once completed.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</b></p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<p>ISA  <b>IL submitted:</b>                      ISA Psychometric Analysis Report (3.3 Appendix A). The final report will come by March 31, 2018. Additional interrater scoring studies are being conducted.</p>	<p>ISA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DIF cited for gender and racial and ethnic groups in Draft report.</li> <li>• Evidence related to fairness and accessibility in design and development of the ISA was not submitted.</li> </ul>
<p><b>see prior DLM/PARCC consortium reviews</b></p>		
<p><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale for ISA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that ISBE has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are fair and accessible across student groups in the design and development of its assessments.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b></p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p><b>ISA</b>  <b>IL submitted:</b>                      ISA Psychometric Analysis Report (3.3 Appendix A). The final report will come by March 31, 2018. Additional interrater scoring studies are being conducted.</p>	<p><b>ISA</b>                      Evidence regarding a range of item difficulties was submitted; however, the ISBE did not state its goal for item ranges (which are typically in the +/- 3.0 range). The item difficulty plots on pages 5-6 convey that items do not cover this range. The scales are generally missing students in the lower and upper tails of the distribution.</p> <p>The Peers encourage ISBE to include additional items on the ISA in order to address this issue.</p> <p>There were no CSEMs presented, nor cut scores. It is thus not possible to evaluate the precision of the ISA at the cut scores across Grades 5, 8, and HS.</p>
<p><b>see prior DLM/PARCC consortium reviews</b></p>		
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:  <b>for ISA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit final psychometric report that includes evidence of 4.3, founded in the ISA test results from the 2016-17 school year.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p><b>ISA</b>  <b>IL submitted:</b>                      Hand Scoring (4.4 Appendix A)                      Illinois used a three-person team to score the “machine-scored” items. The team consisted of two psychometricians and a division supervisor. All items were matched on frequency of raw score calculations and for each item answer choice distribution. The hand scoring process is detailed in the embedded document.</p>	<p><b>ISA</b>                      The Peers located IRR evidence in 3.3 Appendix A.</p> <p>The Peers did not locate documentation regarding the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.4 A, Hand Scoring: description of scoring process; Why were IRR consequences put in place after 40 items were scored? Were there expert scorers? Why 2-3 scorers?</li> <li>• The scoring inconsistency decision rules are not clear. Are they set based on exact match or adjacent scores? This changes the interpretation of the thresholds used (mentioned below) and should be clarified.</li> <li>• The 85% IRR agreement threshold was not met for most items based on the IRR results presented in 3.3 Appendix A.</li> <li>• Unclear how the inaccurate scorer ratings after 40 items are reviewed are addressed (i.e., are the discrepant ratings reviewed and re-scored by an expert rater?)</li> <li>• Unclear if third rater is an expert.</li> </ul> <p>The ISA Accessibility and Accommodations guidance on isbe.net states that:                      “Students with EL Plans may have the test read aloud or translated into a native language. However, all answers must be in English and transcribed into ISBE-Learn for scoring. Again, failure to do so will result in no results for the student and the student will count as not tested for participation, as no scale score will be generated.” This practice gives rise to several test administration concerns that must be addressed, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What training is provided?</li> <li>○ How are standardized administration</li> </ul>

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As 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 Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>procedures ensured?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What licensure/experience requirements are in place for transcribers?</li> <li>○ Is the student’s response in a native language and transcribed into English by the test administrator?</li> <li>○ Is the student supposed to respond in English and the test administrator enters the response?</li> </ul>
<p><b>see prior DLM/PARCC consortium reviews</b></p>		
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:  <b>for ISA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit final psychometric report that includes evidence of 4.4, founded in the ISA test results from the 2016-17 school year (see Peer notes above).</li> <li>• Submit evidence that transcribed administrations are conducted in a standardized manner, consistent with test administration requirements that explain ISBE expectations (see Peer notes above).</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</b></p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p>ISA  <b>IL submitted:</b>                      Illinois utilizes a single form at each grade and subject assessed.</p>	<p><b>ISA:</b>                      N/A because only a single form is used at each grade level. Evidence suggests that ISBE is planning to make changes to the test, but it is not clear if they will continue with a single form at each grade level.</p>
<p><b>see prior DLM/PARCC consortium reviews</b></p>		
<p><b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required for ISA</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b></p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<p><b>ISA</b>  <b>IL submitted:</b>                      Illinois utilizes a single form at each grade and subject assessed.</p>	<p><b>ISA:</b>                      Though Illinois states that only a single form is used at each grade level, the evidence submitted includes reference to a paper version (see ISA Accessibility and Accommodations guidance document on isbe.net).</p> <p>Peers thus request comparability information for the paper versus the online ISA.</p>
<p><b>see prior DLM/PARCC consortium reviews</b></p>		
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:  <b>for ISA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submit evidence of comparability between paper and online versions of the ISA.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b></p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p><b>ISA</b>  <b>IL submitted:</b>                      Illinois is procuring a vendor to conduct further test development to include new item development. Illinois anticipates the Intergovernmental Agreement with Southern Illinois University at Carbondale to be in place by the end of January 2018.</p>	<p><b>ISA:</b>                      ISBE mentions a contract with Southern Illinois University at Carbondale (SIUC) hopefully by January 2018.</p> <p>Evidence not submitted to review this Critical Element</p>
<p><b>see prior DLM/PARCC consortium reviews</b></p>		
