



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Karen B. Salmon, Ph.D.
State Superintendent of Schools
Maryland State Department of Education
200 West Baltimore Street
Baltimore, MD 21201

December 2, 2016

Dear Superintendent Salmon:

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

- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC)).
Substantially meets requirements.
- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in high school (PARCC).
Substantially 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.

Substantially meets requirements means that these components meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. The specific list of items required for Maryland to submit is enclosed with this letter. The Department expects that MSDE should be able to provide this additional information within one year. MSDE must provide to the Department a plan and timeline by which it will submit the additional documentation within 30 days of the receipt of this letter. If adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action.

The Department notes that MSDE submitted a waiver request for assessing speaking and listening that was approved on August 5, 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 Ashley Briggs at: OSS.Maryland@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

Ary Amerikaner
Deputy Assistant Secretary
Delegated the Duties of Assistant Secretary for
Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Douglas Strader

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

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
2.1 – Test Design and Development	Evidence that the assessment design measures the full breadth and depth of the State’s academic content standards, including the speaking and listening aspect of the standards. [NOTE: Maryland has received a speaking and listening waiver; therefore, the Department does not expect Maryland to submit additional evidence regarding speaking and listening during the period of the waiver]
2.2 – Item Development	Information about the composition and credentials of content and bias/sensitivity reviewers for the PARCC assessment. Specifically, information about the subject area specialization of content and bias/sensitivity reviewers on this panel (grade level, general or special education specialization, English learner (EL) specialization).
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	Additional alignment evidence that addresses all remaining grades (grades 3, 4, 6, and 7) in both content areas.
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes	Additional evidence, such as cognitive lab studies, that address the cognitive processes and cognitive complexity required by the standards across grades and content areas.
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum	Cumulative frequency distributions across raw score/scale scores, that include the number and percent of students scored at each raw/scale score point.
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	A plan and timeline for MSDE to continue studying the issue of mode comparability.
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	A plan and timeline for how MSDE will monitor provisions of accessibility features and accommodations identified by a student’s IEP team or 504 team for students with disabilities and for ELs, including incorporation of information collected through the SR/PNP.
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students	Evidence of the formal adoption of the achievement standards for the Reading/language arts and mathematics tests.
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting	Additional detailed information about areas of educational specialization for members of each achievement standards-setting panel, especially the specialty areas of special education and ELs.
6.4 – Reporting	Evidence that MSDE and PARCC provide reports that enable itemized score analyses to local educational agencies and schools.

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

April, 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes-Maryland Evidence



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

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 5
1.3 – Required Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 6
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 7
1.5 – Participation Data (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 8

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS 10
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 10
2.2 – Item Development..... 11
2.3 – Test Administration 12
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)13
2.5 – Test Security 14
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 15

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 16
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 16
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 17
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure 18
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables 19

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER 20
4.1 – Reliability..... 20
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 21
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... 22
4.4 – Scoring 23
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 24
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment 25
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance..... 26

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS 27
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 27
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 29
5.3 – Accommodations..... 30
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations 31

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 MARYLAND

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>Supported by PARCC Consortium evidence</p> <p>1.1.1 Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DOCUMENT #01 Maryland State Board of Education Minutes to June 22, 2010 Meeting/ Adoption of the Common Core Standards • DOCUMENT #02 & DOCUMENT #03 Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards <p>1.1.2 Instructional Programs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DOCUMENT #04 Code of Maryland Regulations for Mathematics Instructional Programs for Grade Prekindergarten -12 • DOCUMENT #05 Memo on Adoption of Amended Regulations governing the Program in Mathematics • DOCUMENT #06 Code of Maryland Regulations for English Language Arts/Literacy Instructional Programs for Grade Pre-Kindergarten -12 • DOCUMENT #07 Legal and Fiscal Impact of Proposed Regulation Updating Reading and English Language Arts Instructional Programs for Grade Prekindergarten through 12 • DOCUMENT #08 Legal and Fiscal Impact of Proposed Regulation Updating Math • DOCUMENT #09 Memo on Adoption of Amended Regulations governing the Program in English Language Arts/ Literacy • Maryland Public Schools website -Programs (http://marylandpublicschools.org/MSDE/programs/ccss/) <p>1.1.3 Legislation regarding Maryland curriculum and graduation requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DOCUMENT #10 Annotated Code of Maryland (7-205.1) for High school curriculum and graduation requirements • DOCUMENT #11 COMAR Enrollment and Credit Requirements • Teaching and Learning: Math http://mdk12.msde.maryland.gov/instruction/curriculum/mathematics/index.html • Teaching and Learning: English Language Arts http://mdk12.msde.maryland.gov/instruction/curriculum/reading/index.html <p>1.1.4 Transition- Educator Supports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DOCUMENT #12 Focus on Transition 	<p>State Board Approval of Common Core Standards and Code for Adoption of Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards that reflect the CCSS are documented.</p> <p>Documents require standards to apply to all schools and students.</p> <p>Documents support the alignment of curriculum and credit requirements with standards.</p> <p>NA for science</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

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"> • 1.1.4 Instructional Supports (http://mdk12.msde.maryland.gov/instruction/commoncore/index.html) • 1.1.4 Formative Assessment for Maryland Educators (FAME)(http://msde-fame.blogspot.com) • 1.1.4 Educator Effectiveness Academies (http://mdk12.msde.maryland.gov/instruction/academies/index.html) • 1.1.4 College & Career Readiness Conferences (http://mdk12.msde.maryland.gov/instruction/ccr_conferences/index.html) • 1.1.4 Webinar Series (https://msde.blackboard.com/webapps/portal/execute/tabs/tabAction?tab_tab_group_id=_104_1) <p>1.1.5 Educator Perspectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DOCUMENT #13 Harvard’s Center for Education Policy Research report gives Maryland educators’ perspectives on Common Core implementation 	
Section 1.1 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

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>Evaluate for all three subjects Supported by PARCC Consortium evidence</p> <p>Maryland: Documents 1-11 (See 1.1 Evidence)</p> <p>NA for science</p>	<p>++see PARCC consortium notes for this element.</p>
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required. (See PARCC evidence.)</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

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>Evaluate for grade/subject combinations listed in left column</p> <p>*Doc. 14 NCLB statute</p> <p>*Doc. 15 ESEA Accountability Flexibility Memo</p> <p>*Doc. 16 MD Code of Regulations-Required Assessments</p> <p>*Doc 17. MD Code of Regulations-Required HS Assessments</p>	<p>*Maryland requires ELA and Math at all 3-8 and high school (English in High School and Algebra in High School) levels in Maryland’s Code of Regulations; Science at each grade band (gr. 5 and 8; Biology in High School).</p> <p>Maryland also documents requirements for alternate assessments at same grade/subject combinations.</p> <p>Comment—note that 2014-15 is transitional year from MD HS assessments to PARCC HS assessments in ELA/Math (English 10 and Algebra I)</p>
Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
xx_ No additional evidence is required		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column-SWD and EL</p> <p>DOCUMENT #18 Memorandum with Clarifying Information on Laws and Regulations Governing Maryland Public Education/Elementary and Secondary Education Act – Every Student Succeeds Act</p> <p>DOCUMENT #19 Nonpublic Placements by Local School Systems [Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) excerpt 13A.05.02.14]</p>	<p>++see PARCC consortium notes for this element.</p> <p>--Document #18 provides memo to state board of education with high school requirements and pathways to graduation, with excerpts from relevant state regulations/statute. States all students must be included. Does not explicitly specify how students who may take AA-AAAS are included within assessment system, especially at the high school level. Document #21 submitted for element 1.5 does address AA-AAAS assessments as a high school requirement, however.</p> <p>-Document #19 provides a regulation that addresses the placement of students with disabilities and non-public schools</p> <p>No Maryland evidence specifically addresses ELs. However, the PARCC submission offers considerable evidence in support of this.</p> <p>Native languages assessments are not applicable for MD.</p>
<p>Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p>_xxx_ No additional evidence is required, in view of the evidence submitted by MD above, and the PARCC consortium evidence submitted in support of element 1.4</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

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
(see PARCC notes for 1.4).		

