



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Stephen Pruitt
Commissioner of Education
Kentucky Department of Education
Capital Plaza Tower
500 Mero Street
Frankfort, KY 40601

January 6, 2017

Dear Commissioner Pruitt:

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

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

- Reading/ language arts (R/LA) and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (Kentucky Performance Rating for Educational Progress (K-PREP)): **Partially meets requirements**
- (R/LA and mathematics general assessments in high school (ACT QualityCore end of course (ACT QualityCore EOC R/LA and math)): **Partially meets requirements**
- R/LA and mathematics alternate assessments of alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in grades 3-8 and high school (Alternate Kentucky Performance Rating for Educational Progress (Alternate K-PREP R/LA and math)): **Partially meets requirements**

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

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

- Science general assessments in high school (ACT QualityCore end of course (ACT QualityCore EOC Biology)): **Partially meets requirements**
- Science AA-AAAS in high school (Alternate Kentucky Performance Rating for Educational Progress (Alternate K-PREP science)): **Partially meets requirements**

The **partially meets requirements** designation for a component means that it does not meet a number of the requirements of the statute and regulations, and Kentucky will need to provide substantial additional information to demonstrate it meets the requirements. The Department expects that Kentucky may not be able to submit all of the required information within one year.

The specific list of items required for KDE to submit is enclosed with this letter. Because several of the State's components have partially met the requirements, the Department is placing a condition on KDE's Title I grant award related to those components of the assessment system. To satisfy this condition, KDE must submit satisfactory evidence to address the items identified in the enclosed list. KDE must submit a plan and timeline within 30 days for when it will submit all required additional documentation for peer review. The Department will also host regular (e.g., quarterly) progress calls with KDE to discuss the State's progress on its timeline. If adequate progress is not made, following the peer review of the additional evidence, 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 KDE's IDEA Part B grant award.

The Department notes that KDE submitted a waiver request for assessing speaking and listening that was approved on December 13, 2016, for the 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19 school years.

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

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 Chueene Boston and Millie Bentley-Memon of staff at: OSS.Kentucky@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