<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:  <b>for ISA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit evidence that meets the requirements in Critical Element 4.7.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards;</li> <li>• States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs;</li> <li>• Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess</li> </ul>	<p><b>SAT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>2.1.1: SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017)</b>, pp. 49-52 describe the types of available allowable accommodations.</li> <li>• <b>2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b>, provides instructions for supervisors responsible for registering students for testing accommodations, and managing the test administration for students who require testing accommodations.</li> <li>• <b>2.3.5: SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017)</b>, PowerPoint deck presented to SSD supervisors via an online training session and reviews the policies and procedures related to SAT administrations for students who require testing accommodations.</li> <li>• <b>5.1.1, selected pages from the College Board Students with Disabilities website. (accessed September 1, 2017)</b> provide images of the College Board web pages regarding the accommodations request and approval process. This information is available through the College Board website - <a href="https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities">https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities</a>.</li> <li>• <b>5.1.2. College Board Typical Accommodations (accessed October 2, 2017)</b>, document provides information regarding typical testing accommodations available for SAT test administrations. This information is available through the College Board website - <a href="https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities/typical-accommodations">https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities/typical-accommodations</a>.</li> <li>• <b>5.1.3. Support for Students with Temporary Physical/ Medical Conditions;</b> this form is used to request testing support for students with temporary impairments (caused by injury, accident, etc) who cannot postpone their tests.</li> <li>• <b>5.1.4 Reports for Students who Test with State Allowed Accommodations</b> Students who test using state allowed accommodations will receive test results that are marked with an “SAA” label. These screen shots show how the designation appears on their reports.</li> <li>• <b>5.1.5 Parent Consent Form Templates;</b> template provided by the College Board that district and school administrators may use to attain parental consent to administer the SAT with testing accommodations to particular students. This resource is optionally used by our state</li> </ul>	<p><b>SAT</b></p> <p>IL-specific evidence is not provided for SAT administration: bullets 1, 2, 3; what information about the SAT is provided to IEP teams by IL?</p> <p>IEP teams making accommodations decisions need a complete list of all allowable accommodations for the SAT.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities;</li> <li>• Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;</li> <li>• Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;</li> <li>• Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area</li> </ul>	<p>partners.</p> <p><b>DLM Science</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• isbe.net. Dynamic Learning Maps Alternate Assessment Participation Guidance</li> </ul>	<p><b>DLM Science:</b>            ISBE, in its index for PARCC and DLM, specifically states on page 19 that            “Parents are informed of the implications of the alternate assessment via the participation guidelines completed at the time of the IEP annual meeting and parent interpretative guide of assessment results and individual student reports.”</p> <p>However, Peers couldn’t find specific documentation of it in the guidelines that are mentioned.</p> <p>Evidence does not indicate that parents are informed of the implication of taking the DLM science assessment.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>on the State’s general assessments);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul> <p><b>For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), ISBE must provide:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Evidence of State and local policies that communicate the implications of a student’s participation in an AA-AAAS and;</b></li> <li><b>Evidence of how parents of these children are informed of these implications.</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>DLM</b> The regulation provided indicates that the participation guidelines include the implications of a student’s participation in an AA-AAS and that this is how parents are informed. Although the participation guidelines were not submitted for review, peers located these at</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>isbe.net. Dynamic Learning Maps Alternate Assessment Participation Guidance</li> </ul> <p><b>ISA</b> <b>IL submitted:</b></p>	<p><b>DLM</b> IL, in its index for PARCC and DLM, specifically states on page 19 that “Parents are informed of the implications of the alternate assessment via the participation guidelines completed at the time of the IEP annual meeting and parent interpretative guide of assessment results and individual student reports.” However, I couldn’t find specific documentation of it in the guidelines that are mentioned.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The participation guidelines do not indicate what the implications of taking DLM are and do not indicate that parents and children are informed of the implication of taking the DLM assessment.</li> </ul> <p><b>ISA</b> ISBE, in its index for PARCC and DLM,</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><a href="http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/ilcs/ilcs5.asp?ActID=1005&amp;ChapterID=17">http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/ilcs/ilcs5.asp?ActID=1005&amp;ChapterID=17</a>                      (105 ILCS 5/2-3.64a-5)                      (Text of Section from P.A. 100-7)                      Sec. 2-3.64a-5. State goals and assessment. (a)                      For the assessment and accountability purposes of this Section, "students" includes those students enrolled in a public or State-operated elementary school, secondary school, or cooperative or joint agreement with a governing body or board of control, a charter school operating in compliance with the Charter Schools Law, a school operated by a regional office of education under Section 13A-3 of this Code, or a public school administered by a local public agency or the Department of Human Services.</p> <p>Basics about ISA:                      slide 8                      This resource was added during the 2017 administration. The information was shared during 2016 during webinars etc., but was not posted as a stand-alone document until the 2017 season.                      Features available for all students:  <a href="https://www.isbe.net/Documents/ISA-accessibility-features.pdf">https://www.isbe.net/Documents/ISA-accessibility-features.pdf</a>                      ISA or DLM-AA?  <a href="https://www.isbe.net/Documents/dlm-partic-gdlns.pdf">https://www.isbe.net/Documents/dlm-partic-gdlns.pdf</a></p> <p>Code References ISBE follows to govern IEP etc.:                      Title 34: Education                      PART 300—ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES                      Subpart D—Evaluations, Eligibility Determinations, Individualized Education Programs, and Educational Placements                      §300.320 Definition of individualized education program.                      (a) General. As used in this part, the term individualized education program or IEP means a written statement for each child with a disability that is developed, reviewed, and revised in a meeting in accordance with §§300.320 through 300.324, and that must include—                      (6)(i) A statement of any individual appropriate accommodations that are necessary to measure the academic achievement and functional performance of the child on State and districtwide assessments consistent</p>	<p>specifically states on Page 19 that:                      “Parents are informed of the implications of the alternate assessment via the participation guidelines completed at the time of the IEP annual meeting and parent interpretative guide of assessment results and individual student reports.”                      