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>Evaluate for:</p> <p>DOCUMENT #20 Maryland Accountability Addendum for ESEA Flex. DOCUMENT #21 COMAR High School Assessment Requirements DOCUMENT #22 High School Graduation Requirements DOCUMENT #23 High School Status Overview from MD Report Card DOCUMENT #24 HSA Status Results 2015 DOCUMENT #25 HSA Test Performance Results 2015 DOCUMENT #26 PARCC Performance Math disaggregated by subgroup reports DOCUMENT #27 PARCC Performance Reading disaggregated by subgroup reports DOCUMENT #28 PARCC Performance Summary disaggregated by subgroup reports DOCUMENT #29 PARCC Math and ELA Performance Results</p>	<p>Document #20 outlines approach to calculation of part. rate. Document #21 codifies MD high school assessment participation requirements Document #22 codifies MD high school graduation requirements Document #23 MD overview of Grade 11 participation rate results with links to website. Document #24 MD Grade 12 participation rate for all test taking status --broken by student group. --grades 10, 11 available on MD ED website by subject and by student group --HSA status results do account for Science in HS data</p> <p>Documents #26 through #29 provide summary data by student group only by TESTED students for grades 3-8. These documents DO NOT appear to show participation rate for grades 3-8. Student groups are broken down, but denominators (i.e., total student population) are NOT SHOWN.</p> <p>Science participation N/A for this review, as no science testing evidence submitted.</p>

Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
<p>_xxx_ No additional evidence is required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no participation rate data evident in the PARCC grade 3-8 test performance summaries, only information about the number of children tested. By participation rate, ED is specifically referring to the total number of children tested as a % of the number of children who meet the criteria described in document 20. Subsequent to the peer review, but prior to Maryland receiving the official status letter from the Department regarding this peer review, the 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

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
information for the number of enrolled students 3-8 in conjunction with number tested to calculate participation rates was provided. This information satisfied the comments in notes above.		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>--SEE PARCC CONSORTIUM NOTES</p>	<p>++see PARCC consortium notes for this element.</p>
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>See PARCC notes.</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>--SEE PARCC CONSORTIUM NOTES</p>	
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>See PARCC notes.</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet --SEE PARCC CONSORTIUM NOTES</p> <p>Maryland Evidence: DOCUMENT #30 Maryland PARCC Spring 2016 State Specific Appendix</p> <p>DOCUMENT #31 PARCC Spring 2016 Local Accountability Coordinator Training PowerPoint</p>	<p>++see PARCC consortium notes for this element.</p> <p>Document #30 indicates that all personnel who administer the PARCC assessments must be trained: School Test Coordinators provide copies of sign-in sheets, training dates, and make-up training to indicate that all staff involved in testing have been trained.</p> <p>Document #30 also indicates that non-certified individuals may serve as proctors and administer accommodations under the supervision of a Test Administrator and must be trained.</p>
<p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>__X_ No additional evidence is required, in view of the evidence submitted by MD above, and the PARCC consortium evidence submitted in support of element 2.3 (see PARCC notes for 2.3).</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

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>Evaluate for all elements in left hand column: DOCUMENT #32 Local Accountability Coordinators’ Guide to Test Security</p> <p>DOCUMENT #33 Testing Incident Report Form</p> <p>DOCUMENT #34 Monitoring Training PowerPoint</p> <p>DOCUMENT #35 Observation Form</p>	<p>++see PARCC consortium notes for this element.</p> <p>Document #32 MD LEA guide to test security w/ incident report form (Document #33)</p> <p>Document #34 MD training for SEA staff performing LEA testing monitoring observations with observation form (Document #35)</p>
<p>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p>XXX_ No additional evidence is required, in view of the evidence submitted by MD above, and the PARCC consortium evidence submitted in support of element 2.4 (see PARCC notes for 2.4).</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

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>--SEE PARCC CONSORTIUM NOTES</p> <p>Maryland evidence: DOCUMENT #36 COMAR 13A.03.04</p> <p>DOCUMENT #37 Certification of Training Form</p> <p>DOCUMENT #38 Test Security Training PowerPoint for LACs and STCs</p> <p>DOCUMENT #39 Procedures for Conducting a Test Security Investigation</p> <p>Additional evidence found elsewhere:</p>	<p>++see PARCC consortium notes for this element.</p> <p>Maryland does not require that PARCC Security Agreement be signed or archived. However, Maryland has its own regulations and security requirements. All test administrators must sign the Maryland Non-Disclosure form.</p> <p>Maryland has procedures for detecting test irregularities in addition to information provided by PARCC.</p> <p>Procedures for investigating test irregularities and breaches of test security and for sanctions based on investigation findings are in place.</p> <p>Sanctions may be imposed either by the LEA and/or MSDE. MSDE reviews LEA recommendations and may have further requirements (e.g., retraining of personnel, removal from testing role, and/or personnel action.</p> <p>Maryland should examine the 2014 Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing and updating COMAR to reflect the changes in the Standards.</p>
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>X_ No additional evidence is required, in view of the evidence submitted by MD above, and the PARCC consortium evidence submitted in support of element 2.5 (see PARCC notes for 2.5).</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

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>--SEE PARCC CONSORTIUM NOTES</p> <p>DOCUMENT #40 Maryland School Performance Web Site Privacy Information</p> <p>DOCUMENT #41 Maryland Report Card Data Suppression Rules</p> <p>DOCUMENT #42 Maryland Board Agenda Reflecting Presentation on Suppression</p> <p>DOCUMENT #43 Suppression Report Presentation to the Maryland Board of Education</p> <p>DOCUMENT #44 Maryland Board Minutes Reflecting Presentation on Suppression</p> <p>Additional evidence for this Critical Element found elsewhere: Documents #33 and #34 concerning policies and procedures to protect the integrity of assessment materials for test administration.</p> <p>Also see Test Security Section 2.5.</p>	<p>++see PARCC consortium notes for this element.</p> <p>Maryland has policies and procedures to protect the integrity of test administration materials.</p> <p>Maryland has suppression rules to protect personally identifiable information about individual students in reporting. Maryland uses a minimum # of 10 for reporting.</p> <p>More evidence for this Critical Element is provided in the PARCC evidence.</p>
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</p> <p><u> </u>X_ No additional evidence is required, in view of the evidence submitted by MD above, and the PARCC consortium evidence submitted in support of element 2.6 (see PARCC notes for 2.6).</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>--SEE PARCC CONSORTIUM NOTES</p>	<p>++see PARCC consortium notes for this element.</p>
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>See PARCC notes.</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