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

Enclosures

cc: Rhonda Sims, Office of Assessment and Accountability

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

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<p>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</p>	<p>For all Reading/ language arts (R/LA) and mathematics assessments (general and alternate assessments of alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS)) and for all science assessments (general and AA-AAAS), KDE should provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A description of State stakeholders involved in the development and/or adoption process for the R/LA, mathematics, and science content standards that includes detail on subject-matter expertise, individuals representing English learners (ELs) and students with disabilities.
<p>1.5 – Participation Data</p>	<p>For the R/LA, mathematics and science general assessments in high school (ACT QualityCore EOC R/LA, mathematics, and science), KDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 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.
<p>2.1 – Test Design and Development</p>	<p>For the K-PREP R/LA and mathematics in grades 3-8, and ACT QualityCore EOC R/LA, mathematics, and science in high school, KDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the test blueprints align to the full range of academic content standards (e.g., an independent alignment study). • Evidence on how depth of knowledge (DOK) is incorporated into test design. • A rationale of the exclusion of DOK level 1 questions from item development in R/LA and mathematics (K-PREP). • Evidence that the R/LA assessments measure the full breadth and depth of the State’s academic content standards, including the speaking and listening aspect of the standards at all grades, and the writing standards for R/LA at grades 3, 4, and 7. <p>[NOTE: KDE has received a speaking and listening waiver; therefore, the Department does not expect Kentucky to submit additional evidence regarding speaking and listening during the period of the waiver.]</p> <p>For the Alternate K-PREP R/LA, math, and science at each grade and subject, KDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A rationale for each dimension (“Attainment Tasks” and “Transition Attainment Record”) in the Alternate K-PREP design, and to support how each dimension serves to meet the criteria for this critical element, evidence specifically that includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; ○ Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; ○ Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills).
2.2 – Item Development	<p>For the K-PREP R/LA and mathematics in grades 3-8, and ACT QualityCore EOC R/LA, mathematics, and science in high school, KDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the areas of expertise of item reviewers used in the item development process for KDE general assessments, specifically subject area expertise, and backgrounds in educating students with disabilities and ELs, as applicable.
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	<p>For the K-PREP R/LA and mathematics in grades 3-8, and ACT QualityCore EOC R/LA, mathematics, and science in high school, KDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of alignment, including a report of results of an independent alignment study that is technically sound (i.e., method and process, appropriate units of analysis, clear criteria) and documents adequate alignment, specifically that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Each assessment is aligned to its test blueprint, and each blueprint is aligned to the full range of State’s academic content standards; or ○ Each assessment is aligned to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and the procedures the State follows to ensure such alignment during test development; ○ Includes a description of a systematic process and timeline the State will implement to address any gaps or weaknesses identified in the alignment studies.
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes	<p>For the K-PREP R/LA and mathematics in grades 3-8; the ACT QualityCore EOC R/LA, mathematics, and science in high school; and the Alternate K-PREP R/LA, math, and science KDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate to KDE content standards, such as one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Results of cognitive labs exploring student performance on items that show the items require complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills; OR ○ Reports of expert judgment of items that show the items require complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills; OR ○ Empirical evidence that shows the relationships of items intended to require complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills to other measures that require similar levels of cognitive complexity in the content area (e.g., teacher ratings of student performance, student performance on performance tasks or external assessments of the same knowledge and skills).
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	<p>For the K-PREP R/LA and mathematics in grades 3-8; the ACT QualityCore EOC R/LA, mathematics, and science in high school; and the Alternate K-PREP R/LA, math, and science KDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Empirical evidence that supports the internal structures of the tests, especially for any subscales that are used in reporting and interpretation (e.g., correlations among subscales, confirmatory factor analyses).
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships	<p>For the K-PREP R/LA and mathematics in grades 3-8; the ACT QualityCore EOC R/LA, mathematics, and science in high school; and the Alternate K-PREP R/LA, math, and science KDE must provide:</p>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
with Other Variables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Studies of correlations/relationships between the K-PREP R/LA and math tests with other tests/measures of the same/similar constructs for all tested grades. • Studies of correlations/relationships between the HS ACT QualityCore R/LA, mathematics, and science tests with other measures of the same/similar constructs. • Studies of correlations/relationships between Alt K-PREP assessments of R/LA, math, and science with assessments of the same/similar constructs for all grades assessed.
4.1 – Reliability Additional Evidence Needed	<p>For the ACT QualityCore EOC R/LA, mathematics, and science in high school, KDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of estimates for test reliability, standard errors of measure, and classification accuracy for student subgroups (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity, student disability status, EL status). <p>For the Alternate K-PREP R/LA, math, and science, KDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of estimates for overall test reliability, standard errors of measurement, and classification accuracy, and similar estimates for student subgroups (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity, student disability status, EL status) if subgroup data are reportable for this test.
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility	<p>For the K-PREP R/LA and mathematics in grades 3-8; the ACT QualityCore EOC R/LA, mathematics, and science in high school; and the Alternate K-PREP R/LA, math, and science KDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence regarding the professional background of test item reviewers as noted in element 2.2, specifically for bias and sensitivity reviews. • Empirical evidence that documents the fairness of the tests (e.g., differential item functioning (DIF) analyses of major subgroups). <p>For the ACT QualityCore EOC R/LA, mathematics, and science in high school; and the Alternate K-PREP R/LA, math, and science, KDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence as noted in element 4.1
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum	<p>For the ACT QualityCore EOC R/LA, mathematics, and science in high school; and the Alternate K-PREP R/LA, math, and science, KDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the conditional standard error of measure (CSEM) for each score on each test, or similar estimates that indicate that the tests provide adequately precise measurements across the full performance continuum.
4.4 – Scoring	<p>For the K-PREP R/LA in grades 3-8, KDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of improved inter-rater reliability for K-PREP writing test items. <p>For the Alternate K-PREP R/LA, math, and science, KDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the inter-rater agreement for the Transaction Attainment Record dimension of the test.
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	<p>For the K-PREP R/LA in grades 3-8; and Alternate K-PREP R/LA, math, and science, KDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the procedures used for linking and equating forms across years of test administration (e.g., how linking items were selected, how linking/equating data is used, how linking items represent test blueprints), and