However, Peers couldn’t locate specific documentation of this claim in evidence provided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some information submitted on index does not indicate where to access</li> <li>• Evidence not submitted for bullets 1, 3, 4, 5, or 6</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>with section 612(a)(16) of the Act; and                      (ii) If the IEP Team determines that the child must take an alternate assessment instead of a particular regular State or districtwide assessment of student achievement, a statement of why—                      (A) The child cannot participate in the regular assessment; and                      (B) The particular alternate assessment selected is appropriate for the child</p> <p>DLM Participation Guidelines  <b>Parent Interpretive Guide</b>(5.1 Appendix A)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Dynamic Learning Maps Alternate Assessment Participation Guidance</b></li> <li>• Code References ISBE follows to govern IEP etc.:                          Title 34: Education                          PART 300—ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES                          Subpart D—Evaluations, Eligibility Determinations, Individualized Education Programs, and Educational Placements: addresses</li> <li>• ACCESSIBILTIY AND ACCOMMODATIONS GUIDANCE – available to students with disabilities with IEPs; however, does not indicate that selections must be consistent with IEP, and does not indicate if a practice is an accessibility feature or an accommodation</li> </ul>	
<p><b>from 2016 review</b>                      For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), ISBE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of State and local policies that communicate the implications of a student’s participation in an AA-AAAS and;</li> <li>• Evidence of how parents of these children are informed of these implications.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:  <b>for SAT</b></p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide IL-specific evidence for SAT administration: bullets 1, 2, 3 of this critical element.</li> <li>• Provide a complete list of SAT-allowable accommodations.</li> </ul> <p><b>for DLM Science</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit IL-specific evidence for DLM Science administration: bullets 1, 2, 3, 7, and 8 of this Critical Element.</li> </ul> <p><b>for PARCC and DLM YE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit evidence of State and local policies that communicate the implications of a student’s participation in an AA-AAAS and;</li> <li>• Submit evidence of how parents of these children are informed of these implications.</li> </ul> <p><b>for ISA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit evidence related to bullets 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 within Critical Element 5.1.</li> </ul>	

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> <li>• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;</li> <li>• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>	<p><b>SAT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>2.1.1: SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017)</b>, pp. 50-51 describe the types of accommodations available to English learners.</li> <li>• <b>2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b>. This manual provides instructions on how to administer the SAT to English Learner students who are required to test with additional supports such as glossaries or translated instructions. Refer to pages iv, vi, and 30 for those instructions.</li> <li>• <b>5.2.1 : College Board- Approved Word-to-Word Glossaries for the SAT® Suite of Assessments (2017)</b>. This document lists the word-to-word glossaries that the College Board has approved for use with the SAT by English Learner students. The state education agency decides which students can use these language supports. These supports do not require an accommodations request and provide college reportable scores to students.</li> <li>• <b>5.2.2: College Board translated instructions for the SAT (2017)</b> The College Board provides translated test instructions to English language learners in the following languages: (a) English, (b) Arabic, (c) Chinese, (d) Haitian Creole, (e) Polish, (f) Russian, (g) Portuguese, (h) Spanish, and (i) Vietnamese. The state education agency decides which students can use these language supports. These supports do not require an accommodations request and provide college reportable scores to students.</li> <li>• <i>The College Board's policies and procedures are designed to ensure that appropriate testing accommodations are made available to students with disabilities, including English learners with a diagnosed disability. Students who are approved for and using testing accommodations at their school through a current Individualized Education Program (IEP) 504 Plan, or Formal Written Plan will have those same accommodations automatically approved for taking the SAT®, PSAT™10, PSAT/NMSQT®, SAT Subject Tests™, and AP® Exams. Please refer to the evidence provided in response to critical elements 5.1 and 5.3 for additional information regarding College Board accommodations processes.</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>SAT</b></p> <p>5.2.1 and 5.2.2: How does IL implement these SAT policies and procedures?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IL did not provide state procedures to determine if ELs need accommodations or how to select accommodations for EL students.</li> <li>• What and how is information about EL accommodations shared with schools, teachers, parents, and students?</li> <li>• Are there IL SAAs for ELs that result in non-reportable scores?</li> <li>• When will the extended time study results be available and how will IL address the findings?</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>For all components of the State assessment system, ISBE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>Evidence of procedures for determining whether an English learners should be assessed with accommodations; and of selection procedures for accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>	<p><b>DLM-Science</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IL did not submit specific evidence for this critical element. IL notes state, “Decision at the LEA level per EL plan for student. The test can be read aloud or translated into the student’s native language. All answers must be in English.” However, there is different procedures cited in DLM Accessibility Manual and DLM TAM.</li> </ul> <p><b>PARCC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5.2 Appendices A, B, C provide this information to districts, schools, teachers. Not clear how this information is provided to parents. Appendix , p. 56 references EL parent involvement in selection. The information brochures for students and parents are provided in a link.</li> </ul> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>p. 24 in DLM Accessibility Manual references EL; however, doesn’t suggest selection procedures other than to include teachers who have an understanding of the student’s language needs.