



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

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

January 11, 2018

Dear Superintendent Salmon:

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

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

External peer reviewers and Department staff carefully evaluated MSDE's submission and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that the components of your assessment system for reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) assessments) meet all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of section 1111(b)(1) and (3) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB. In addition, Department staff also has determined that MSDE's PARCC assessments meet the new requirements for State assessments under the ESEA, as amended by ESSA. Congratulations on meeting this important ESEA requirement; assessments that produce valid and reliable results are fundamental to a State's accountability system.

Based on the recommendations from this peer review and the Department's analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

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

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

- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (PARCC): **Meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**
- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in high school (PARCC): **Meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**

MSDE also provided information regarding the Multi-State Alternate Assessments (MSAA), the alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. Feedback regarding this component of your assessment system will be presented in a subsequent letter.

Please be aware that approval of MSDE's PARCC assessments is not a determination that the system complies with Federal civil rights requirements, including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, and requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Finally, please remember that, if MSDE makes significant changes in its PARCC assessments, the State must submit information about those changes to the Department for review and approval.

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. We have found it a pleasure working with your staff on this review. Please accept my congratulations for your State's approved assessments under the ESEA. I wish you well in your continued efforts to improve student achievement in Maryland.

If you have any questions, please contact Ashley Briggs of my staff at: OSS.Maryland@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

Jason Botel
Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary,
Delegated the Authority to Perform the
Functions and Duties of the Assistant Secretary
of Elementary and Secondary Education

cc: Douglas Strader, State Assessment Director

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

August 2017 State Assessment Peer Review Notes

(Note: this submission contains evidence stemming from 2016 peer review (PARCC-State) as well as submission for a 2017 review (MSAA-State))



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 Maryland

Contents--(Note: this submission contains evidence stemming from 2016 peer review (PARCC-State) as well as submission for a 2017 review (MSAA-State)

- SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS . 4**
 - 1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students 4
 - 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)..... 9

- 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 16
 - 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 18

- SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 19**
 - 3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 19
 - 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 20
 - 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure 21
 - 3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables 22

- SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER 23**
 - 4.1 – Reliability..... 23
 - 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 24
 - 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... 25
 - 4.4 – Scoring 26
 - 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 27
 - 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment 28
 - 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance 29

- SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS 30**
 - 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 30
 - 5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 32
 - 5.3 – Accommodations..... 34
 - 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations 36

- SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 39**
 - 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students 39
 - 6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 41
 - 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 42
 - 6.4 – Reporting..... 43