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>--SEE PARCC CONSORTIUM NOTES</p>	<p>++see PARCC consortium notes for this element.</p>
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>See PARCC notes.</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>--SEE PARCC CONSORTIUM NOTES</p>	<p>++see PARCC consortium notes for this element.</p>
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>See PARCC notes.</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>--SEE PARCC CONSORTIUM NOTES</p>	<p>++see PARCC consortium notes for this element.</p>
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>See PARCC notes.</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>--SEE PARCC CONSORTIUM NOTES</p>	<p>++see PARCC consortium notes for this element.</p>
<p>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>See PARCC notes.</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>--SEE PARCC CONSORTIUM NOTES</p>	<p>++see PARCC consortium notes for this element.</p>
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>See PARCC notes.</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>--SEE PARCC CONSORTIUM NOTES</p>	<p>++see PARCC consortium notes for this element.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>See PARCC notes.</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>--SEE PARCC CONSORTIUM NOTES</p>	<p>++see PARCC consortium notes for this element.</p>
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>See PARCC notes.</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>--SEE PARCC CONSORTIUM NOTES</p>	<p>++see PARCC consortium notes for this element.</p>
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>See PARCC notes.</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>--SEE PARCC CONSORTIUM NOTES</p>	<p>++see PARCC consortium notes for this element.</p>
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>See PARCC notes.</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>--SEE PARCC CONSORTIUM NOTES</p>	<p>++see PARCC consortium notes for this element.</p>
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>See PARCC notes.</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

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; • Includes instructions that students eligible to be 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS --SEE PARCC CONSORTIUM NOTES</p> <p>DOCUMENT # 45 Maryland’s Differences Among Assessments Chart for Students Receiving Special Education Services March 2015</p> <p>DOCUMENT # 46 Instructional and Testing Accessibility Features and Accommodations for PARCC</p> <p>NA for AA-AAAS</p>	<p>++see PARCC consortium notes for this element.</p> <p>Maryland provides training on assessments for students with disabilities who may take the general assessments with and without accommodations and on AA-AAA and on the participation guidelines for students to participate in an alternate assessment.</p> <p>Maryland utilizes a statewide IEP Online system which incorporates the PARCC accessibility features and accommodations. IEP teams document all necessary PARCC accessibility features, accommodations, and administrative considerations a student may receive.</p> <p>PARCC has provided extensive resources for States to use in decision-making to determine which assessment students will take. MSDE can access these resources as they update their plans to support students.</p> <p>NA for AA-AAAS Policies regarding effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an AA-AAAS will be reviewed when the alternate assessment is reviewed.</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>Peers were unable to provide a comprehensive review of this section due to the lack of evidence for policies, procedures and practices regarding students who take the AA-AAAS.</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS --SEE PARCC CONSORTIUM NOTES</p> <p>DOCUMENT #48 PARCC Accommodation Form for a Student Who Is an English Learner (EL) in Maryland</p> <p>DOCUMENT #49 Maryland Accommodations Manual for English Learners (ELs) Crosswalk to PARCC</p> <p>Document #47 and 50 PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual, Fourth Edition (AF&A Manual) Slides 64-73 of the PARCC Accessibility Feature and of Accommodations Manual Training Presentation for local school systems and non-public schools in Maryland</p>	<p>++see PARCC consortium notes for this element.</p> <p>Document #47 contains the procedures for whether English learners should be assessed with accommodations. However, the peers were unable to locate a Maryland procedural guide that is the basis for this training.</p> <p>Document #47 and #49 provides information about accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners.</p> <p>Documents #47, #48, and #49 provide guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</p> <p>Use of Transadapted Spanish form: MSDE has elected NOT to use the Spanish translated forms for the 2015-16 test administration. The forms will be introduced when the policy and procedures around the best usage of this new accommodation have been implemented.</p>
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required, in view of the evidence submitted by MD above, and the PARCC consortium evidence submitted in support of element 5.2 (see PARCC notes for 5.2).</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS; --SEE PARCC CONSORTIUM NOTES</p> <p>Maryland evidence: DOCUMENT #51 Appendix F Unique Accommodations Request Form</p> <p>DOCUMENT #52 MSDE Testing Calendar</p> <p>DOCUMENT #53 MSDE Testing Calendar Nonpublic</p> <p>Additional evidence found elsewhere: DOCUMENT #47 and #49</p>	<p>++see PARCC consortium notes for this element.</p> <p>Documents #47 and #49 provide additional evidence that the State has established practices for implementing the PARCC accommodations.</p> <p>Accessibility and Accommodations expectations specific to Maryland:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Maryland, all administrative considerations, accessibility features and accommodations indicated in the SR/PNP must be documented for federal reporting requirements. Small Group Testing (5 students is the maximum group size in Maryland) Other Frequent Breaks, according to state policy: In Maryland IEP, 504 or EL plan (or other EL documentation) that documents the need for frequent breaks not listed in the three categories above. Student’s testing time pauses/stops. If prior to or during testing, the school principal (or principal’s designee) determines that a student requires an emergency accommodation, an emergency accommodation form must be completed and submitted to the LAC in Maryland. Question 5: Are the EL accommodations of 7 H, I, and K not allowable for Maryland? Last year we had a cross walk to tell us which accommodations are not available. [MSDE Response: MSDE has elected NOT to use the Spanish translated forms for the 2015-16 test administration. The forms will be introduced when the policy and procedures around the best usage of this new accommodation have been implemented.]
<p>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required, in view of the evidence submitted by MD above, and the PARCC consortium evidence submitted in support of element 5.3 (see PARCC notes for 5.3).</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS; --SEE PARCC CONSORTIUM NOTES</p> <p>Maryland evidence: DOCUMENT #54 Observations Memorandum</p> <p>DOCUMENT #55 Observation Form</p> <p>DOCUMENT #56 Email to Local Special Education Directors on April 23, 2015 at 12:29 regarding the upcoming PARCC accommodations review</p> <p>DOCUMENT # 57 Text-to-Speech Human Read Aloud Monitoring Training Agenda</p> <p>DOCUMENT #58 Text-to-Speech Monitoring Rubrics test</p> <p>Additional evidence found elsewhere: Documents #34 and #35</p> <p>Findings from the Accessibility Features and Accommodations Studies: PARCC Field Tests, p. 32</p> <p>PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual, 4th Edition, pp. 67-68</p>	<p>++see PARCC consortium notes for this element.</p> <p>Maryland monitors on-site document review and conducts on-site structured observations of test administration for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secure storage locations for testing materials • Archival information on testing groups, Test Examiners/Administrators, Accommodators, and Proctors • Certification of Training and Non-Disclosure Agreements • School security plans • IEPs for accommodated students • Secure testing materials to include Alt-MSA portfolios <p>Observations include testing environment, handling of materials, giving directions, questions from students, use of test materials, timing, test security, accommodations, and other.</p> <p>MSDE conducts random observations of testing to monitor testing irregularities. School districts are selected for on-site visits based on the previous year’s test security violations.</p> <p>On pages 67-68 of the PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual, PARCC states that, “Information on the use of accessibility features and accommodations is collected through the SR/PNP along with other demographic information in each PARCC member state.” The document continues by providing information for use in the monitoring of accessibility features and accommodations.</p> <p>The Peers were unable to find evidence that MSDE is using available PARCC resources and its on-line IEP system to confirm that students are receiving</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		appropriate test accommodations as specified in their IEPs, 504 plans, and EL plans as specified in the PNP.
Section 5.4 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed: A plan for how Maryland will monitor provisions of accessibility features and accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities and for English learners, including incorporation of information collected through the SR/PNP.</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet --SEE PARCC CONSORTIUM NOTES</p> <p>Maryland evidence: DOCUMENT #59 Code of Maryland Regulations – Achievement Standards</p> <p>NA for Science not submitted</p> <p>NA for AA-AAAS not submitted</p>	<p>++see PARCC consortium notes for this element.</p> <p>Peers could find no Maryland specific evidence that addresses the items in this Critical Element as applied to the PARCC assessment academic achievement standards as defined by performance level descriptors and cutscores. While Maryland uses PARCC assessments and the achievement levels for PARCC are Did Not Yet Meet, Partially Meets Expectations, Approaches Expectations, Meets Expectations, Exceeds Expectations, Document #59 does not match this terminology. Document #59 also predates the PARCC assessment.</p> <p>Maryland Report Card reports performance of all students who took the PARCC assessment in terms of the PARCC academic achievement standards (performance levels). However, it is unclear what percent of students at each grade-level and content area participated in the PARCC assessments.</p>
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maryland needs to provide evidence of State formal adoption of academic achievement standards. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>--SEE PARCC CONSORTIUM NOTES</p> <p>NA for AA-AAAS</p>	<p>++see PARCC consortium notes for this element.</p>
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>See PARCC Notes</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>--SEE PARCC CONSORTIUM NOTES</p>	<p>++see PARCC consortium notes for this element.</p>
<p>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>See PARCC notes.</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