</li> </ul> <p><b>ISA</b>  <b>IL submitted:</b>  <a href="http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/ilcs/ilcs5.asp?ActID=1005&amp;ChapterID=17">http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/ilcs/ilcs5.asp?ActID=1005&amp;ChapterID=17</a>          (105 ILCS 5/2-3.64a-5)          (Text of Section from P.A. 100-7)          Sec. 2-3.64a-5. State goals and assessment. (a)          For the assessment and accountability purposes of this Section, "students" includes those students enrolled in a public or State-operated elementary school, secondary school, or cooperative or joint agreement with a governing body or board of control, a charter school operating in compliance with the Charter Schools Law, a school operated by a regional office of education under Section 13A-3 of this Code, or a public school administered by a local public agency or the Department of Human Services.          Decision at the LEA level per EL plan for student. The test can be read aloud or translated into the student’s native language. All answers must be in</p>	<p><b>DLM Science</b>  <b>Evidence sufficient</b></p> <p>Peers located evidence in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DLM Accessibility Manual, p. 24</li> <li>DLM Test Administration Manual, pp. 66-67</li> </ul> <p><b>PARCC</b>          Not clear how this information is provided to parents. 5.2 Appendices A, B, C</p> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence not provided related to whether EL should be assessed using accommodations or how accommodations for EL are selected.</li> </ul> <p><b>ISA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Slide 8 displays the accessibility features that are available to students with disabilities and EL students; they are the same for both populations.</li> <li>Guidance for the selection of appropriate accessibility features and accommodations for ELs is not provided.</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	English. Basics about ISA: slide 8	
<p><b>from 2016 review</b>                      For all components of the State assessment system, ISBE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of procedures for determining whether an English learners should be assessed with accommodations; and of selection procedures for accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for <b>DLM Science</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>for SAT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide state procedures to determine if ELs need accommodations and how to select accommodations for EL students for the SAT.</li> </ul> <p><b>PARCC and DLM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>Evidence of procedures for determining whether an English learners should be assessed with accommodations; and of selection procedures for accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul> <p><b>ISA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State has procedures for determining whether English learners should be assessed with accommodations and selection procedures for accessibility features and accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>5.3 – Accommodations</b></p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504;</li> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);</li> <li>Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> <li>Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>	<p><b>SAT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>2.1.1: SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017), pp. 49–51</b> describe the available allowable accommodations, including a description of the supports available for English Learners.</li> <li><b>2.3.5: SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017).</b> PowerPoint deck is presented to SSD supervisors via an online training session and reviews the policies and procedures related to SAT administrations for students who require testing accommodations. All students with documented disabilities, including English Learners, can request and are approved for disability accommodations.</li> <li><b>5.1.1 Pages from the College Board Students with Disabilities website. (accessed September 1, 2017)</b> This document provides images of the College Board web pages regarding the accommodations request and approval process. All students with documented disabilities, including English Learners, can request and are approved for disability accommodations. This information is available through the College Board website - <a href="https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities">https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities</a></li> <li><b>5.1.2. College Board Typical Accommodations (accessed October 2, 2017).</b> This document provides information regarding typical testing accommodations available for SAT test administrations. This information is available through the College Board website - <a href="https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities/typical-accommodations">https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities/typical-accommodations</a>.</li> </ul>	<p><b>SAT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bullet 2 – ELs may use translated directions and word-word dictionaries; potential provision of extended time for EL is under review</li> <li>Bullet 3: no studies provided or referenced</li> <li>Peers were not able to locate evidence that there is a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As 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 Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>5.1.3. Support for Students with Temporary Physical/ Medical Conditions</b> This form is used to request testing support for students with temporary impairments (caused by injury, accident, etc.) who cannot postpone their tests.</li> <li>• <b>5.1.4. Reports for Students who Test with State Allowed Accommodations</b> Student who test with State Allowed Accommodations receive a non-college reportable score. This document shows the online and paper-based score report that these students obtain. In adherence to applicable state and federal accessibility laws, College Board reports and resources are designed to meet accessibility standards including Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.</li> <li>• <b>5.1.5 Parent Consent Forms Templates</b> The College Board provides to its state clients templates that they may use to obtain parental consent for students to test with College Board approved accommodations or State Allowed Accommodations. The template is included here as evidence of supports the College Board provides to the state.</li> </ul> <p>DLM-Science</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IL did not submit specific evidence for this critical element. IL notes state, “Decision at the LEA level per EL plan for student. The test can be read aloud or translated into the student’s native language. All answers must be in English.”</li> </ul>	<p><b>DLM Science</b> Evidence not provided related to bullet 3 in critical element</p> <p>Peers located evidence related to allowable accommodations in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DLM Accessibility Manual, p. 24</li> <li>• DLM Test Administration Manual, pp. 66-</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>For all components of the State assessment system, ISBE must submit:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that confirms that the State is using the <b>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.</b></li> <li>• Evidence that the State has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>	<p><b>PARCC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The form for PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations was submitted.</li> <li>• Request for unique accommodations may be submitted using this form</li> </ul> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dynamic Learning Maps Accessibility Features/Accommodations Form was submitted</li> <li>• This form states: “Any accommodations that are not addressed may be implemented <b>IF</b> the accommodation does not negate the purpose of the assessment. Any accommodation used during testing should be familiar to the student through previous use in the student’s instructional program.