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maryland

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

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>Relevant to State Adoption <u>DOCUMENT #01</u> Memorandum to the Maryland State Board of Education to request amendment of the Code of Maryland Regulations Test Administration and Data-Reporting Policies and Procedures (p. 2)</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #02</u> Maryland State Board of Education Minutes for February 24, 2015, Meeting/Adopting of the NCSC (all pages)</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #03</u> Code of Maryland Regulations for Test Administration and Data Reporting Procedures</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #04, #05, #06</u> NCSC Core Content Connectors and Essential Understandings (all pages)</p> <p>Relevant to application to all students <u>DOCUMENT #7</u> Code of Maryland Regulations for Mathematics Instructional Programs for Grade Pre-Kindergarten – 12</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #8</u> Code of Maryland Regulations for ELA Instructional Programs for Grade Pre-Kindergarten-12</p>	<p>Per MSAA Document #1 includes State Adoption of the Common Core. There is no requirement to have Common Core Connectors (CCC) whose purpose is to demonstrate the linkages between state standards and alternate achievement standards adopted by the State. However, the State submitted evidence that the Board adopted the NCSC (now the Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA)). The State noted that the CCCs are aligned to the Common Core State Standards, and therefore the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards.</p>
<p>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR 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>Relevant to Coherence and Rigor <u>DOCUMENT #04, #05, #06</u> NCSC Core Content Connectors and Essential Understandings (all pages)</p> <p>Relevant to graduation requirements <u>DOCUMENT #10</u> Memorandum to request adoption of changes to Code of Maryland Regulations 13.A.03.02, Graduation Requirements Public High Schools (p. 4)</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #11</u> Board meeting minutes approving change in Code of Maryland Regulations Language 13.A.03.02, Graduation Requirements Public High Schools May192015 (p. 6)</p>	<p>Per MSAA See above.</p>
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR 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><u>DOCUMENT #15</u> No Child Left Behind</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #16</u> ESEA Flexibility Accountability Addendum</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #03</u> Code of Maryland Regulations for Test Administration and Data Reporting Procedures</p> <p>From MD: Maryland follows the assessment and accountability requirements in No Child Left Behind. These requirements have continued through ESEA Flexibility and will continue through the Every Student Succeeds Act. Note: Alt-MSA was replaced by the NCSC.</p> <p>Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 13.03.04.01 lists the tests administered by or through the Maryland State Board of Education.</p>	<p>As a general note, all of Maryland’s materials need to be updated to reference current assessments and specific grade levels.</p> <p>Department staff noted a concern related to Maryland’s Flexibility Addendum, which states that “high school students may substitute AP or IB examinations for high school assessments.” It is not clear that the State is requiring that all high school students take one statewide assessment for federal accountability purposes. Clarification is needed regarding how and when students may substitute AP or IB for the assessment used in high school for federal accountability purposes.</p>
<p>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u> </u><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification regarding the use of one high school assessment for federal accountability purposes and the substitution of AP or IB examinations for those assessments. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR 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><u>DOCUMENT #03</u> Code of Maryland Regulations for Test Administration and Data Reporting Procedures</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #17</u> Maryland Accommodations Manual – 2012, pages 2-6</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #18</u> Maryland Guidance for Individualized Education Program (IEP) Teams on Participation Decisions for the Alternate Assessments (page 4)</p> <p>Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) requires all students to participate in statewide assessments, including students placed in a non-public school by a local school system.</p> <p>The Maryland Accommodations Manual (MAM) (issue: 2012) (a policy manual) was developed to ensure that participation in assessments is consistent in all Maryland Programs, schools, and school systems. The MAM includes guidance for ELs that are in their first year of enrollment in a U.S. school.</p> <p>By nature, the NCSC/MSAA test is only administered to students who already have been found eligible for Special Education services, regardless of their English Learner (EL) status. Participation criteria for Maryland are outlined in the MSDE Department of Special Education / Early Intervention Services’ <u>Maryland Guidance for Individualized Education (IEP) Teams on</u></p>	<p>MD communicates clearly and consistently that all students must be included in assessment system, including SWDs and ELs in Accommodations Manual and Guidance. These are generally very thorough regarding participation in MSAA. The MAM describes exemption from ELA for first year EL students.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR 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><u>Participation Decisions for the Alternate Assessments</u> (July 2016). This document is a required attachment for all Maryland IEPs. Specifically, page 4 addresses considerations for participation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IEP information including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considerations for students who may be learning English as a second or other language (i.e., English Language Learners) that may interfere with an accurate assessment of his or her academic, social, or adaptive abilities. <p>Additionally, on page 4, the guidance includes the following cautionary information regarding criteria that are <u>not</u> appropriate to consider during the decision making process...</p> <p>English Language Learner (ELL) Status</p>	
Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR 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>1.5 – 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><u>DOCUMENT #19</u> Official PARCC Participation Memo</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #20</u> Participation Memo</p>	<p>The PARCC participation memo explains how to calculate part rate for PARCC, including “attemptedness rule”. However, there is an inconsistency in the definition of a participant. In #19, participation is defined as answering one question for every unit of test minus one (this appears to be a change from the previous year). Document #20 defines a participant answering one question on the assessment.</p>
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/>_x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification regarding the State’s definition of attemptedness and participation. 		

