



## 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

May 4, 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 February 2018, 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 meet most, but not all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of section 1111(b)(1) and (3) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and our own analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

- Alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) for grades 3-8 and high school in reading/language arts and mathematics (Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA)). **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB.**

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.*

In addition to the MSAA assessment, MSDE also provided documentation related to the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers, a reading/language arts and mathematics general assessment in grades 3-8. Feedback was provided on this submission in a letter dated January 11, 2018.

**Substantially meets requirements** means that these components meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required.

The specific list of items required for MSDE to submit is enclosed with this letter. MSDE must submit a plan and timeline within 30 days for when it will submit all required additional documentation for peer review. The Department will also host progress calls with the State to discuss the State's progress on its timeline. If, following the peer review of the additional evidence, adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action.

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

Please note that the assessment requirements for ESEA, as amended by the NCLB, were in effect through the end of the 2016-2017 school year. The MSDE peer review was conducted under the requirements of this statute. Beginning in the 2017-2018 school year, the assessment requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA will apply to State assessments.

Given that this review began under the requirements of the ESEA as amended by the NCLB, it is important to indicate that while the MSAA assessment substantially meets most of the peer review guidance criteria under the NCLB, the State is still responsible to ensure that these assessments also comply with the requirements of the ESSA. Department staff have carefully reviewed MSDE evidence and peer review recommendations in light of the updated requirements for State assessments under the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. As a result of this additional review, I have determined that the MSDE must also provide evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards (AAAS) ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. This requirement is noted under Critical Element 6.3 in the enclosed list of items.

Thank you for your ongoing commitment to improving educational outcomes for all students. I look forward to our continued partnership as we move ahead with this critical work. I appreciate the work you are doing to improve your schools and provide a high-quality education for your students.

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Additional Evidence Needed</b>
<p><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p>	<p>For the Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that State established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the MSAA assessments that include evidence of a policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration in writing (including the assessment delivery devices, accessibility tools and features available for students, and item formats) prior to testing.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</b></p>	<p>For the MSAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that test records and results are maintained securely.</li> </ul>
<p><b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b></p>	<p>For the MSAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that item response theory (IRT) assumptions of test unidimensionality are met.</li> </ul>
<p><b>4.1 – Reliability</b></p>	<p>For the MSAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the reading/language arts tests (with operational constructed response writing items) demonstrate appropriate reliability.</li> </ul>
<p><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></p>	<p>For the MSAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols designed to produce reliable results and facilitate score interpretations for constructed-response items in reading/language arts that include operational writing items. Specifically:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Adequate procedures and criteria for ensuring and documenting inter-rater reliability;</li> <li>○ Clear scoring rubrics, comprehensive instructions for raters, adequate training of raters, and evaluation of inter-rater reliability.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards (additional requirement under section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA</b></p>	<p>For the MSAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act. The Maryland State Department of Education should provide this evidence by December 15, 2020.</li> </ul>

# 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><b>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</b></p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State.</p>	<p><b>Relevant to State Adoption</b>  <u><b>DOCUMENT #01</b></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><b>DOCUMENT #02</b></u>                      Maryland State Board of Education Minutes for February 24, 2015, Meeting/Adopting of the NCSC (all pages)</p> <p><u><b>DOCUMENT #03</b></u>                      Code of Maryland Regulations for Test Administration and Data Reporting Procedures</p> <p><u><b>DOCUMENT #04, #05, #06</b></u>                      NCSC Core Content Connectors and Essential Understandings (all pages)</p> <p><b>Relevant to application to all students</b>  <u><b>DOCUMENT #7</b></u>                      Code of Maryland Regulations for Mathematics Instructional Programs for Grade Pre-Kindergarten – 12</p> <p><u><b>DOCUMENT #8</b></u>                      Code of Maryland Regulations for ELA Instructional Programs for Grade Pre-Kindergarten-12</p>	<p><b>Per MSAA</b>                      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><b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maryland**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</b></p> <p>The State’s academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science specify what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school to succeed in college and the workforce; contain content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.</p>	<p><b>Relevant to Coherence and Rigor</b>  <u><b>DOCUMENT #04, #05, #06</b></u>                      NCSC Core Content Connectors and Essential Understandings (all pages)</p> <p><b>Relevant to graduation requirements</b>  <u><b>DOCUMENT #10</b></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><b>DOCUMENT #11</b></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><b>Per MSAA</b>                      See above.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maryland**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p><b>1.3 – Required Assessments</b></p> <p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments (based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate academic achievement standards-AAAS) in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12);</li> <li>• Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12).</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>DOCUMENT #15</u></b> No Child Left Behind</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #16</u></b> ESEA Flexibility Accountability Addendum</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #03</u></b> 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><b>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarification regarding the use of one high school assessment for federal accountability purposes and the substitution of AP or IB examinations for those assessments.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maryland**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p><b>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</b></p> <p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system;</li> <li>• For English learners (EL):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment;</li> <li>○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b><u>DOCUMENT #03</u></b> Code of Maryland Regulations for Test Administration and Data Reporting Procedures</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #17</u></b> Maryland Accommodations Manual – 2012, pages 2-6</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #18</u></b> 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**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
	<p><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"> <li>• IEP information including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <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>	
<b>Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>		
<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><b>1.5 – Participation Data</b></p> <p>The State’s participation data show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system. In addition, if the State administers end-of-course assessments for high school students, the State has procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates on each required assessment and provides the corresponding data.</p>	<p><u><b>DOCUMENT #19</b></u> Official PARCC Participation Memo</p> <p><u><b>DOCUMENT #20</b></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><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/>_x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarification regarding the State’s definition of attemptedness and participation.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maryland**