</li> </ul> <p><b>ISA</b> <b>IL submitted:</b> See 2.3, 5.1, and 5.2. The test platform has text-to-speech and line reader for all students. All other accommodations are applied at the school level per the student’s IEP, 504 Plan, or EL Plan. Features available for all students: <a href="https://www.isbe.net/Documents/ISA-accessibility-features.pdf">https://www.isbe.net/Documents/ISA-accessibility-features.pdf</a> This resource was added during the 2017 administration. The information was shared during 2016 during webinars etc., but was not posted as a stand-alone document until the 2017 season.</p>	<p align="center">67</p> <p>Must submit evidence related to bullet 3 and the process to review exceptional accommodation requests.</p> <p><b>PARCC</b> Evidence sufficient</p> <p><b>DLM</b> Evidence sufficient</p> <p><b>ISA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Peers could not locate evidence for bullet 3</li> <li>• The Peers could not locate evidence of the process for requesting accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> <li>• The Peers could not locate evidence that the ISA is made available in Braille or Large Print formats.</li> <li>• The Peers could not locate guidance related to how to select accommodations for EL.</li> <li>• No Accessibility Manual was located for the ISAP. If an Accessibility and Accommodations Manual has not been developed, the Peers recommend that ISBE develop a comprehensive Accessibility and Accommodations Manual that includes all accessibility and accommodations</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>information for its statewide assessment program, including selection, administration, and evaluation of efficacy of accommodations and practices.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ISA Accessibility and Accommodations guidance on isbe.net states that: “Students with EL plans may have the test read aloud or translated into a native language. However, all answers must be in English and transcribed into ISBE-Learn for scoring. Again, failure to do so will result in no results for the student and the student will count as not tested for participation as no scale score will be generated.”</li> </ul>
<p><b>from 2016 review</b>            For all components of the State assessment system, ISBE must submit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>Evidence that the State has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for <b>PARCC and DLM YE</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>for SAT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submit evidence required in bullet 3 of this critical element.</li> <li>Submit evidence of IL’s process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul> <p><b>for DLM Science</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submit evidence related to bullet 3 and the process to review exceptional accommodation requests.</li> </ul> <p><b>for ISA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submit evidence related to bullet 3 and the process to review exceptional accommodation requests.</li> <li>Submit evidence that the ISA is made available in Braille and Large Print formats.</li> <li>Submit evidence related to selection of accommodations for students who are ELs.</li> <li>Submit evidence related to transcribed administrations of the ISA are appropriate and effective.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b></p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul> <p><b>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</b></p>	<p><b>SAT</b> For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts and Math, so no evidence will be provided related to a specific state’s alternate assessment. The state will determine which students take the general or the alternate assessment. Below we provide documentation regarding the accommodations that the College Board provides for administrations of the general assessment. <b>Evidence # 2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b> This manual provides instructions for supervisors who will be responsible for registering students for testing accommodations, and managing the test administration for students who require testing accommodations. <b>Evidence #2.3.5: SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017)</b> This PowerPoint deck is presented to SSD supervisors via an online training session and reviews the policies and procedures related to SAT administrations for students who require testing accommodations.</p> <p><b>DLM-Science</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IL did not submit evidence for this critical element.</li> </ul> <p><b>PARCC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5.4 App. A: PARCC provides Operational Report format; however, it is not evident that this report is evidence that IL monitors test administration to ensure standardized test administration procedures for special populations. No indicators on this report that IL is monitoring the selection and use</li> </ul>	<p><b>SAT</b> IL does not mention or show evidence of monitoring SAT administrations either before, during, or post administration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not indicated that the SAT accommodations are provided to IEP teams</li> <li>• What are state-allowed accommodations (SAA) that may not be accepted?</li> <li>• In 2.3.5, what training is provided to scribes and readers? This is critical training; slide 41 says training must be provided, but there is no further information.</li> </ul> <p><b>DLM Science</b> Response does not show evidence of monitoring related to accommodation selection and fidelity of implementation during test administration.</p> <p><b>PARCC</b> Response does not show actual evidence of monitoring.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>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).</b></p>	<p>of accommodations.</p> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5.4 App. B submitted; notes indicate that SBE may use these extracts for monitoring purposes. However, no evidence submitted that IL does monitor this.</li> </ul> <p><b>ISA</b> IL submitted: See 2.3 and 5.1 – 5.3.</p>	<p><b>DLM</b> Response does not provide evidence of monitoring.</p> <p><b>ISA</b> Response does not provide evidence of monitoring. No evidence of monitoring test administration for special populations was submitted.</p> <p>The ISA Accessibility and Accommodations guidance on isbe.net states that: “Students with EL Plans may have the test read aloud or translated into a native language. However, all answers must be in English and transcribed into ISBE-Learn for scoring. Again, failure to do so will result in no results for the student and the student will count as not tested for participation, as no scale score will be generated.”</p>
<p><b>from 2016 review</b> For all components of the State assessment system, ISBE must submit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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).</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>for SAT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submit evidence for 5.4 critical element.</li> </ul> <p><b>for DLM Science</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submit evidence of monitoring related to accommodation selection and fidelity of implementation during test administration.</li> </ul> <p><b>for PARCC and DLM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submit evidence that IL 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).</li> </ul> <p><b>for ISA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submit evidence that ISBE conducts monitoring of test administration to ensure that standardized test administration procedures for special populations are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)