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

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>Consortium submission reviewed separately. See Consortium submission.</p>	<p>Per MSAA See Consortium submission peer review findings.</p>
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement—See MSAA peer review notes (2016 and 2017)</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 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>Consortium submission reviewed separately. See Consortium submission.</p>	<p>Per MSAA See Consortium submission peer review findings.</p>
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement—See MSAA peer review notes (2016)</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 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><u>DOCUMENT #21</u> Maryland Specific Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA) Policies</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #22</u> MSAA Spring 2017 Testing Coordinator’s Training PowerPoint (all pages)</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #23</u> Training Sign in Sheets for MSAA Spring 2017 Testing Coordinator’s Training</p> <p>Other relevant evidence <u>DOCUMENT #29</u> Certification of Training Form</p>	<p>Per MSAA</p> <p>Policies and Standardized Procedures Document #21 policies and #22 training</p> <p>Training Document #22 test coordinator training provides good evidence of thorough training which is accompanied by individual accountability in the required quiz for test administrators. Why don’t Test Coordinators have to take and pass the quiz? (Document 22 page 16)</p> <p>Document #23 verification of test coordinator training.</p> <p>Document #22 page 15 lists six training modules that Test Administrators are required to complete prior to passing a quiz.</p> <p>Technology requirements and contingency plans: Document #22 test coordinator training includes technology info. It is unclear to the peer reviewers why Test Coordinators do not have to take and pass the quiz since they are responsible to “ensure that technology capacity is met.”</p>
<p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement (See also MSAA peer review notes 2016 and 2017)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <u>X</u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR 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><u>DOCUMENT #24</u> Local Accountability Coordinators’ Guide to Test Security</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #25</u> Testing Incident Report Form</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #26</u> Monitoring Training PowerPoint</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #27</u> Observation Form</p> <p>Maryland’s Escalation Protocol:</p> <p>Maryland has in place procedures for breach identification, investigation, consequences, remediation, and personnel action. Procedures are outlined within the “Local Accountability Coordinators’ Guide to Test Security” which is disseminated to LEAs.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maryland has a designated State Test Security Officer (STSO) who is included on the alerts sent via e-mail from the testing vendor. 2. When the STSO receives a security breach alert, the STSO reviews the alert to determine whether State action is warranted. For example, a student posted an item to a Twitter account. 3. If State action is warranted, the STSO contacts the LEA to work with the school and student in question to address the alert. 4. The LEA submits a Testing Incident Report Form 	<p>Maryland provided guidance, a training PowerPoint, incident report form, and observation form. Maryland seems to have a rigorous monitoring process for test administration. However, Maryland notes that monitors may choose the schools that are monitored. It is not clear that Maryland has a process for selecting which schools and students are monitored that ensures that the administration of the alternate assessment (MSAA) is monitored sufficiently.</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 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>(TIRF) to the STSO documenting their investigation into the incident and the resolution.</p> <p>5. The STSO receives all TIRFs received along with the State Test Administration and Security Committee (STASC) to determine whether the LEA appropriately resolved the incident and whether further action such as score invalidation and/or personnel action is warranted. (The STASC is comprised of the STSO, Assistant State Superintendent, Section Chief for Assessment, and legal counsel from the Office of the Attorney General.)</p> <p>Maryland On-site Visits & Monitoring During Testing:</p> <p>Maryland conducts random observations of testing at schools across the state to monitor testing anomalies. Maryland’s Assessment Branch coordinates the training and scheduling of all personnel who participate in monitoring. The purpose of monitoring is to observe testing to ensure that standardized testing procedures are followed and to obtain feedback for improvement of future testing.</p> <p>All Maryland personnel participating in monitoring must complete a training facilitated by MSDE’s State Test Security Officer. The training addresses what Monitors should do before, during, and after observations, procedures for scheduling observations and for visiting the schools, and what to look for during an observation.</p> <p>During training, Monitors receive a list of schools</p>	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR 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>from which they may select the school(s) they will monitor. The list is compiled from schools with reported test security violations from the previous year and includes schools from each of Maryland’s 24 school districts as well as non-public schools. When monitoring, Monitors use an “Observation Form” to make notes on the following areas: testing environment, distribution of materials, reading of scripted directions, questions asked by students, use of test materials, timing, collection of materials, test security, accommodations, content-specific comments, and general comments.</p> <p>Within two days of making an observation, Monitors must complete an electronic version of the “Observation Form” and e-mail it to the Project Manager for the assessment as well as to the State Test Security Officer. All forms are reviewed to determine whether there are any test security matters that must be addressed and to note any concerns regarding the administration such as problems with materials, timing, etc.</p>	
Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
<p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See evidence requested in 5.4 for evidence that the State monitors the administration of the MSAA to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. 		

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

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><u>DOCUMENT #28</u> COMAR 13A.03.04</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #29</u> Certification of Training Form</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #30</u> Test Security Training PowerPoint for LACs and STCs</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #31</u> Procedures for Conducting a Test Security Investigation</p> <p>Other relevant evidence: <u>DOCUMENT #22</u> MSAA Spring 2017 Testing Coordinator’s Training PowerPoint (pp.46-48)</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #25</u> Testing Incident Report Form</p>	<p>Per MSAA</p> <p>Preventions Document #28 Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 13A.03.04.03 policy describes prevention strategies to maximize test security by local school systems.</p> <p>COMAR 13A.03.04.04 designates responsibility for test security at the local level.</p> <p>COMAR 13A.03.04.05 describes test behavior violations and COMAR 13A.03.04.04.06 describes data collection and reporting violations.</p> <p>COMAR 13A.03.04.04.07 describes sanctions for violation of test security policies.</p> <p>Document #29, Certification of Training Form describes test coordinator and test administrator responsibilities for maintaining test security.</p> <p>Document #30, the Test Security PowerPoint covers in detail the test security policies and procedures, including a description of test irregularity detection and investigation procedures, possible sanctions, and remediation options.</p> <p>Document #22, Test Coordinator’s Training PowerPoint, also includes descriptions of test security policies and procedures.</p> <p><u>Detection:</u></p> <p>Detection procedures to be conducted by the vendor and the local school systems are described in the</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maryland