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>evidence of results of those procedures.</p> <p>For the ACT QualityCore EOC R/LA, mathematics, and science in high school, KDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of procedures used for equating multiple forms within a year of test administration and evidence of results of those procedures.
<p>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</p>	<p>For the K-PREP R/LA and mathematics in grades 3-8; the ACT QualityCore EOC R/LA, mathematics, and science in high school; and the Alternate K-PREP R/LA, math, and science , KDE must provide evidence of clear guidance for IEP teams and parents regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on AA-AAAS; • 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; • Information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities; • Selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities; • Procedures to ensure that the State’s implementation of AA-AAAS for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.
<p>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</p>	<p>For the K-PREP R/LA and mathematics in grades 3-8; the ACT QualityCore EOC R/LA, mathematics, and science in high school; and the Alternate K-PREP R/LA, math, and science KDE must provide: evidence of clear guidance for educators of ELs, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed with accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for ELs; and • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for ELs.
<p>5.3 – Accommodations</p>	<p>For the K-PREP R/LA and mathematics in grades 3-8; the ACT QualityCore EOC R/LA, mathematics, and science in high school; and the Alternate K-PREP R/LA, math, and science KDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that it ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for children with disabilities under IDEA and students with disabilities covered by Section 504; • Evidence that it ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs; • Evidence that it 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; • Evidence that it has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting	<p>For the ACT QualityCore EOC R/LA, mathematics, and science in high school, KDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a standards-setting report for the achievement standards adopted.
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	<p>For the Alternate K-PREP R/LA, math, and science, KDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State’s alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s academic content standards, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A description of the process used to develop the alternate academic achievement standards that shows the State’s grade-level academic content standards or that extended academic content standards were used as a main reference in writing performance level descriptors for the alternate academic achievement standards ; OR ○ The process of setting cut scores used, as a main reference, performance level descriptors linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards; OR ○ The cut scores were set and performance level descriptors written to link to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards; OR ○ A description of steps taken to vertically articulate the alternate academic achievement standards (including cut scores and performance level descriptors) across grades.
6.4 – Reporting	<p>For the ACT QualityCore EOC R/LA, mathematics, and science in high school; and the Alternate K-PREP R/LA, math, and science, KDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of test score reports by proficiency level by student subgroups. • Evidence that alternate formats of test score reports are available. • Evidence of test score interpretive guides for educators and parents.

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

June, 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS .	3
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students	3
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards	4
1.3 – Required Assessments(reviewed by Department staff only).....	5
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments(reviewed by Department staff only).....	6
1.5 – Participation Data(reviewed by Department staff only).....	8
SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS	9
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	9
2.2 – Item Development.....	12
2.3 – Test Administration	13
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration(reviewed by Department staff only)	14
2.5 – Test Security	15
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....	16
SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....	17
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	17
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	18
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	19
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	20
SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER	21
4.1 – Reliability.....	21
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	22
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	23
4.4 – Scoring	24
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	25
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	26
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance.....	27
SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS	28
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	28
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	30
5.3 – Accommodations.....	31
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	32
SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .	33
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students	33
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....	34
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	35
6.4 – Reporting.....	36

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</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>KY has adopted challenging academic content standards (Common Core Ela/math and Next Generation Science Standards). State Board of Ed minutes indicate these standards apply to all public schools and students in the state.</p> <p>Evidence was not included explicitly stating whether the standards were augmented. The Board Minutes state “15%” of the standards could be augmented. No evidence was provided to determine if this was done.</p> <p>Evidence that the standards are challenging is missing. Such evidence could be collected through outside review, such as by a State institution of higher education. A review may not be necessary if the State is exclusively using the Common Core Standards.</p> <p>Note: KY adopted CC ELA however, the assessments do not address writing for grades 3 & 7; language for grades 3 & 4; and speaking and listening are not addressed.</p>
<p>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independent review of reading, mathematics, and science standards. A review may not be necessary if the State is exclusively using the Common Core Standards. • Submit evidence to clarify if the standards were adopted in entirety or with revision, substitution or augmentation. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</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>The documents provide some evidence on the intended rigor and encouragement of teaching of advanced skills. The documents do not provide evidence on whether these goals were accomplished, nor do the documents provide evidence on the coherence of the standards or whether they were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.</p> <p>A description of stakeholders involved in the development process for the content standards should be included. Identify whether representatives for students with disabilities, English Language Learners (ELLs), parents and the community were included.</p> <p>An independent review of the rigor and coherence of the standards would be helpful. A review may not be necessary if the State is exclusively using the Common Core Standards in entirety without substitution or augmentation and an external independent study could confirm rigor of standards.</p>
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A description of stakeholders involved in the development process for the content standards. • Independent review of reading, mathematics, and science standards. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