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 the extent practicable, in a native language 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet --SEE PARCC CONSORTIUM NOTES</p> <p>Maryland evidence: DOCUMENT #60 Code of Maryland Regulations – Reporting</p> <p>DOCUMENT #61 Code of Maryland Regulations – Reporting Requirements</p> <p>DOCUMENT #62 2015 Maryland Report Card</p> <p>DOCUMENT #63 State and LEA Level Results</p> <p>DOCUMENT #64 E-mail Message for State and LEA Level Results</p> <p>DOCUMENT #65 E-mail Message Regarding Release of PARCC Aggregate Reports</p>	<p>++see PARCC consortium notes for this element.</p> <p>As noted in Section 1.5, Maryland did not report participation data based on full enrollment for the PARCC assessments as part of this submission. There is no participation rate data evident in the PARCC grade 3-8 test performance summaries, only information about the number of children tested. By participation rate, ED is specifically referring to the total number of children tested as a % of the number of children who meet the criteria described in document 20. A survey of the MD state report card site (linked in several evidence documents) also did not show the number of enrolled students, or the ratio of tested to enrolled students.</p> <p>PARCC does not provide itemized score analyses but PARCC does provide and Maryland does provide the many PARCC interpretation guides to enable useful interpretation of the results to address academic needs of students. Current submitted sample PARCC reports do not include classroom level reports. What does Maryland do to provide information at the classroom level for teachers to use?</p> <p>Maryland delivers performance reports for all students who took the PARCC assessment in terms of the PARCC academic achievement standards (performance levels).</p> <p>Code of Maryland Regulations specifies the data-based areas to be measured and reported annually by Maryland before the beginning of the school year for the state, school systems, and schools. Reporting was delayed for PARCC for the 2014-2015 administration.</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MARYLAND

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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"> What mechanisms does Maryland have to use PARCC data to provide classroom level reports for teachers? Reporting to the public the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration. Please provide the number of enrolled students 3-8 and tested High School courses in conjunction with number tested to calculate participation rates. 		

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

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



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

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

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

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS	3
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students	3
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards	4
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only)	5
SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS	6
2.1 – Test Design and Development	6
2.2 – Item Development	8
2.3 – Test Administration	9
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)	10
2.5 – Test Security	11
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy	13
SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY	14
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	14
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes	16
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	17
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	18
SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER	20
4.1 – Reliability	20
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility	21
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum	25
4.4 – Scoring	26
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	28
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	29
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	31
SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS	32
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	32
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs	34
5.3 – Accommodations	35
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	37
SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING	38
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students	38
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting	39
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	40
6.4 – Reporting	41

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

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>1.1.1 Common Core State Standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts & Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Studies b. Common Core State Standards for Mathematics <p>Science standards not included</p>	
<p>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>See State evidence.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

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>1.2.4 Reaching Higher: The Common Core State Standards Validation Committee a. Findings, pp. 2-3</p> <p>1.2.5 The Common Core State Standards: Insight into Their Development and Purpose</p> <p>NA for Science</p>	
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>See State evidence.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column-SWD and EL</p> <p>*PARCC Accessibility/Accommodations Manual</p>	<p>Several policy-like statements (Sections 3 and 4) support inclusions of all students, including those with disabilities and EL in statewide assessments</p> <p>Same sections also support inclusion of English Learners in statewide assessments.</p> <p>The PARCC manual submitted clearly outlines an approach for instructional staff to consider when considering accessibility features for all students.</p> <p>The manual also clearly outlines an approach for IEP teams to use when considering and selecting assessment accommodations.</p> <p>This manual also clearly outlines an approach for instructional staff to use when considering and selecting allowable accommodations for EL students.</p>
<p>Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p>This summary feedback for “No Additional Evidence Needed”, or “Additional Evidence Needed” is most appropriately limited to the context of a specific state</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