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>above documents.</p> <p><u>Remediation:</u></p> <p>Possible remediation options are described in Document #30. Sanctions are described both in policy in Document #28 and in training in Document #30.</p> <p><u>Investigation:</u></p> <p>Document #28 mandates local school system investigations. Document #30 describes how LEAs will conduct investigations and report findings. This document also describes vendor investigation procedures. Document #31 describes local and state investigation procedures.</p>
Section 2.5 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required.		

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

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><u>DOCUMENT #32</u> Security Policy</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #33</u> Privacy Page</p> <p>Other relevant evidence: <u>Documents from 2.5 should be referenced here particularly as it relates to protecting the integrity of test materials and related to test administration.</u></p>	<p>Per MSAA</p> <p>Protect integrity in test development Information about measures to protect the integrity of materials and data during test development should be described in MSAA review documents.</p> <p>Protect integrity of test materials in test administration See 2.5</p> <p>Protect integrity in storage and use of results Document #32 mainly addresses technology.</p> <p>Security of student-level data Document #32 Page 8 does not list student records as covered under Personally Identifiable Information (PII)</p> <p>Per Data Privacy: Document #33 is the privacy page for on-line uses of the Maryland site.</p> <p>Evidence failed to address the sensitive nature of student test records and that State guidance provided no specific references to testing data or information.</p>
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State is protecting student data regarding score reports and defining minimum # size. • Evidence that test records and results are maintained securely. 		

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

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>Consortium submission reviewed separately. See Consortium submission.</p>	<p>Per MSAA See Consortium submission peer review findings.</p>
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement—See MSAA peer review notes (2016 and 2017)</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 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>Consortium submission reviewed separately. See Consortium submission.</p>	<p>Per MSAA See Consortium submission peer review findings.</p>
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement—See MSAA peer review notes (2016 and 2017)</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 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>Consortium submission reviewed separately. See Consortium submission.</p>	<p>Per MSAA See Consortium submission peer review findings.</p>
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement—See MSAA peer review notes (2016 and 2017)</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 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>Consortium submission reviewed separately. See Consortium submission.</p>	<p>Per MSAA See Consortium submission peer review findings.</p>
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement—See MSAA peer review notes (2016 and 2017)</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 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>Consortium submission reviewed separately. See Consortium submission.</p>	<p>Per MSAA See Consortium submission peer review findings.</p>
<p>Section 4.1 Summary Statement—See MSAA peer review notes (2016 and 2017)</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 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>Consortium submission reviewed separately. See Consortium submission.</p>	<p>Per MSAA See Consortium submission peer review findings.</p>
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement—See MSAA peer review notes (2016)</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 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>Consortium submission reviewed separately. See Consortium submission.</p>	<p>Per MSAA See Consortium submission peer review findings.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement—See MSAA notes (2016 and 2017)</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 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>Consortium submission reviewed separately. See Consortium submission.</p>	<p>Per MSAA See Consortium submission peer review findings.</p>
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement—See MSAA peer review notes (2016 and 2017)</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 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>Consortium submission reviewed separately. See Consortium submission.</p>	<p>Per MSAA See Consortium submission peer review findings.</p>
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement—See MSAA peer review notes (2016)</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 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>Consortium submission reviewed separately. See Consortium submission.</p>	<p>Per MSAA See Consortium submission peer review findings.</p>
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement—See MSAA peer review notes (2016 and 2017)</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 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>Consortium submission reviewed separately. See Consortium submission.</p>	<p>Per MSAA See Consortium submission peer review findings.</p>
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement—See MSAA peer review notes (2016 and 2017)</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 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 	<p><u>DOCUMENT #34</u> Maryland’s Differences Among Assessments chart for Students Receiving Special Education Services</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #35</u> COMAR: Free and Appropriate Public Education: Individualized Education Document 13.A.05.01.09</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #18</u> Maryland Guidance for Individualized Education Program (IEP) Teams on Participation Decisions for the Alternate Assessments (all pages)</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #36</u> Professional Development PowerPoint – Maryland Guidance for Individualized Education Programs (IEP) Teams on Participation Decisions for the Alternate Assessments</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #22</u> MSAA Spring 2017 Testing Coordinator’s Training PowerPoint (pp. 15, 34-40)</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #23</u> Training Sign in Sheets from Spring 2017 Testing Coordinator’s Training</p> <p>Other relevant evidence: <u>DOCUMENT #17</u> Maryland Accommodations Manual</p>	<p>Per MSAA Documents 17 and 34 should be updated.</p> <p>Differences in assessments and resulting instruction: Document #34 describes assessments available, who determines participation, and differences among the assessments.</p> <p>Decisions by IEP Team: Document #35 contains policies directing IEP development and determination of which assessments students will take and accommodations they will receive.</p> <p>Document #18 describes in detail how participation in MSAA is to be determined by the IEP team. This document may require updating to reflect the new name of the assessment as MSAA.</p> <p>Document #36 is the training IEP teams receive per the decision-making guidelines.</p> <p>Guidelines for participation in MSAA: Document #18 Appendix A guides the IEP team through the decision-making guidelines. Appendix B includes a flowchart for determining whether a student will participate in the MSAA or the PARCC general assessment. Document #36 is the training provided on these guidelines.</p> <p>Document #17 provides direction to IEP teams on how to select appropriate accommodations for students and describes those accommodations. This document requires some updating to remove</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 Maryland