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>1.3 – Required Assessments</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"> • Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). 	<p>State Statutes and Regulations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 1_3 ALL_01: Senate Bill 1 2009 (pp 7-19) <input type="checkbox"/> 1_3 ALL_02: KRS 158_6453 Assessment Academic Content Standards HS College Ready Accommodations (pp. 4-10) <input type="checkbox"/> 1_3 ALL_03: 703 KAR 5:070 Inclusion <p>The Kentucky assessment system is established by statute and Kentucky Board of Education action. KDE: OAA June 1, 2016 11 (grades 10-12);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). <p>Regulation Feb 2014 (pp. 3-4, 7-9, 16-17, 21-23, 29-32)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 1_3 ALL_04: 703 KAR 5:240 Accountability Administrative Procedures (pp. 1-2) <p>Kentucky Board of Education Adoption</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 1_3 ALL_05: KBE Summary Minutes of June 2009 mtg (pp. 16) <input type="checkbox"/> 1_3 ALL_06: KBE Summary Minutes of August 2009 mtg (pp. 15-17) <input type="checkbox"/> 1_3 ALL_07: KBE Summary Minutes of December 2013 mtg (pp. 18-19) <input type="checkbox"/> 1_3 ALL_08: KBE Summary Minutes of February 2014 mtg (pp. 11) 	<p>The evidence is nearly complete. The only inconsistency is that a student could take the high school science test during 9th grade and therefore not take a science assessment between 10th and 12th grade.</p> <p>Writing is not addressed in grades 3 & 4. Language is not addressed in grades 3 & 4. No grade addresses speaking and listening. This is true for both general and alternate assessments.</p>
<p>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p>x__ No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

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>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</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"> • For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system; • For English learners (EL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment; ○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years. 	<p>Inclusion of All Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1_4 ALL_01: Inclusion of Special Populations Regulation 703 KAR 5:070 (pp. 3, 4, 7, 8, 16, 23, 29, 30) • 1_4 ALL_02: Administration Code Regulation 703 KAR 5:080 (p. 4) <p>Students with Disabilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1_4 ALL_03: Inclusion of Special Populations Regulation 703 KAR 5:070 (pp. 9-16) <p>English Learners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1_4 ALL_04: Inclusion of Special Populations Regulation 703 KAR 5:070 (pp. 16, 19) 	<p>Evidence for this critical element is complete.</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 KENTUCKY

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

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>1.5 – Participation Data</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>Prompts for Reviewers: --data disaggregated by student group: ELA/Math/Science --Shows students tested and students enrolled for each breakout --for end-of-course HS, procedures to ensure each student is tested and counted in participation rate along with data --includes grade level tests and AA-AAAS</p>	<p>The participation tables are complete. No information is provided on procedures for calculating participation in end-of-course assessments.</p>
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u> </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the end-of-course tests, evidence that 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. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