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

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As 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 Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</b></p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities;</li> <li>• The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply;</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<p><b>SAT</b>                      Illinois Learning Standards                      IL ELA Standards                      IL Math Standards                      IL Learning Standards Books                      Illinois SAT Alignment (6.1 Appendix A)</p> <p><b>DLM Science</b>                      IL did not submit evidence for this critical element</p> <p><b>ISA</b>  <b>IL submitted:</b>                      See 1.2 and <a href="https://www.isbe.net/Documents_Board_Meetings/08-16-2017-Packet.pdf">https://www.isbe.net/Documents_Board_Meetings/08-16-2017-Packet.pdf</a>                      E. Illinois Science Assessment Threshold Scores and Performance Level Descriptors pp. 59-62                      The high school assessment is a Biology I test directed at first year biology I students. It is not grade based. (from slide 4 of ISA_101.pdf)                      6-1 Capture.PNG                      Performance Bands:                      August 2017 BOE Meeting Student Assessment Items <a href="https://www.isbe.net/Documents_Board_Meetings/08-16-2017-Packet.pdf">https://www.isbe.net/Documents_Board_Meetings/08-16-2017-Packet.pdf</a>                      E. Illinois Science Assessment Threshold Scores and Performance Level Descriptors pp. 59-62                      The scale score range is 200-400.</p>	<p><b>SAT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The evidence submitted pertains to academic content standards, not academic achievement standards. No evidence submitted that IL adopted academic achievement standards for SAT.</li> </ul> <p><b>DLM Science</b>                      IL must provide evidence that IL adopted DLM science academic achievement standards.</p> <p><b>ISA</b>                      6.1 Appendix A Performance Level Descriptors, the ISBE agenda/plenary from the August meeting in 2017, indicates that there were problems with setting the performance levels on the ISA. It only has two levels: Proficient and Not Proficient. This does not meet the federal requirement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plenary packet, pp. 59-62 submitted. However, only 2 performance levels are proposed; mandate requires at least 3 levels. No evidence that this was approved by ISBE.</li> <li>• 2016 Illinois Science Assessment Results FAQ - Updated 01/18/2018. FAQ states: “The State Board approved the Illinois Science Assessment threshold scores and performance levels descriptors at its public regular business meeting on Aug. 16, 2017.” However, there are no board documents that substantiate this.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:  <b>for SAT</b></p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>• Submit evidence that IL adopted academic achievement standards for SAT.</p> <p><b>for DLM Science</b></p> <p>• Submit evidence for this critical element.</p> <p><b>for ISA</b></p> <p>• Submit minutes demonstrating ISBE approval of PLDs and cut score at each grade level.</p> <p>• Submit evidence that the ISA has at least three performance levels.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b></p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p><b>SAT</b>  <b>The College Board provides the below documentation to our state partners as support resources to be used during their standard setting process.</b></p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1 – SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017)</b>  Pages 120 - 133 describe how the benchmarks were determined and how they are related to college outcomes.</p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board SAT Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire, and Illinois</b>  Each of these College Board produced documents contains a detailed alignment between the state standards and the SAT. Please refer to Critical Element 2.1 for the relevant sections. These documents were provided to each panelist as a reference that could be used during the Achievement standards setting process.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.8 – Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)</b>  Panelists were provided with this document as a reference that could be used during the standards setting process.</p> <p><b>Evidence #6.2.1 – Final Report on the 2016 SAT Multi-State Standard Setting.</b>  This report summarizes the procedures used to obtain recommended cut scores from the standard setting panels, as well as the final cut scores that were agreed upon by the four states: Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, and New Hampshire. First, an overview of the standard setting meeting is presented, followed by a detailed description of the procedures and results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>2.1.1 – SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017), pp. 120-133 describe how the</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>SAT</b>  No evidence that ISBE adopted the standard setting cut scores; evidence that CT, DE, ME &amp; NH adopted the 2016 SAT Multi-state standards. ((6.2.1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6.2.1 references 4 states approved cut scores—does not reference IL. Did ISBE approve cut scores?</li> <li>• Description of Essay standard setting process is not included; only DE and ME did this standard-setting. What will ISBE do? P.73, App. J</li> <li>• Used Modified Angoff, p. 5</li> <li>• ALDs written by SME in 4 states – but no process described (p.4). Did IL staff participate in this process? Did ISBE approve ALDs?</li> <li>• No indication of EL expertise on panels</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>benchmarks were determined and how they are related to college outcomes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>6.2.1 – Final Report on the 2016 SAT Multi-State Standard Setting</b>, summarizes the procedures used to obtain recommended cut scores from the standard setting panels, as well as the final cut scores that were agreed upon by the four states: Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, and New Hampshire.</li> </ul> <p><b>DLM Science</b> No evidence submitted</p> <p><b>ISA</b> <b>IL submitted:</b> August 2017 BOE Meeting Student Assessment Items <a href="https://www.isbe.net/Documents_Board_Meetings/08-16-2017-Packet.pdf">https://www.isbe.net/Documents_Board_Meetings/08-16-2017-Packet.pdf</a> E. Illinois Science Assessment Threshold Scores and Performance Level Descriptors pp. 59-62</p>	<p><b>DLM Science</b> No evidence submitted. ISBE must submit evidence that cut scores from the DLM standard setting were adopted.</p> <p>There is no evidence that IL educators were involved in the DLM standard setting process.</p> <p><b>ISA</b> As cited in 6.1 Appendix 1, the process did not result in meeting the federal requirement of three levels.</p> <p>IL used a Modified Angoff method to set 1 cut score and 2 levels of proficiency. Mandate requires at least 2 cut scores and 3 levels of proficiency. Additional detail is needed to more fully describe the standard setting process.</p>

**see prior DLM/PARCC consortium reviews**

**Section 6.2 Summary Statement**

X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:  
**for SAT**

- Submit evidence for Critical Element 6.2.