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>disabilities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA; • Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments); • The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum. 		<p>references to Modified Assessments which are no longer allowed.</p> <p>Document #22 pp. 12-13 reviews participation guidelines for students with disabilities and p.14 for English language students.</p> <p>Information on Accessibility Tools and Features: Document #22 provides specific information about accessibility tools and features.</p> <p>Guidance on selection of appropriate accommodations: Document #17 contains explicit instructions on different families of accommodations, the types of students who might benefit from them, and accommodations conditions (e.g., Section 5 Accommodations Fact Sheets, p. 5-1)</p> <p>Information to parents on consequences of MSAA participation: Document #18 p. 12 includes a statement of understanding to be signed by parents regarding consequences of MSAA participation.</p> <p>Promotion of access to general curriculum: Document #18 p. 7 question 7 indicates that students taking the MSAA are receiving instruction only in the AALDs, not the general standards and are therefore not eligible for the regular diploma, but notes that the student is to be continual reassessed to determine eligibility to take the general assessment and earn a regular diploma.</p>
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

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><u>DOCUMENT #18</u> Maryland Guidance for Individualized Education Program (IEP) Teams on Participation Decisions for the Alternate Assessments (all pages)</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #36</u> Professional Development PowerPoint – Maryland Guidance for Individualized Education Programs (IEP) Teams on Participation Decisions for the Alternate Assessments</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #22</u> MSAA Spring 2017 Testing Coordinator’s Training PowerPoint (pp. 15, 34-40)</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #23</u> Training Sign in Sheets from Spring 2017 Testing Coordinator’s Training</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #17</u> Maryland Accommodations Manual – 2012, (Sections 7-9)</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #17</u> Maryland Accommodations Manual – 2012, Appendix E: Unique Accommodations Request Form for State Assessments for Students with an EL Plan</p> <p>Other relevant evidence: Document #22 pp. 14 reviews participation guidelines for English learners.</p>	<p>Per MSAA Procedures for determining EL accommodation use: Document #18 page 4 of the document describes considerations the IEP must make including ELs participation in MSAA.</p> <p>Document #36 page 14 #8 provides guidance to IEP Teams regarding EL status impact on considerations for participation in the MSAA.</p> <p>Information on accessibility tools and features for EL: Document #22 provides specific information about accessibility tools and features.</p> <p>Guidance for selection of EL accommodations: Document #17 Section 7 describes accommodating EL based on their EL plan.</p> <p>Document #17 allows for the request for a unique accommodation for an EL based on the student’s educational plan. Appendix E is the form that must be submitted to make the request. Appendix H lists EL accommodations for the Maryland Content Assessments. It is unclear whether all descriptions of accommodations in Document #17 apply to MSAA. This document requires updates.</p> <p>What are MSAA rules for delivery of human read-alouds in native language for ELs who cannot access the test in English using the embedded accessibility tools and features?</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 Maryland

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 5.2 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify whether read-aloud in their native language is available to ELs who are assigned to the MSAA who cannot access the test in English using the embedded accessibility tools, and how translators are trained to standardize test administration. 		