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>2.1 – Test Design and Development</p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; • Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design. 	<p>K-PREP-Item Writing Training Math, slide 6</p> <p>2_1 KP_12 K-Prep Item Writer Training for Reading_2012-w-KDE edits, slide 10</p> <p>ACT College Readiness System: Reading Multiple Choice, page 22</p>	<p>Evidence addressed purposes and blueprints. KY uses computer based assessments but the test forms are not adaptive.</p> <p>The purposes of the assessments are provided in the Senate Bill. The test blueprint describe the structure of each assessment in detail.</p> <p>General Assessments: Does the state have any evidence that the test blueprints align to the full range of the grade level academic content standards? Does the state have an independent external alignment study to confirm alignment?</p> <p>DoK proportions were not in any of the blueprints. Item writers were limited to writing new items which <i>excluded</i> items for DoK 1. DoK in math item writing training included only DoK 2 or 3.</p> <p>DoK in ELA item writing training did not specifically exclude DoK 1, but did not allow items to be written to content standard 1 for both K-PREP and ACT. This excludes items at the DoK 1 level. What is the rationale for excluding DoK 1 items and what is the possible impact for low performing students?</p> <p>Item writer training is specific to the CCSS. KDE is part of the item review process. What was the state’s part in the review of all of the items of their assessment system? Was it every item, only KY developed items, which items were reviewed? This was not made clear. The evidence provided information that KY educators reviewed a number of items. It is not clear to the peers how many items were reviewed or to which standards these items were written. For example were these items written to the additional 15% of standards that could be augmented</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 KENTUCKY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>0_2 ALT_01 Alt K-PREP Technical Manual 2014-15, page 10.</p>	<p>to the CCSS or were these items for the entire range of standards on the K-PREP?</p> <p>Note: KY adopted CC ELA however, the assessments do not address writing for grades 3 & 7; language for grades 3 & 4; and speaking and listening are not addressed.</p> <p>ALT-K-PREP: Peers could not reconcile the claim that this is one test with two dimensions. Per page 10 of the Alt K-Prep Technical Manual, students do not take both dimensions. When an assessment has multiple dimensions individual students take multiple dimensions.</p> <p>Peer Reviewers believe Progress and Attainment are two different assessments. That being the case, all evidence that is required across ED’s six standards should be provided for both Progress and attainment. For example, how are both aligned to grade level content standards? How do both promote access to the general curriculum?</p> <p>It is also unclear whether it is acceptable to have multiple assessment options nested within the states alternate assessment.</p> <p>The evidence does include a rationale for the reduced breadth in comparison to the grade level standards. A rationale does not exempt the state from covering the full range of standards on the assessment.</p> <p>The evidence does not include a description of how the content standards were linked to the items and how vertical articulation of academic expectations for students will be maintained. Has an external linkage study of the extended standards to the content standards been conducted?</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 KENTUCKY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		Does the state have any evidence that the test blueprints align to the full range of the grade level academic content standards? Does the state have an independent external alignment study to confirm alignment?
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independent alignment studies to show item pools are aligned to the content standards for general and alternate assessments. • An independent linkage study should be conducted to show linkage of the extended content standards to the general content standards. • Peers will expect to see a full test design, evidence and peer review submission for both tests identified in the ALT K-PREP. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.2 – Item Development</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>The State used reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items.</p> <p>All KY specific items developed for the K-Prep assessments were reviewed by KY educator committees during content and bias reviews. Did these educators review all of the items or just a portion?</p> <p>Checklists were provided to reviewers so they know what to look for during the review meetings. What kind of DoK training was conducted for reviewers? Were experts from the field of disabilities and ELLs included?</p>
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The state should submit specific information on which items were reviewed by KY teachers and the review process for all other items (for example, how do Pearson and ACT items align specifically to KY content standards). • Submit documentation around the educators included in the state item review that identifies the area of expertise for each reviewer. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

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>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</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 align="center">_____All Assessments_____</p> <p>Site Visits During Test Administration:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2_4 ALL_01: 2015 K-PREP Site Visits</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2_4 ALL_02: 2015 K-PREP Site Visits</p> <p>Survey Question Responses</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2_4 ALL_03: 2015 K-PREP Site Visits</p> <p>Summary Findings Report</p>	<p>Evidence for this critical element is complete.</p>
<p>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</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 KENTUCKY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.5 – Test Security</p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS</p> <p>2_5 ALL_04 Kentucky Security Audit Report --Final -- 01-31-2012, p. 4</p>	<p>Evidence for this element is thorough and complete. Plans are provided for prevention, detection, investigation, and remediation of any assessment irregularities.</p> <p>Several recommendations were given including data forensics in the Caveon report (2012). Has there been a plan to address any of these recommendations for strengthening test security?</p>
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</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 KENTUCKY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</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"> • To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS</p>	<p>Evidence for this element is nearly complete. Plans are in place to protect the integrity of test materials and the confidentiality of students.</p> <p>It was difficult to find the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.</p> <p>KY has administrative code to protect student level data and personal identifiable information adopted from US agencies code. KY has training materials for staff involved in the storage and use of data.</p>
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</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 KENTUCKY