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

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose 2.1.1.1 About PARCC Assessments; Intended Interpretation and uses of results 2.1.1.2 – 2.1.1.7 • Test blueprints and item specifications provide detailed guidance to item development that addresses coverage and support for interpretation and use of results 2.2.1a-2.1.2.6 • ECD, Claims Structure, and Descriptions provide information about content challenge and required complexity of items and tasks 2.1.2.7a-2.1.2.9 and 2.1.3.4a-2.1.3.14 • The PARCC Cognitive Complexity Study 2.1.3.1evaluation was intended to guide selection of items for test forms to meet challenge and complexity requirements. • The NNSTOY 2.1.3.3, Fordham 2.1.3.2a (intended to evaluate grades 5 and 8 for alignment and comparisons of challenge and rigor with other measures) and HumRRO 2.1.3.2b (intended to evaluate HS assessments for alignment and comparison to challenge and rigor of other measures) studies address issues of cognitive complexity. • Technology-based = Usability of accessibility tools 2.2.5 and 2.2.6 • NA-not computer-adaptive 	<p>More than adequate evidence is provided for the intended interpretation and uses of results both in an overarching statement and as communicated in score reports and interpretation guides to support score reports.</p> <p>Several documents provide guidance for item development to ensure appropriate content challenge and complexity. Pre-item development documentation supported item development that addressed a variety of complexity levels consistent with the intent of the full range of the grade-level academic content standards.</p> <p>PARCC Cognitive Complexity Study investigators evaluated item content for cognitive complexity for the purpose of assembling operational test forms to align with the content standards.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content challenge and cognitive complexity are defined for use in item and task development in 2.2.12 and 2.2.21, 2.2.13-2.2.14, 2.2.21 • Item development processes 2.2.1-2.2.4, 2.2.9-2.2.10, 2.2.12, 2.2.15-2.2.16, 2.2.17-2.2.19 • Item research and reviews 2.2.5-2.2.8, 2.2.11, 2.2.20 	<p>Peers could not locate information about the composition (e.g., racial and geographic diversity) and credentials (e.g., certification, grade levels, special population, etc.) of those participating in the Content and Bias/Sensitivity.</p> <p>Peers could not locate information about the most common reasons for item rejections that should be useful in future item development.</p>
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Composition and credentials of Content and Bias/Sensitivity Reviewers 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>Administration policies and procedures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communicate admin procedures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Standardized 2.3.1.1 Admin Bulletin, 2.3.1.1 Technology Bulletin, TCM & TAMs 2.3.1.7 ○ Accommodations: Manual 2.3.1.8, TCM 2.3.1.6 pp 54-60 • Training: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Practice tests 2.3.1.2 ○ Sample items 2.3.1.3 ○ Tutorials 2.3.1.4 ○ Online Training Modules 2.3.1.5 ○ Test Admin study 2.3.2.1 • Technology: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Technology Bulletin 2.3.1.1 ○ Customer Support 2.3.1.9 ○ Technology Set-up Tools 2.3.3.1 ○ Contingency TCM 2.3.1.6 pp.33, Early Warning System 2.3.3.2, Error Codes 2.3.3.3, Escalation Protocol 2.3.3.4 <p>NA-AA-AAS</p>	<p>In the HumRRO report, reviewers found that accommodations offered were valid and appropriate based on current research, However, reviewers were unable to locate information regarding research regarding whether the accessibility features and accommodations alter the constructs measured.</p> <p>It is not clear who is and whether personnel are required to complete all training prior to administration. PARCC says they provide data to states on who has viewed which modules and completed the end-of-training quiz.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do States decide who takes the training? • Are States individually making policies concerning training requirements since format of training varies from state-to-state? • If so, how does this variation affect accuracy of results? (See Test Admin Study) <p>PARCC States should document fidelity of implementation of training materials provided by PARCC through the States’ monitoring processes.</p> <p>Use of a common test platform ensures consistency for delivery for training and test administration and a common experience for students. It also minimizes test administration problems that are introduced by the use of multiple platforms.</p>
<p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for PARCC.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

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>2.5.1.1 TCM and TAMs 2.5.1.2 Security Agreement 2.5.1.3 Post-Test Certification Forms 2.5.1.4 Form to Report Testing Irregularities and Security Breaches 2.5.1.5 <u>Form to Report Contaminated, Damaged, Missing Materials</u> 2.5.1.6 <u>Chain-of-Custody Requirements in 2016 Spring Test Coordinator Manual</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Section 2.1, pp. 3-5: Maintaining The Security of Test Materials and Content Section 3.3.2, p. 16: Security Plan Chain-of-Custody Forms <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Computer-Based Testing Form</u> <u>School-Level Paper-Based Testing Form</u> <u>LEA/District-Level Paper-Based Testing Form</u> <p>2.5.1.7 <u>TestNav Security Highlights</u> 2.5.1.8 <u>DDoS Migration AWS-Pearson SECURE DOCUMENT</u> 2.5.1.9 <u>Troubleshooting Guide for Online Testing</u> 2.5.1.10 <u>TestNav Early Warning System</u> 2.5.1.11 <u>PearsonAccessNext Operational Reports</u> 2.5.2.1 <u>Data Forensics Study Plan SECURE DOCUMENT</u> 2.5.2.2 <u>PARCC Handscoring Alert Process SECURE DOCUMENT</u> 2.5.3.1 <u>PARCC State Alert/Escalation Protocol SECURE DOCUMENT</u></p>	<p>PARCC Evidence of recommended Test Security procedures to create a secure environment and to protect PII is more than adequate.</p> <p>States need to demonstrate full use and application of these procedures and protections.</p>
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

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"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>2.6.1.1 <u>Chain-of-Custody Requirements in 2016 Spring Test Coordinator Manual</u></p> <p>2.6.1.2 <u>Paper-Based Testing Materials Security Procedures in 2016 Spring Test Coordinator Manual</u></p> <p>2.6.1.3 <u>PARCC State Alert/Escalation Protocol</u> SECURE DOCUMENT</p> <p>2.6.1.4 <u>Data Forensics Study Plan</u> SECURE DOCUMENT</p> <p>2.6.1.5 <u>Student Registration/Personal Needs Profile Field Definitions</u></p> <p>2.6.1.6 <u>Non-Disclosure Agreements</u> for all item reviewers, forms reviewers, etc.</p> <p>2.6.1.7 <u>PARCC Data Privacy and Security Policy</u></p> <p>2.6.2.1 <u>Pearson Privacy Policy</u></p> <p>2.6.2.2 <u>Pearson Terms and Conditions</u></p> <p>2.6.2.3 <u>User Role Matrix for Pearson Access Next</u></p> <p>2.6.2.4 <u>Score Report Interpretation Guide</u></p> <p> a. Section 1.3, p. 1: Confidentiality of Reporting Results</p> <p>2.6.2.5 <u>Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974</u></p> <p>2.6.3.1 <u>Protection of Student Privacy: Aggregate Reports</u> SECURE DOCUMENT</p>	<p>Minimum cell sizes for reporting for PARCC is Performance View-16 students; Growth View-25.students. State member minimum cell sizes range from 10 to 25.</p> <p>Policies and procedures for reporting conform to industry standards. (PARCC honors the minimum # sizes and suppression rules for the respective states.)</p>
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