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

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><u>DOCUMENT #22</u> MSAA Spring 2017 Testing Coordinator’s Training PowerPoint (pp. 15, 34-40)</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #23</u> Training Sign in Sheets from Spring 2017 Testing Coordinator’s Training</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #37</u> MSAA/NCSC Test Administrator Manual (pp. 20-24)</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #17</u> Maryland Accommodations Manual – 2012, (pp. 2-3)</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #17</u> Maryland Accommodations Manual – Appendix D: Unique Accommodations Request Form for State Assessments for Students with an IEP or 504 Plan</p>	<p>Per MSAA</p> <p>Available accommodations: Document #17 describes Maryland policies and procedures regarding who must be accommodated and how accommodations are to be provided. Document #37 pp. 20-23 describe accessibility tools and features available on the MSAA, many of which have been traditionally thought of as accommodations. These are now available to all students taking the test. In addition, Document #37 p. 24 describes accommodations not embedded in the assessment. Appendices A, B and C provide protocols for the administration of these accommodations.</p> <p>EL accommodations: Document #17 allows for the request for a unique accommodation for an EL based on the student’s educational plan. Appendix E is the form that must be submitted to make the request. Appendix H lists EL accommodations for the Maryland Content Assessments. It is unclear whether all descriptions of accommodations in Document #17 apply to MSAA. This document requires updates.</p> <p>Appropriate and effective: Document #17 describes the policy that Maryland intends to provide accommodations that are appropriate (p. 2-4) and do not alter the construct (p. 2-2).</p> <p>Peers were unable to locate evidence of studies examining appropriateness and effectiveness of accommodations.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maryland

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>Do not alter construct: Document #17 describes policy that Maryland intends to provide accommodations that are appropriate (p. 2-4) and do not alter the construct (p. 2-2).</p> <p>Peers were unable to locate evidence of studies concerning whether accommodations alter the construct being measured.</p> <p>Comparability of scores between accommodated and non-accommodated scores: Peers were unable to locate evidence of studies examining comparability of accommodated and non-accommodated scores.</p> <p>Exceptional request: Document #17 allows for the request for a unique accommodation based on the student's IEP. Appendix D is the form that must be submitted to make the request.</p>
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan and timeline for studying the effectiveness of MSAA accommodations, adherence to construct, and comparability of accommodated and non-accommodated scores. 		

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

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><u>MD Specific PARCC DOCUMENT #5.4a</u> PARCC SR/PNP</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #5.4b</u> PARCC Spring 2016 Accommodated Form Usage - State Report - MD</p> <p>Other relevant evidence <u>DOCUMENT #26</u> Monitoring Training PowerPoint</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #27</u> Observation Form</p> <p><u>MSAA DOCUMENT #26</u> Monitoring Training PowerPoint</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #27</u> Observation Form</p> <p>Other relevant evidence <u>DOCUMENT #17</u> Maryland Accommodations Manual – 2012, (pp. 2-2 and 2-3) and Tool SWD 5</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #37</u> Test Administration Manual</p>	<p>Per Maryland PARCC Document # 5.4a is the manual for test administrators to enter student registration and personal needs profile information entered prior to test administration. Document #5.4b is a report provided to the State of the number of students receiving each type of accessibility feature and accommodation available on the on-line platform during testing.</p> <p>Peers recommend that Maryland use a stratified random sampling method to select monitoring sites to insure representation of those taking the PARCC with accommodations.</p> <p>Per Maryland PARCC and MSAA</p> <p>Receive accommodations consistent with policies: Document #26 is training for those conducting monitoring observations of testing and the provision of accommodations per the IEP. Document #27 is the observation form used for monitoring. Document #37 page 25 contains more guidance for monitoring the MSAA.</p> <p>Consistent with instruction: Document #17 page 2-2 and 2-3 describes Maryland policy that students receive test accommodations that are the same as those used during instruction.</p> <p>Consistent with IEP: Document #17 SWD 5 is a tool that test administrators use to document what accommodations students received immediately</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 Maryland

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>following testing. It is not clear to what extent this document is used for monitoring administration of test accommodations.</p> <p>Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures: Document #26 describes training and Document #27 provides a form for observations of test administration to ensure fidelity of test administration.</p> <p>Document #37 pages 6 and 37 describe before testing administration requirements to complete a Learner Characteristics Inventory (LCI). It is not clear whether the LCI is monitored to determine match with individual student IEPs. This tool may have potential for use in broadening the systematic data collection for monitoring purposes that is described here.</p> <p>Document #37 page 38 describes after test administration requirements to enter what accommodations students actually used during the test administration. It is not clear whether and where these data are submitted. This information could offer a means of broadening data collection for monitoring. However, its use if any is not described here.</p> <p>Peers recommend that Maryland use a stratified random sampling method to select monitoring sites to insure representation of those taking the MSAA.</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 Maryland

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>Additional Evidence Requested for PARCC/State, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: “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”</p>		
<p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A plan and timeline for implementing a strategy to ensure that on-site observations include students taking the PARCC with and without accommodations and students taking the MSAA with and without accommodations every year. 		