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results;</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills);</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.</li> </ul>	<p>Consortium submission reviewed separately. See Consortium submission.</p>	<p><b>Per MSAA</b> See Consortium submission peer review findings.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement—See MSAA peer review notes (2016 and 2017)</b></p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maryland**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.2 – Item Development</b></p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p>Consortium submission reviewed separately. See Consortium submission.</p>	<p><b>Per MSAA</b> See Consortium submission peer review findings.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement—See MSAA peer review notes (2016)</b></p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maryland

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>• Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments;</li> <li>• If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>DOCUMENT #21</u></b> Maryland Specific Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA) Policies</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #22</u></b> MSAA Spring 2017 Testing Coordinator’s Training PowerPoint (all pages)</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #23</u></b> Training Sign in Sheets for MSAA Spring 2017 Testing Coordinator’s Training</p> <p>Other relevant evidence <b><u>DOCUMENT #29</u></b> Certification of Training Form</p>	<p><b>Per MSAA</b></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><b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement (See also MSAA peer review notes 2016 and 2017)</b></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**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p><b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p><b><u>DOCUMENT #24</u></b> Local Accountability Coordinators’ Guide to Test Security</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #25</u></b> Testing Incident Report Form</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #26</u></b> Monitoring Training PowerPoint</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #27</u></b> Observation Form</p> <p><b>Maryland’s Escalation Protocol:</b></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"> <li>1. Maryland has a designated State Test Security Officer (STSO) who is included on the alerts sent via e-mail from the testing vendor.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>3. If State action is warranted, the STSO contacts the LEA to work with the school and student in question to address the alert.</li> <li>4. The LEA submits a Testing Incident Report Form</li> </ol>	<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><b>Maryland On-site Visits &amp; Monitoring During Testing:</b></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**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
	<p>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>	
<b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maryland**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.5 – Test Security</b></p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>DOCUMENT #28</u></b> COMAR 13A.03.04</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #29</u></b> Certification of Training Form</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #30</u></b> Test Security Training PowerPoint for LACs and STCs</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #31</u></b> Procedures for Conducting a Test Security Investigation</p> <p>Other relevant evidence: <b><u>DOCUMENT #22</u></b> MSAA Spring 2017 Testing Coordinator’s Training PowerPoint (pp.46-48)</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #25</u></b> Testing Incident Report Form</p>	<p><b>Per MSAA</b></p> <p><b>Preventions</b> 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><b><u>Detection:</u></b></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><b><u>Remediation:</u></b></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><b><u>Investigation:</u></b></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>
<p><b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maryland