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>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. 		<p>The K-Prep manual references alignment in its developmental processes. The Alt K-Prep manual refers to annual alignment studies and results are not provided.</p> <p>Evidence is provided for alignment between ACT courses and CCSS. Independent alignment studies should be conducted between the Kentucky content standards for each of these tests. The studies should address content match, breadth, and complexity.</p> <p>A stakeholder alignment review was conducted but does not eliminate the need for an external linkage study of the extended standards to the content standards for the Alt K-Prep.</p>
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p> <p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alignment study for reading and mathematics for K-Prep. The study should address content match, breadth, and complexity. • Alignment study for reading, mathematics, and science for both Alt K-Prep assessments. The study should address content match, breadth, and complexity. • Alignment study for reading, mathematics, and science for HS ACT. The study should address content match, breadth, and complexity. • Linkage study for the alternate standards to the general content standards. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>The K-Prep manual references alignment in its developmental processes. The Alt K-Prep manual refers to annual alignment studies and results are not provided. Evidence is provided for alignment between ACT courses and CCSS. Independent alignment studies should be conducted between the state content standards and each of these tests. The studies should address content match, breadth, and complexity.</p>
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alignment study for reading and mathematics for K-Prep. The study should address content match, breadth, and complexity. • Alignment study for reading, mathematics, and science for both assessments for the Alt K-Prep. The study should address content match, breadth, and complexity. • Alignment study for reading, mathematics, and science for HS ACT. The study should address content match, breadth, and complexity. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>		<p>The IRT and principle components analysis evidence for the K-PREP is sufficient for interpretation at the total score level. If subscales are to be interpreted, correlations among subscales and a confirmatory factor analysis should be calculated. Evidence based on internal structure is missing for the Alt K-PREP and the HS ACT tests.</p>
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correlations among subscales and would prefer a confirmatory factor analysis for Alt K-PREP for both assessments. • Correlations among subscales and would prefer a confirmatory factor analysis for HS ACT. • Correlations among subscales and would prefer a confirmatory factor analysis for K-PREP if subscale interpretation is intended. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>		<p>Most of the evidence provided is not relevant to validity based on relationships with other variables.</p> <p>The Alt K-PREP technical manual refers to comparisons between assessment results and student work samples; results are not provided.</p> <p>Evidence based on relations to other variables is typically characterized by calculating correlations or other agreement indices between the assessment scores and a second set of data points, typically scores from a different assessment.</p>
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Studies of correlations between the K-PREP reading and math tests and other tests of the same constructs for all tested grades. • Studies of correlations between both Alt K-PREP assessments of reading, math, and science with assessments of the same constructs for all grades assessed. • Studies of correlations between the HS ACT reading, mathematics, and science tests and other tests the same constructs. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