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>3.1.1.1 <u>2015 PARCC Technical Report</u></p> <p>3.1.1.2 <u>Evidence of PARCC Validity</u></p> <p>3.1.1.3 <u>Quality of Items, Tasks, and Stimuli Study</u></p> <p>3.1.1.16 <u>Cognitive Complexity Study</u></p> <p><u>Evidence cited elsewhere relevant to this CE:</u> Thomas B. Fordham Institute, “Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation Assessments,” and HumRRO, “Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation High School Assessments”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alignment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Content (knowledge and process) 3.1.1.3 <u>Quality of Items, Tasks, and Stimuli Study</u> a. pp. 1-4, 8-17, 72-73, 79-80 ○ Range Fordham p.7 and 54 ○ Balance HumRRO p.25, 36, and 38 ○ Cognitive Complexity 3.1.1.16 <u>Cognitive Complexity Study</u> <p>NA for AA-AAA</p>	<p>NNSTOY, Fordham, and HumRRO reports evaluated alignment only for grades 5, 8, and High School in ELA/L and Mathematics. These investigators noted that more PLD Level 1 items are needed, particularly at grade 8 and High School Mathematics. PARCC has indicated they are adding items to address this concern. In addition, Fordham investigators were unable to summarize results for balanced emphasis as regards concepts, procedures, and applications.</p> <p>PARCC evidence of coverage of the full range of the grade-level academic content standards was lacking in both ELA and Mathematics particularly at grades 5 and 8. Future alignment studies that include multiple forms per grade for all grades tested may find that coverage is not an issue across forms. Further evidence is needed.</p> <p>PARCC Technical Report indicates that alignment studies found excellent alignment for both content and depth. However, the HumRRO study of the High School assessments found that the ELA/L assessment was limited overall for Depth. This finding contrasts with the Fordham study findings for ELA/L grades 5 and 8, where a good to excellent match was found for Depth. Both studies found a weak match at all levels for Speaking and Listening.</p> <p>Alignment study findings for Mathematics at all levels for most aspects of alignment were good to excellent, although Fordham found that the distribution of items for grade 8 was weak at DOK1. Fordham also experienced difficulty in</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>ascertaining balance of emphasis across the key concepts of the domains. No summary result was provided for this dimension of alignment. Balance of emphasis is an essential dimension of alignment.</p> <p>As adjustments are made to address the DOK1 issue, PARCC needs to verify all aspects of alignment for adjusted forms.</p>
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peers were unable to find that grades other than grades 5, 8, and High School were included in alignment studies. It was also not clear how many forms were evaluated. PARCC should perform alignment studies to cover multiple operational forms that will be used in future administrations for every grade tested in both content areas. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>3.2.1 <u>PARCC Item Development Research: Cognitive Labs</u></p> <p>3.2.2 <u>Quality of Items, Tasks, and Stimuli Study</u></p> <p>3.2.3 <u>Cognitive Complexity Study</u></p>	<p>PARCC evidence from 3.1 that applies to this critical element: 3.1.1.5a-3.1.1.7l documents provide additional evidence for cognitive processes in the design of items in ELA/L and Mathematics to meet the requirement.</p> <p>The recommendation was made in the Cognitive Complexity Study that this study be repeated based on 2015 operational data. What is PARCC’s plan to address this?</p> <p>PARCC cognitive labs that explore student performance on items to show the items require complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skill would more clearly support the validity of the assessment in eliciting the intended cognitive processes.</p> <p>See Peer Review Guidance 3.2. Examples page 36.</p>
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct cognitive labs based on cognitive processes across grades and content areas, or • Conduct follow-up Cognitive Complexity Studies that focus on cognitive processes across grades and content areas. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>3.3.1 2015 PARCC Technical Report Section 9.3: Evidence Based on Internal Structure (pp. 115-147)</p> <p>3.3.2 PARCC 2014 Field Test Technical Report Section 9: Dimensionality Analyses (pp. 115-209)</p>	<p>PARCC’s internal structure evidence and Dimensionality analyses provide strong evidence for validity.</p> <p>PARCC’s descriptive information for subclaim reporting as opposed to numerical scores was a useful approach for this critical element for users and sound approach for test developers.</p> <p>PARCC’s <i>DIF</i> Analyses were conducted and used as one piece of evidence to determine exclusion of items. Flagged items are designated as DNU (Do Not Use) or recommended to be re-field tested.</p>
<p>Section 3.3 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 THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

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>2015 PARCC Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Section 9: Validity (pp. 115-147) b. Addendum 9: Validity (pp. 563-566) <p>Postsecondary Educators’ Judgment Study</p> <p>Benchmarking Study</p> <p>Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation Assessments:</p> <p>The Right Trajectory: State Teachers of the Year Compare Former and New State Assessments</p> <p>Quality of Test Administration Study</p> <p>Predictive Validity of MCAS and PARCC Study</p> <p>Evidence found elsewhere relevant to this Critical Element:</p> <p>PARCC College- and Career-Ready Determination Policy</p>	<p>PARCC’s convergent and divergent validity analysis results were reported.</p> <p>PARCC’s preliminary studies considering the relationship between the high school tests and post-secondary outcomes are reported.</p> <p>The PARCC Benchmarking Study 3.4.3 provides validity evidence for comparisons to other highly respected assessments.</p> <p>PARCC’s plans for future investigations of consequential validity are also reported.</p> <p>PARCC should continue to provide the results of these studies and actions taken based on the recommendations of these studies to USED.</p> <p>In the PARCC College- and Career-Ready Determination Policy, PARCC sets forth an agenda for empirical investigation of consequential validity: “The following statement will be used to conduct validation studies of the efficacy of PARCC’s College- and Career-Ready Determinations in the future.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Students who earn a College- and Career-Ready Determination by performing at level 4 in grade 11 ELA/literacy and enroll in College English Composition, Literature, and technical courses requiring college-level reading and writing have approximately a 0.75 probability of earning college credit by attaining at least a grade of C or its equivalent in those courses.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Students who earn a PARCC College- and Career-Ready Determination by performing at level 4 in Algebra II or Mathematics III</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