**for DLM Science**

- Submit evidence for Critical Element 6.2.

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As 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 Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
for ISA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submit evidence that the ISA has at least three performance levels.</li> </ul>	

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p><b>SAT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board SAT Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire, and Illinois Each of these College Board produced documents contains a detailed alignment between the state standards and the SAT.</li> <li><b>6.2.1 – Final Report on the 2016 SAT Multi-State Standard Setting.</b> This report summarizes the procedures used to obtain recommended cut scores from the standard setting panels, as well as the final cut scores that were agreed upon by the four states: Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, and New Hampshire.</li> </ul> <p><b>DLM Science</b> The Essential Elements were submitted. These are not academic achievement standards.</p> <p><b>ISA</b> <b>ISBE submitted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Fact Sheet: Illinois Learning Standards in Science</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Fact Sheet: Illinois Learning Standards in Science Word Version <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Similarities Between 1997 ILS and 2014 ILS (NGSS)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Differences Between 1997 ILS and 2014 ILS (NGSS)</li> </ul> </li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Illinois Learning Standards for Science incorporating the Next Generation</li> </ul>	<p><b>SAT</b> Alignment done by College Board to ISBE standards. Not sure that having the test publisher doing the alignment study is considered appropriate for peer review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence provided does not describe development of ALDs</li> <li>The alignment was not conducted by an independent reviewer</li> <li>Description of process to develop ALDs is lacking in 6.2.1</li> <li>Interesting that cut score level 3 is the same as SAT predictor of 75% success for both ERW and math</li> <li>How does evidence submitted, 2.1.8, 2.1.2-2.1.7, 2.2.1, 2.2.2, document 6.3?</li> </ul> <p><b>DLM Science</b> ISBE must submit evidence for this critical element.</p> <p><b>ISA</b> No notes were provided by ISBE and it is impossible to provide evidence at this point in time that “a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.”</p> <p>Evidence related to this Critical Element was not provided. Discussion of the academic achievement standards was not submitted. The standards</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Science Standards (NGSS) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to Read the NGSS</li> <li>• Framework for K-12 Science Education</li> </ul>	presented are the content standards.
<b>see prior DLM/PARCC consortium reviews</b>		
<b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement—</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>for SAT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit evidence for this critical element.</li> </ul> <p><b>for DLM Science</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit evidence for this critical element.</li> </ul> <p><b>for ISA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit evidence for this critical element.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;</li> <li>• The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;</li> <li>• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;</li> <li>○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>○ Provide information to help</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>SAT</b>  <b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts and Math:</b></p> <p>The following documents are reference materials provided by the College Board to educators to support their use of the College Board reporting platform.</p> <p>Many of the publications created by the College Board refer to the SAT Suite of assessments, which includes the SAT, PSAT/NMSQT, PSAT 10, and PSAT 8/9. In your review of the submitted evidence, please focus on the information that refers to the SAT assessments.</p> <p>In adherence to applicable state and federal accessibility laws, College Board reports and resources are designed to meet accessibility standards including Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.</p> <p><b>Evidence # 6.4.1: K–12 Educator Brief: The College and Career Readiness Benchmarks for the SAT® Suite of Assessments (April 2016)</b></p> <p>This brochure explains how the SAT benchmarks were derived and how to interpret SAT test results. It also provides a set of frequently asked questions regarding the assessment reporting.</p> <p><b>Evidence # 6.4.2: K-12 Educator Brief: The SAT® Suite of Assessments: Using Scores and Reporting to Inform Instruction (2015)</b></p> <p>This educator brief provides an overview of the different reports available to teachers, and how these reports can be used for curricular and intervention purposes.</p> <p>Pages 23-41 display and explain the uses for sample reports available through the College Board reporting portal.</p> <p><b>Evidence # 6.4.3: SAT Understanding Scores 2017 (2017)</b></p> <p>This brochure provides information to educators regarding scoring benchmarks, how the assessment is scored and how to access score reports on the College Board reporting portal. It also provides a guide on how to interpret student score reports.</p> <p><b>Evidence # 6.4.4: Professional Development Module #6: Using Scores and Reporting to Inform Instruction (2015)</b></p>	<p><b>SAT</b></p> <p>Not sure if any special reports were generated for IL.</p> <p>Evidence submitted does not provide IL documentation for these criteria.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there IL state material that accompanies the SAT score reports? What reports are delivered to parents – same as student reports?</li> <li>• SAT information is provided, but not connected to requirements for States.</li> <li>• What alternate formats are available upon request?</li> <li>• What are IL timelines for sending individual reports?</li> <li>• If SAT is given in grade 11 in IL, all the SAT material indicates that the SAT is grade 11 and grade 12 – how does IL address this for reporting purposes?</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</li> <li>● The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>	<p>This PowerPoint presentation can be used to train educators on how to access, interpret and apply score report results to inform classroom instruction.</p> <p><b>Evidence # 6.4.5: Facilitator Guide to Professional Development Module #6: Using Scores and Reporting to Inform Instruction (2015)</b></p> <p>This guide is a companion to the PowerPoint presentation and is intended as a support resource for administrators or district trainers who will be training their educators on how score reporting.</p> <p><b>Evidence # 6.4.6: Educator Online Reporting Screen Shot Demo [February 2017].</b></p> <p>This PowerPoint shows the different reports that available through the College Board online reporting system.