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>4.1 – Reliability</p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement. 		<p>Most of the evidence was presented for the K-PREP, including reliability estimates overall and by student group, SEM, and classification accuracy.</p> <p>For the ACT HS exams reliability estimates and SEM were presented. No evidence was provided for the report of reliability and SEMs by all subgroups for the ACT HS reading, mathematics and science.</p> <p>None of the required evidence was presented for the Alt K-PREP.</p>
<p>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A report of the reliability and SEMs by all subgroups (gender, ethnicity, disability status, ELL status, etc.) classification accuracy for the ACT HS in reading, mathematics, and science. • A report of the reliability estimates and SEMs overall and by student group, as well as classification accuracy for the Alt K_PREP in reading, mathematics, and science. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</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>All assessments need documentation that experts in the fields of students with disabilities and English Language Learners were involved in the item development and review process</p> <p>K-PREP: Evidence was provided in the Yearbook 2014-2015 for grade levels 3-8 and items that had DIF for gender, ethnicity and some race. Peers would have liked to see SES, disability status and English Language Learner status. Consider including the direction of the DIF (focal group/referent group). Explanations of how DIF summaries informed the item review/revision process for the assessments.</p> <p>ACT and K- Prep: Do you have any empirical analyses of (DIF) to identify possible bias or interpretations of results.</p> <p>Alt-K-Prep- frequency distributions by disability category.</p> <p>Need to report reliability estimates, SEMs, and classification accuracy for all subgroups in the Alt-K-PREP and the ACT.</p>
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Empirical evidence to support that there are no impact to any subgroup. • A report of the reliability estimates and SEMs overall and by student group, as well as classification accuracy for the ACT and the Alt K_PREP in reading, mathematics, and science. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>		<p>Evidence was provided for K-PREP conditional SEM by score.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report of ACT HS conditional SEM by score. • Report of Alt K-Prep conditional SEM by score for each assessment. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>4_4 KP_03 HumRRO 2013 038 K-PREP On-Demand Writing Scoring</p>	<p>Evidence for K-PREP and the ACT HS test are complete.</p> <p>Since the Transition Attainment Record is a rating scale some estimate of rater agreement would be relevant. Peers advise a correlation and percent agreement to support the reliability of the rating scale.</p> <p>Provide a plan to address the concerns raised by the HumRRO report for the On Demand Writing scoring issues which listed concerns for inter-rater reliability. Peers advise a correlation and percent agreement to support the reliability of the rating scale. This report identifies training concerns that should be addressed. Follow up on recommendations from the HumRRO report.</p>
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimates of rater agreement on the Transition Attainment Record of the Alt K-Prep. • Provide a plan to address the On Demand Writing scoring issues for reliability concerns identified in the HumRRO Report. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</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>The evidence was confusing and lacked clarity around the number of forms used for each administration of the assessment.</p> <p>Only the ACT HS has multiple forms. There is no evidence of correlation between the forms.</p> <p>Do we have KY specific evidence of score interpretations of forms across years?</p> <p>K-Prep Technical manual (page 52) does show the number of linking items, however we do not know if the items match the blueprint. We also do not have evidence about how the performance of these items compare from year to year.</p> <p>For Alt-K-PREP and ACT HS linking items are needed as well as the aforementioned data for the K-PREP.</p>
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence of correlation between forms on the ACT HS and year to year for the K-PREP and ALT-K-PREP. • Provide more detailed information on the linking items for all assessments. For example, please indicate how these items were selected, the data the items yielded, and how that data was interpreted and used. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</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"> • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 		<p>Only the ACT HS has multiple versions: computer-based and paper & pencil. There is no evidence of correlation between these versions.</p>
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence of correlations between the computer and paper versions of the assessments, and comparability studies for braille. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>		<p>States should have credible independent studies in addition to vendor studies to support the continuous improvement of the KY assessment system. For example the HumRRO report is a good example of an independent evaluation of an assessment within the KY system.</p> <p>States should have a description of how KY is addressing noted deficiencies in reports. For example, how are you going to make improvements using the HumRRO Report?</p>
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide independent studies on the assessments’ functioning and quality. • Plans following up on the results of these studies. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

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>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</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"> • Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards; • States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs; • Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment; • Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities; • Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities; 		<p>The evidence for this critical element is not provided among the highlighted documents, nor is it easily found among other documentation.</p> <p>The state should consider how to provide complete and coherent guidance to IEP teams for the determination of the appropriate standards, related assessments and support or accommodations.</p> <p>The state needs evidence that access to the general curriculum is promoted for all students with disabilities. For example, some states use standards based IEPs that are linked to grade level content standards, and or promote access to the general content.</p> <p>No evidence was provided regarding the monitoring of IEPs.</p> <p>Very few accommodations are identified for the state assessments. Studies should focus on determining that all students with disabilities are able to fully access each assessment. A DIF study should be conducted comparing students with and without 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 KENTUCKY