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>4.1.1 2015 PARCC Technical Report a. Section 8: Reliability (pp. 76-114)</p>	<p>All reliabilities reported by PARCC met industry standards except for certain subjects, accommodations, and subgroups, e.g., American Indians/Alaska Natives, Students with Disabilities, and English learners.</p> <p>Overall SEMs and conditional SEMs (Addendum 7) are better than most state results, probably due to the much larger sample size, a benefit of consortium test participation. These are more than acceptable for a new assessment program.</p> <p>The Livingston Lewis procedures and the results were also acceptable at all cut score levels and achievement levels and when the proficiency levels were collapsed into pass/fail decisions for both accuracy and consistency, they were even higher. (Tables 8.27 and 8.29)</p> <p>NA-CAT</p>
<p>Section 4.1 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 THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>American Sign Language GAAP Guidelines</p> <p>Accommodated Test Form Validation Checklists by Accommodation Type</p> <p>PARCC Human Reader Script Guidelines</p> <p>PARCC 2015 Operational Equating Plan and Procedures, pages 18-25</p> <p>Sample Data Review Item Card Templates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sample ELA constructed response or technology-enhanced 2-point item card • Sample math constructed response 6-point item card • Sample PCR Task Try Out item card • Sample EBSR and TECR Task Try Out item card • Sample math constructed response 4-point item card • Sample math multiple choice item card • Sample math constructed response 3-point item card <p>TestNav Item Evaluation Iteration 1 – Students with Visual Impairments Usability Study Summary</p> <p>Findings from the PARCC Accommodations and Accessibility Studies Report</p> <p>Findings from the Quality of Items/Tasks/Stimuli Investigations: PARCC Field Tests</p> <p>PARCC Item Development Research: Cognitive Labs for Students with Disabilities and English Learners</p> <p>Product Review Board September Quarterly</p>	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>2015 PARCC Technical Report a. Section 12: Scale Scores (pp. 193-219)</p>	<p>Technical Report Section 12 pp 204-215 data appears to support the findings of the Fordham and HumRRO studies regarding a lack of Level 1 items in certain grades and courses.</p> <p>Appendix 12.3 pp 383-384 (Grade 3 ELA/L) indicates that the top 20 achievable score points all round down to 850. This is pattern across grades. What did the TAC think of the impact on IRT calibrations?</p> <p>Peers would be interested in viewing the cumulative frequency distributions across raw score/scale scores – What number and percent of students scored at each raw/scale score point?</p> <p>NNSTOY, Fordham, and HumRRO reports evaluated alignment only for grades 5, 8, and High School in ELA/L and Mathematics. These investigators note that more PLD Level 1 items are needed, particularly at grade 8 and High School Mathematics. Further evidence was noted in the SEM findings from the operational test. Additional item development is reportedly planned to remedy this situation so that the performance of low-achieving students can be more precisely measured.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference questions in right hand column. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>2015 PARCC Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Section 4: Item Scoring, pp. 40-49 b. Section 10: IRT Calibration and Scaling in Operational Year One, pp. 148-186 c. Section 12: Scale Scores, pp. 193-219 <p>Handscoring Specifications: Fall 2014 and Spring 2015 Operational Assessments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. pp. 13-67 <p>Final Report: 2015 PARCC Operational Assessment: Psychometric Evaluation</p> <p>PARCC Spring 2015 Test Coordinator Manual, pp. 11-15</p>	<p>Evidence provided conforms to industry standards. Peers noted that “two separate vendors independently conducted the calibration and scaling of the Fall and Spring administrations with a third vendor conducting an external evaluation of these procedures.”</p> <p>Recommendations and suggestions noted on page 41 of the 2015 PARCC Operational Assessment: Psychometric Evaluation (4.4.3) should be incorporated by PARCC in future years.</p> <p>For human or hand-scored items (Tech Manual, Section 4.2), “the first score is the score to be reported, while the second, resolution, and adjudication scores are used to monitor scorer performance only.” Approximately 90% of the responses were scored only once. A random selection of ten percent of responses were scored a second time by human scorers.. Pearson backread approximately five percent of the hand-scored responses. Backreading scores were used to monitor scorer performance. The first score was always used for both second reads and back reads.</p> <p>Inter-rater agreement in PARCC Technical Report p. 49 for perfect agreement range in mathematics was 92% and in ELA/L was 65%; within one point for mathematics was 99% and for ELA/L was 98%. The inter-rater reliability for ELA/L at the 65% exact agreement expectation should be monitored closely in future years (Technical Report, page 49). Peers noted that this seems a low threshold for exact agreement and should be expected to improve as the assessment matures. PARCC should continue to work toward a more ideal perfect agreement rate on ELA/L scoring.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>To strengthen the credibility of results and precision of scoring, Peers recommend a deeper examination of ELA/L inter-rater exact agreement at the grade for specific areas of concern. Results of this examination could be used to reflect on the precision of rubrics and the adequacy of training for all scorers. Peers' concern is for the implications of the exact agreement rate for the 90% of scores not examined by a second reader for reliability.</p> <p>In Table 4.4 page 49 of the Technical Report, Peers recommend increasing exact agreement expectations for the future for Mathematics to maintain the high mark they have established in the actual results.</p>
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required at this early stage in the assessment.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>2015 PARCC Technical Report</p> <p>Operational Equating Plan and Procedures for the 2015 Spring and 2014 Fall Block Administrations</p> <p>ELA/Literacy Blueprints</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. ELA Blueprints, 2016 versions for: b. ELA Common Form Specifications for: c. Task Generation Models for: d. Item Guidelines for ELA/Literacy <p>Mathematics Blueprints</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. PARCC Mathematics High Level Blueprints b. PARCC Mathematics Assessment Unit Structure c. Mathematics Claim Structure Documents d. Math Subclaim Points Document 	<p>Form to form equating: ETS provided a more than adequate model for scaling, equating, etc. that was clearly described in the Technical Report.</p> <p>Peers recommend that PARCC have an independent third party replicate calibrating, scaling, and equating. Peers understand that for the first administration, Pearson attempted to replicate these procedures and the results were checked somewhat independently by Measured Progress. Peers feel a full replication by an independent third party would increase confidence of the final raw score to scale score tables that are used for reporting.</p> <p>Across years – not yet available.</p>
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required at this early stage of the assessment.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>1. Design and Development Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2015 PARCC Technical Report • ELA/Literacy Blueprints • Math Blueprints <p>2. Comparability Studies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mode Comparability Study based on Spring 2015 operational test • Spring 2014 Digital Devices Comparability Research Study • Spring 2015 Digital Devices Comparability Research Study • PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual, 4th Edition 	<p>Multiple Versions: PBT v CBT =The Mode Comparability Study found significant mode differences between PBT and CBT versions of the test. A small number of items for English Language Arts/Literacy (i.e., 0 to 7 items per grade) and a slightly higher number of items for Mathematics (i.e., 2 to 17 items per grade) possessed either positive or negative C-level differential item functioning (DIF) across modes. CBT and PBT items were calibrated separately for each grade/subject. PARCC excluded items flagged for positive and negative C-DIF from the linking sets. Common items that behave differently across modes will have two sets of item parameter estimates: one set for online conversions and one set for paper. Technical Report pp.143-144.</p> <p>Because mode differences were found, Peers noted that PARCC, in the Technical Report referenced calibrating the PBT and CBT separately and post-equating them. This approach will allow for a strong interpretation and compensation for the mode difference. However, Peers were unable to ascertain whether the process was applied prior to reporting scores for the 2014-15 school year or was it done only within the Mode Comparability Study. Did PARCC apply this procedure prior to reporting the 2014-15 test scores?</p> <p>Mode Comparability Study leaders noted, “The current study was not conducted on all PARCC tests but on selected forms of certain grade levels and subjects from one state [sic]. The results varied across grade levels and subjects, which suggests that any preliminary and descriptive conclusions based on these selected tests cannot be generalized to the tests that were not included in this study.”</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>What are PARCC’s plans for further comparability studies between computer and paper tests? What are the plans to address the issues raised by the study or further investigation given the limitations of this study?</p> <p>What is PARCC doing in the future to ensure score comparability across modes?</p> <p>When scores are reported, PARCC should ensure that adjustments are made across modes so that scores have the same meaning for all students.</p>
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans for applying findings/proposed methodology from the Mode Comparability Study to ensure scores in future years have the same meaning for all students, given possible mode comparability issues. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>2015 PARCC Technical Report Section 13: Quality Control Procedures, pp. 220-229</p> <p>PARCC Program Quality Plan</p> <p>Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Members</p> <p>Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Agendas</p> <p>TAC White Papers commissioned by PARCC</p>	<p>Extensive evidence is provided for the examination and implementation of quality controls during the development of the assessment.</p> <p>TAC Agendas were interesting but excerpts from minutes or summaries of key TAC recommendations would have been more useful.</p> <p>Technical Report page 17 describes the process for evaluating the sufficiency of the item bank for ongoing maintenance of the assessment program, including replenishing items and passages. Peers also noted that field test items were embedded in the Spring 2015 forms.</p>
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

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>PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual, Fourth Edition</p> <p>Online Professional Development Module on the PARCC Accessibility System</p> <p>Training Module for PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations</p> <p>PARCC Assistive Technology Guidelines</p>	<p>Guidance is extensive and detailed and assumes compliance with IDEA. Training is also provided.</p> <p>In PARCC’s Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual, Fourth Edition, IEP information is consistent with federal law and regulations.</p> <p>PARCC has provided a series of steps to guide schools in decision-making regarding accessibility and accommodations. However, it is up to PARCC states to develop and adopt policies for educators and ensure that policies are carried out to ensure fairness.</p> <p>PARCC States need to document fidelity of appropriate PNP registration to ensure student access to appropriate accessibility features provided by PARCC.</p> <p>NA per AA-AAS.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