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

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><u>Maryland PARCC DOCUMENT #6.1a</u> PARCC Performance Level Setting Memo</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #6.1b</u> PARCC Performance Level Setting</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #6.1c</u> State_BOE_Pres_20150922</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #6.1d</u> MD_State_Specific-6.1d State_BOE_Pres_20150922_Cover_Letter_PARCC_PL_Setting</p> <p><u>MSAA DOCUMENT #01</u> Memorandum to the Maryland State Board of Education to request amendment of the Code of Maryland Regulations Test Administration and Data-Reporting Policies and Procedures (p. 2)</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #02</u> Maryland State Board of Education Minutes for February 25, 2015, Meeting/Adopting of the NCSC (all pages)</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #03</u> Code of Maryland Regulations for Test Administration and Data Reporting Procedures</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #04, #05, #06</u> NCSC Core Content Connectors and Essential Understandings (all pages)</p>	<p>Per Maryland PARCC Document #6.1a and #6.1d are Memos to the State Board concerning the PARCC performance levels and standard setting. Document #6.1d also states that “Because PARCC is the joint work of a consortium of states, policy decisions are made collectively by a Governing Board made up of the heads of participating state education agencies.” Document #6.1b is a presentation to the Board describing how PARCC standard setting was conducted.</p> <p>Document #6.1c is a presentation to the Board describing outcomes of the PARCC standard setting. Slide 19 indicates that the Board adopted the performance levels and reporting results.</p> <p>Per MSAA Documents #1, 2, and 3 provide information about State Board consideration and approval of the changing from the Alt-MSA to the MSAA.</p> <p>Document #39 is a presentation on reporting and performance levels. Examples of 3rd grade descriptors are included.</p> <p>Peers recognize the Board Minutes approving adoption of the NCSC Alternate Assessment (now the MSAA) as approval of the intact assessment including alternate achievement standards set by the Consortium and note the presentation of performance levels and sample descriptors.</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 Maryland

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Other relevant evidence <u>DOCUMENT #39</u> Performance Level Descriptors NCSC_MSAА	
Section 6.1 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR 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>State notes that this CE is documented under the NCSC Consortium submission.</p>	<p>See Consortium review</p>
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement – See MSAA peer review notes (2016)</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 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>State notes that this CE is documented under the NCSC Consortium submission.</p>	<p>See Consortium submission peer review findings.</p>
<p>Section 6.3 Summary Statement – See MSAA peer review notes (2016)</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 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 	<p><u>Maryland PARCC DOCUMENT #6.4a</u> Accessing and Utilizing PARCC Reports power point presentation (pages: 3-11 and 14-15)</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #6.4b</u> PARCC Participation Memo</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #6.4c</u> PARCC Participation Report</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #6.4d</u> http://reportcard.msde.maryland.gov/participation/PARCC/2015_99AAAAA.pdf</p> <p><u>MSAA DOCUMENT #38</u> Code of Maryland Regulations – Reporting</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #39</u> Performance Level Descriptors Training PowerPoint</p> <p><u>DOCUMENT #40</u> Email notification of Reporting Window</p>	<p>Per Maryland PARCC</p> <p>Classroom level reports: Document 6.4a is training for accessing reports and 6.4d is a link that allows users to sort data down to the item level.</p> <p>Itemized reports: State described the process by which LEAs are provided information to access the Data Management and Reporting System (DMRS) which contains classroom and item level data.</p> <p>Participation rates: Document 6.4c is participation report from PARCC for the State.</p> <p>Per MSAA</p> <p>Reporting by proficiency level: Document #38 is policy requiring annual reporting. Document #39 shows reporting of student achievement by proficiency level</p> <p>Percent not tested: Document #39 slides 2,3,4,6 and 22 show summary reports that include number tested and not tested.</p> <p>Interpretive guides: Peers could not find interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of assessment results.</p> <p>Itemized score analyses: Valid interpretations may not be possible given a small number of items and small <i>n</i> sizes.</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 Maryland

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>academic needs of students;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand; • The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. 		<p>Individual reports: Document #38 is policy requiring annual reporting of individual scores.</p>
<p>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of MSAA assessment results. 		