</p> <p><b>Evidence #6.4.7: K-12 Educator Brief: Concordance</b></p> <p>This resource provides to educators a tool by which to compare scores from different assessments. Concordance tables are provided for the redesigned SAT and the SAT administered prior to the redesign, as well as a concordance that allows for the comparison between the redesigned SAT and the ACT.</p> <p><b>Evidence #6.4.8: Student Online Reporting Screen Shot Demo</b></p> <p>This PowerPoint deck shows the different reports that students can access using the College Board Online Reporting System.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.4 Reports for Students who Test with State Allowed Accommodations</b> Students who test using state allowed accommodations will receive test results that are marked with an “SAA” label. These screen shots show how the designation appears on their reports.</p> <p><b>DLM Science</b> IL did not submit evidence for this critical element.</p> <p><b>PARCC Key Dates (6.4 Appendix A)</b> <b>Illinois Key Dates 2015 (6.4 Appendix B) PARCC and DLM-</b></p>	<p><b>DLM Science</b> No information provided for DLM Science.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>For all components of the State assessment system, ISBE must submit:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a process and timeline for the delivery of student reports for all tests.</li> <li>• Evidence of availability of Braille and/or large print report formats upon request.</li> <li>• Evidence that indicates ISBE follows a process and timeline for delivering reports as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul> <p><b>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.</b></p>	<p><b>YE)</b> <b>PARCC</b> Illinois was provided PARCC (Pearson) key dates of when PARCC releases reports. Based on this information, Illinois set their key dates for LEAs. PARCC provides translated student report shells in ten languages and districts have the ability to upon request Braille or large print individual score reports</p> <p>ISBE Assessment Division works in collaboration with ISBE Student Information Systems to determine the dates for delivering student scores based on the PARCC key dates released to ISBE. This information is then delivered to LEAs through webinars that are recorded live and then posted to ISBE webpage.</p> <p><b>ISA</b> <b>IL submitted:</b> Illinois faced budget and procurement challenges that impacted the reporting of data. 2016 Results were shared with school districts January 2018. Data were shared with the public January 12, 2018 via the ISBE Board Packet and presented at the public meeting on January 17, 2018. <a href="https://www.isbe.net/Documents_Board_Meetings/20180117-Packet.pdf">https://www.isbe.net/Documents_Board_Meetings/20180117-Packet.pdf</a> VIII. Release of 2016 Science Assessment Results pp. 182-192 Individual Student Results will be shared with LEAs February 2018. 2016 Illinois Science Assessment Results 2016 State, District &amp; School Performance Results 2016 State, District &amp; School Mean Scale Scores 2016 State, District &amp; School Participation Rates</p>	<p><b>PARCC and DLM</b> Evidence needed related to process and <u>current</u> timeline for delivery of student reports as soon as practicable after each test administration.</p> <p>6.4 Appendices A and B do present timelines, but no timelines for ISR delivery to parents. A statement is provided indicating that based on these timelines, IL sets key dates for LEAs, but no specifics are provided.</p> <p>No evidence that DLM provides reports in alternate formats. No evidence is provided that braille and large print ISRs are available; only a statement on the index</p> <p>No mention of itemized score analyses for either assessment. No evidence provided that reports enable itemized score analyses</p> <p>The webinar, purportedly in 6.4 Appendix C, is not a webinar with the indicated information.</p> <p><b>ISA</b> Budget and procurement problems delayed reporting of 2016 science scores until January 2018. Reports provide little if any information other than overall scale score for the entire test.</p> <p>2016 Illinois Science Assessment Results FAQ - Updated 01/18/2018. ISRs will be sent to districts in February and districts can send them to parents/guardians at their discretion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sample reports were not submitted.</li> <li>• Links provided did not contain performance results</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Commented [BD1]: Test these links. My cpu wouldn't launch the files. May need to embed the Excel file directly.</p> <p>I spoke with the web team. They said this happens when we go from Word to our web. The solution is to submit as a PDF and the links will work.</p> <p>The PDF does work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The 2016 assessment window opened on May 1, 2016, giving some districts limited time to administer the assessment before the conclusion of the school year. In addition, schools that utilized devices running Apple iOS operating systems experienced significant technology issues that required converting to a paper administration. In some places, paper materials did not arrive in time for students to take the assessment before the school year ended. Low participation rates in some schools and districts should not be interpreted as a lack of effort or diligence on their part in light of the obstacles some faced.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <input type="checkbox"/> 2016 Illinois Science Assessment Results FAQ- Updated 01/18/2018</li> </ul>	
<p><b>from 2016 review</b></p> <p>For all components of the State assessment system, ISBE must submit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a process and timeline for the delivery of student reports for all tests.</li> <li>• Evidence of availability of Braille and/or large print report formats upon request.</li> <li>• Evidence that indicates ISBE follows a process and timeline for delivering reports as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul> <p>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.</p>		
<p><b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>for SAT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit evidence for this critical element.</li> </ul> <p><b>for DLM Science</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit evidence for this critical element.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Illinois Resubmission (PARCC/DLM)+New(SAT/Science)**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>for PARCC and DLM YE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit evidence of a process and current timeline for the delivery of student reports for all tests.</li> <li>• Submit evidence of availability of Braille and/or large print report formats upon request for <u>DLM</u></li> <li>• Submit evidence that indicates ISBE follows a process and timeline for delivering reports as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul> <p><b>for PARCC ONLY</b> R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (PARCC), ISBE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that ISBE and PARCC provide reports that enable itemized score analyses to LEAs and schools.</li> </ul> <p><b>for ISA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit evidence for this critical element.</li> </ul>		

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