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. 		
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PARCC evidence can be used by the States to support the inclusion of all students in the general assessment. However, each State is ultimately responsible for implementing practices such as those contained in the PARCC materials to ensure that all students have a fair and equitable assessment experience. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>5.2.0.1 Informational brochures for students, parents, and educators in English and Spanish that pertain to EL participation in PARCC were developed and are available online:</p> <p>Parent PARCC Accessibility Brochure</p> <p>Training Module for PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations</p> <p>Initial Draft Development of ELL Section of PARCC Accommodation Manual</p> <p>PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual, Fourth Edition Appendix K</p> <p>Bilingual Dictionaries and Glossaries Authorized for Use by English Language Learners on MCAS and PARCC</p>	<p>Guidance is extensive and detailed. Training is also provided.</p> <p>PARCC offers Spanish forms of all math assessments. Use of translated versions is a state option. A list of bilingual dictionaries is provided. Accessibility tools and features are available to all students including ELs. Future translations into other languages is planned as an option for States.</p> <p>Accommodations specific to ELs are also provided.</p> <p>PARCC has provided a series of steps to guide schools in decision-making regarding inclusion of and accommodations for EL students. However, it is up to PARCC states to develop and adopt policies for educators and ensure that policies are carried out to ensure fairness.</p> <p>PARCC States need to document fidelity of appropriate PNP registration to ensure student access to appropriate accessibility features provided by PARCC.</p>
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PARCC evidence can be used by the States to support the inclusion of EL students in the general assessment. However, each State is ultimately responsible for implementing the recommended practices contained in the PARCC materials to ensure that all students have a fair and equitable assessment experience. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual, Fourth Edition</p> <p>PARCC Translation Policy</p> <p>2015 PARCC Technical Report</p> <p>Findings from the Quality of Items/Tasks/Stimuli Investigations: PARCC Field Tests</p> <p>PARCC Item Development Research: Cognitive Labs (for Students with Disabilities and English Learners)</p> <p>Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation Assessments:</p> <p>5.3.4.2 PARCC Unique Accommodation Summary Request SECURE DOCUMENT</p> <p>Additional evidence found elsewhere:</p> <p>Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation High School Assessments</p> <p>Quality of Test Administration Investigation</p>	<p>A wide array of accommodations are available for SWD, EL, and students covered under section 504.</p> <p>PARCC evidence describes an array of accessibility features and accommodations provided. However, it is up to PARCC states to ensure they are made available to students with disabilities (IDEA), students covered by Section 504, and English learners.</p> <p>PARCC States need to document fidelity of appropriate PNP registration to ensure student access to appropriate accessibility features provided by PARCC.</p> <p>PARCC has conducted Cognitive Labs to gather initial information about the interaction of students with disabilities and English learners with items and accessibility tools.</p> <p>The HumRRO investigators note in <i>Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation High School Assessments</i> that “The Center’s forthcoming test characteristics methodology, that considers data from administered tests, will support a fuller examination of accessibility.”</p> <p>Findings from the PARCC <i>Quality of Test Administration Investigations</i> provide some initial findings from Year 1 operational test for the effectiveness of training and fidelity of use of accessibility features and accommodations. The observational sample was very small for this study. Most data was self-report via survey.</p> <p>Are further studies planned on exactly how well the accessibility tools and features, accommodations, and</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>assistive technology worked in actual use during testing?</p> <p>PARCC provides procedures for exceptional requests to be reviewed and approved in addition to those routinely allowed. (5.3.4.2) During the first operational administration, there were twenty-five exceptional requests of which 17 were approved and 8 were denied. PARCC added one of those 17 approved were added to the fourth edition of the Accessibility and Accommodations Manual.</p> <p>NA per AA-AAS.</p>
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for PARCC at this early stage of the assessment program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each State is ultimately responsible for implementing the accommodations provided by PARCC to ensure that all students have a fair and equitable assessment experience. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>Findings from the PARCC Quality of Test Administration Investigations: Year I of the Operational Assessments Technical Report</p> <p>Additional evidence cited elsewhere: Test Administration Manual 2.6.1.1. Test Coordinator Manual</p>	<p>PARCC Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual provides guidance for policies for accommodations and describes their availability in the PARCC assessment.</p> <p>The TAM contains recommendations for test administration practices to support fidelity of test administration procedures.</p> <p>Because PARCC makes available data concerning individual accessibility features and accommodations for download by Test Coordinators, this information should be used by the states for monitoring.</p> <p>States are responsible for monitoring test administration of all assessments in the system.</p>
<p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for PARCC at this early stage of the assessment program.</p>		
<p>Each State is ultimately responsible for monitoring test administration of all assessments within the State system.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

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>Performance Level Setting Technical Report</p> <p>Performance Level Descriptors</p> <p>2015 PARCC Technical Report Section 12: Scale Scores, pp. 193-219</p>	<p>PARCC followed an established standard setting process. Cut scores were set for each grade in each content area and for each EOY assessment.</p> <p>PARCC developed achievement level descriptors at each grade level for each content area. Mathematics PLDs are more clearly differentiated and aligned with subclaims from grade to grade than ELA/L PLDs for reading. These were reviewed and confirmed as part of Standard Setting.</p> <p>NA for AA-AAS.</p> <p>State evidence is required to substantiate adoption.</p>
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required from PARCC.</p> <p>States must provide evidence of formal adoption of academic achievement levels and performance levels.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

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>Performance Level Setting Technical Report</p> <p>Performance Level Descriptors</p>	<p>Achievement standards were developed using an industry standard methodology.</p> <p>In Appendix 5 of the Performance Level Setting Technical Report, general descriptive tables of panel participants are provided, but lack sufficient detail to understand the real composition of the panels.</p> <p>PLDs are grade and content specific and were reviewed.</p> <p>Standard setting panels are only described in general terms. Special education and EL participants are not specifically noted.</p>
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More descriptive information about the composition of each panel including certification, particularly for special education and English learners 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>Postsecondary Educators’ Judgment Study</p> <p>PARCC Benchmarking Study</p> <p>Performance Level Setting Technical Report</p> <p>PARCC Pioneers Information</p> <p>Predictive Validity of MCAS and PARCC Study</p>	<p>Substantial effort has been made to validate the college and career readiness aspect of their PARCC academic achievement standards.</p> <p>NA-AA-AAS</p>
<p>Section 6.3 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 THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

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>2014-2015 Tables of Cross-State and State-Specific PARCC Results</p> <p>Score Report Interpretation Guide</p> <p>PARCC 2014-15 Published Report Guidance</p> <p>Score Report Interpretation Guide (for educators)</p> <p>Score Report Interpretation Guide For Parents</p> <p>Summative Record File, field definitions</p> <p>Parent Score Report Guides in English and Spanish</p> <p>Setting a New Baseline in English and Spanish</p> <p>Translated Individual Student Report shells, available in 10 languages</p> <p>Translated Score Report Interpretation Guide for Parents, available in 10 languages</p> <p>Report shipment memos (Memos were tailored for each state). Examples from 3 states</p> <p>PARCC 2014-15 Published Report Guidance</p> <p>Pearson key dates document: Overview of PARCC reports release dates. Each state had individual release dates within the PARCC window.</p>	<p>Public Reporting: States are responsible for this item.</p> <p>Educator Reporting: An Interpretation Guide is provided for educators for all reports available to them. Information is reported in the form of student rosters at the overall content area level and for subclaims for each school and district.</p> <p>How will teachers receive information about classroom performance? How are classroom results generated? What do they look like?</p> <p>Peers were unable to locate itemized score analyses. Are they available?</p> <p>Parent Reporting: PARCC score reports to parents are provide in multiple languages. The reports provide score information in the context of achievement levels and abbreviated subclaim PLDs at the proficient level. The reports are clear and supported by an Interpretation Guide that directs those interested to the location of complete PLDs available on-line.</p> <p>How will States calculate the percentage of students not tested? No enrollment data are indicated in consortium and State tables. 6.4.1.1. It is unlikely that PARCC has this information. If this is the case, then States will need to calculate and report the percentages of students not tested.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC CONSORTIUM EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

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. 		
<p>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What mechanism does PARCC have in place to assist States to provide classroom level reports for teachers? 		

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