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"> Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA; Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments); The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum. 		<p>Evidence should be provided that students on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any disability category.</p> <p>KY provides good documentation on the IEP informing parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who are on the alternate achievement standards will receive an alternate diploma.</p>
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guidance documents for IEP teams and parents that address the considerations in Critical Element 5.1. Frequently asked questions documents for IEP teams and for parents that address this topics for Critical Element 5.1. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 		<p>Evidence is provided indicating which accessibility tools, features, and accommodations are available on the K-PREP and ACT HS.</p> <p>Evidence is needed regarding procedures for determining whether accommodations are needed, and which accommodations are needed, for all three measures.</p> <p>Although a list of accommodations was provided for the ALT-K-PREP, there was no guidance on how to determine the most effective accommodations for a student.</p> <p>Guidance documents do not address ELLs with disabilities.</p> <p>State should develop their own guidance around the selection and provision of accessibility supports. The procedures are included in several documents provided but are not available in a clear and cohesive document for teams making decisions for individual students.</p>
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An Accommodations Manual should be developed to address the selection and provision of supports and accommodations for ELLs and ELLs with disabilities in a comprehensive document that addresses accessibility options for all state assessments. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities (SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 	<p>;</p>	<p>Evidence indicates the State provides a list of accommodations for SWDs, students with 504 plans, and ELs within each test administration manual.</p> <p>Evidence is not provided for determining which supports or accommodations are appropriate for individual students.</p> <p>Evidence is not provided indicating “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.”</p> <p>Evidence is not provided describing a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who would require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</p>
<p>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The state should have an Accommodations and Accessibility Manual across assessments, grades and groups that addresses appropriate identification of students who need supports/accommodations, selection of appropriate accommodations, preservation of the construct being assessed, meaningful interpretations from scores attained using accommodations, and the process to individually review both commonly and uncommonly requested accommodations. This manual could be merged with the one mentioned for critical element 5.2 and address accessibility for all students. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</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"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. 		<p>The state does have evidence for procedures around the frequency and identification of students who need accommodations.</p> <p>The state does not have evidence of documentation of accommodations provision during test administration.</p> <p>The state needs more evidence regarding the consistency of accommodations for instruction and assessment. For example, within the IEP document show the correspondence between instructional supports and assessment accommodations.</p>
<p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence regarding the documentation of accommodations delivery during test administration and the consistency of accommodations across instruction and state assessments. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

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>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</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"> • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; • The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels. 		<p>For the K-PREP, all of this information was provided in the Performance Standards Report. All three assessments have four levels, two of which are for high achievement at least one of which is for lower achievement.</p> <p>K-PREP: Evidence presents the Reading & Math Performance Descriptors are in draft. Where are the final descriptors? Were these approved?</p> <p>Evidence of the process used to adopt challenging academic achievement standards is provided for the Alt K-PREP. Alt K-PREP competencies associated with each level are included in a document titled “K-Prep Alternate Performance Level Descriptors”.</p> <p>For ACT HS, evidence of the cut scores is other documents produced by HumRRO; evidence of the competencies associated with each level are missing.</p>
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report for ACT HS that addresses the competencies associated with each level. • Provide evidence that the performance standards were final and approved for K-PREP. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</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>Complete evidence was provided for this critical element regarding K-PREP and Alt K-PREP. A report of standard setting for the ACT HS was not provided.</p>
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report on standard setting for the ACT HS. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</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>Evidence for this critical element is provided for the ACT HS.</p> <p>The evidence provided for the K-Prep and Alt K-Prep do not address this critical element.</p>
<p>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence that K-Prep proficiency leads to college readiness, either in the form of a policy capture report like the one used for the ACT HS or in the form of a letter of endorsement from an institute of higher education. • Evidence in that Alt K-Prep proficiency reflects professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. Independent expert review and endorsement would suffice. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.4 – Reporting</p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration; • The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results; • The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>Evidence for K-PREP for this critical element is complete and thorough. Evidence includes that the State reports to the public results by proficiency level and group, obtains individualized and systems level results and interpretive support, and follows set and reasonable guidelines and processes. Most of this evidence is also available for ACT HS and Alt K-PREP, with the exception of proficiency levels by sub-group (e.g., gender, race, disability status).</p> <p>An interpretive guide that describes the appropriate use of the scores should be provided.</p> <p>No evidence was provided for alternate formats of the reports or how to obtain such alternate formats.</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 KENTUCKY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. 		
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report on ACT HS proficiency status by group. Report on Alt K-Prep proficiency status by group. Procedures on how to obtain an alternate version of the score report. Provide interpretive guides for the use of reports for all assessments. 		

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