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

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

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

(follow up on evidence requested from 2016 Peer Review)



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

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

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

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

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS	3
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	3
2.2 – Item Development.....	4
SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....	5
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	5
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	6
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	7
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	8
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....	9
6.4 – Reporting.....	10

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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><i>State-specific evidence. Individual states will respond as necessary.</i></p>	<p>The PARCC assessment does not currently assess speaking and listening. While it is the case that States currently have waivers, there is no assurance that the Department will continue to grant waivers for speaking and listening.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: “Evidence that the assessment design measures the full breadth and depth of the State’s academic content standards, including the speaking and listening aspect of the standards.” NOTE—States must individually request a waiver from the requirement of testing the speaking and listening standards.</p>		
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a plan and timeline for addressing the speaking and listening aspect of the standards such that appropriate assessments will be available to the PARCC States when their waivers expire. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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>Document 2.2_PARCC Item Review Committees_9 4 12</p> <p>lists available information about PARCC’s initial groups of item reviewers, including self-reported job title, organization, years of teaching experience, experience with special populations of students, geographic settings, and reviewer demographic information.</p>	<p>Document 2.2 provided evidence of representation on Item Review Committees.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: “Information about the composition and credentials of content and bias/sensitivity reviewers for the PARCC assessment. Specifically, information about the subject area specialization of content and bias/sensitivity reviewers on this panel (grade level, general or special education specialization, English learner (EL) specialization).”</p>		
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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>HumRRO, <u>Evaluating the Quality and Alignment of PARCC ELA/Literacy and Mathematics Assessments: Grades 3,4,6, and 7</u></p>	<p>The alignment study report notes that Speaking and Listening were not considered in the findings for ELA alignment. See 2.1.</p> <p>Per Recommendations on pages 28-30, PARCC needs a plan for addressing the recommendations resulting from the HumRRO alignment study. However, the report provided to the peers appears to have limited usefulness for improving the assessment. Peers are uncertain why the information is not provided in more detail. For example, item alignment to each standard rather than domain or cluster may be more helpful for developing plans for improving the assessment. PARCC may need to ask the contractors to provide more explicit findings.</p> <p>Peers were unable to find specific information regarding the composition and expertise of the 19 alignment study panel members.</p> <p>Will the PARCC program seek advice from the PARCC Technical Advisory Committee related to the study?</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: “Additional alignment evidence that addresses all remaining grades (grades 3, 4, 6, and 7) in both content areas, and Alignment evidence that supports a test design that assesses the full range of the State’s academic content standards, including speaking and listening, is needed for all tested grades.”</p>		
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p> <p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As the plan for speaking and listening is developed, ensure that independent alignment studies will be completed. • Plan and timeline for how PARCC will address the alignment study recommendations for improving the assessments. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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>Documents 4.3.1, 4.3.2, and 4.3.3 include scale score cumulative frequency distributions for each assessment administered in spring 2015, fall 2015, and spring 2016.</p>	<p>Peers appreciate the cumulative distribution of scale scores to numbers of students. The omission of raw scores is noted.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: “Cumulative frequency distributions across raw score/scale scores, that include the number and percent of students scored at each raw/scale score point.”</p>		
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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>Document 4.6_PARCC Mode and Device Comparability Study Plan outlines PARCC’s plans to study mode and device comparability in spring 2017.</p>	<p>The Table of PARCC Research Studies 2016 on page 15 show dates in the past. What additional milestones and timelines have been added since November 2016?</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: “A plan and timeline for the State/PARCC to continue studying the issue of mode comparability.”</p>		
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p> <p><u> </u>X<u> </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An updated timeline and milestones and any completed study reports to document adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results among modes and devices. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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>Document 6.2.1 PARCC Standard Setting Panels includes available information about standard setting panelists, including self-reported job title, organization, years of teaching experience, experience with special populations of students, geographic settings, and reviewer demographic information.</p> <p>Document 6.2.2 PARCC Standard Setting Panel Summary Information includes summary information of the self-reported information contained in Document 6.2.1.</p>	<p>Documents 6.2.1 and 6.2.2 provide evidence the standard-setting panels included members experienced in the areas of special education and EL.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: “Additional detailed information about areas of educational specialization for members of each achievement standards-setting panel, especially the specialty areas of special education and ELs.”</p>		
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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><i>State-specific evidence. Individual states will respond as necessary.</i></p>	<p>PARCC produces item level data that are available to the States. However, States produce the reports.</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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. 		
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: “Evidence that MSDE and PARCC provide reports that enable itemized score analyses to local educational agencies and schools”</p>		
<p>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		