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</b></p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results;</li> <li>• To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> <li>• To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>DOCUMENT #32</u></b> Security Policy</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #33</u></b> Privacy Page</p> <p>Other relevant evidence: <b><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></b></p>	<p><b>Per MSAA</b></p> <p><b>Protect integrity in test development</b> Information about measures to protect the integrity of materials and data during test development should be described in MSAA review documents.</p> <p><b>Protect integrity of test materials in test administration</b> See 2.5</p> <p><b>Protect integrity in storage and use of results</b> Document #32 mainly addresses technology.</p> <p><b>Security of student-level data</b> <b>Document #32</b> 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><b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State is protecting student data regarding score reports and defining minimum # size.</li> <li>• Evidence that test records and results are maintained securely.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR 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><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> <li>• If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul>	<p>Consortium submission reviewed separately. See Consortium submission.</p>	<p><b>Per MSAA</b> See Consortium submission peer review findings.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement—See MSAA peer review notes (2016 and 2017)</b></p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maryland**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>Consortium submission reviewed separately. See Consortium submission.</p>	<p><b>Per MSAA</b> See Consortium submission peer review findings.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement—See MSAA peer review notes (2016 and 2017)</b></p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maryland**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p>Consortium submission reviewed separately. See Consortium submission.</p>	<p><b>Per MSAA</b> See Consortium submission peer review findings.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement—See MSAA peer review notes (2016 and 2017)</b></p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maryland**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>Consortium submission reviewed separately. See Consortium submission.</p>	<p><b>Per MSAA</b> See Consortium submission peer review findings.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement—See MSAA peer review notes (2016 and 2017)</b></p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maryland**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>4.1 – Reliability</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement.</li> </ul>	<p>Consortium submission reviewed separately. See Consortium submission.</p>	<p><b>Per MSAA</b> See Consortium submission peer review findings.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement—See MSAA peer review notes (2016 and 2017)</b></p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maryland**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</b></p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<p>Consortium submission reviewed separately. See Consortium submission.</p>	<p><b>Per MSAA</b> See Consortium submission peer review findings.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement—See MSAA peer review notes (2016)</b></p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maryland**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b></p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>Consortium submission reviewed separately. See Consortium submission.</p>	<p><b>Per MSAA</b> See Consortium submission peer review findings.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement—See MSAA notes (2016 and 2017)</b></p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maryland

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>Consortium submission reviewed separately. See Consortium submission.</p>	<p><b>Per MSAA</b> See Consortium submission peer review findings.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement—See MSAA peer review notes (2016 and 2017)</b></p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maryland**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</b></p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p>Consortium submission reviewed separately. See Consortium submission.</p>	<p><b>Per MSAA</b> See Consortium submission peer review findings.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement—See MSAA peer review notes (2016)</b></p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maryland**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b></p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>• Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<p>Consortium submission reviewed separately. See Consortium submission.</p>	<p><b>Per MSAA</b> See Consortium submission peer review findings.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement—See MSAA peer review notes (2016 and 2017)</b></p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maryland**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b></p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p>Consortium submission reviewed separately. See Consortium submission.</p>	<p><b>Per MSAA</b> See Consortium submission peer review findings.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement—See MSAA peer review notes (2016 and 2017)</b></p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR 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><b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards;</li> <li>• States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs;</li> <li>• Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment;</li> <li>• Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities;</li> <li>• Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>DOCUMENT #34</u></b> Maryland’s Differences Among Assessments chart for Students Receiving Special Education Services</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #35</u></b> COMAR: Free and Appropriate Public Education: Individualized Education Document 13.A.05.01.09</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #18</u></b> Maryland Guidance for Individualized Education Program (IEP) Teams on Participation Decisions for the Alternate Assessments (all pages)</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #36</u></b> Professional Development PowerPoint – Maryland Guidance for Individualized Education Programs (IEP) Teams on Participation Decisions for the Alternate Assessments</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #22</u></b> MSAA Spring 2017 Testing Coordinator’s Training PowerPoint (pp. 15, 34-40)</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #23</u></b> Training Sign in Sheets from Spring 2017 Testing Coordinator’s Training</p> <p>Other relevant evidence: <b><u>DOCUMENT #17</u></b> Maryland Accommodations Manual</p>	<p><b>Per MSAA Documents 17 and 34 should be updated.</b></p> <p><b>Differences in assessments and resulting instruction:</b> Document #34 describes assessments available, who determines participation, and differences among the assessments.</p> <p><b>Decisions by IEP Team:</b> 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><b>Guidelines for participation in MSAA:</b> 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"> <li>• Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;</li> <li>• Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments);</li> <li>• The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.</li> </ul>		<p>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><b>Information on Accessibility Tools and Features:</b> Document #22 provides specific information about accessibility tools and features.</p> <p><b>Guidance on selection of appropriate accommodations:</b> 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><b>Information to parents on consequences of MSAA participation:</b> Document #18 p. 12 includes a statement of understanding to be signed by parents regarding consequences of MSAA participation.</p> <p><b>Promotion of access to general curriculum:</b> 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>
<b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b>		
_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><b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> <li>• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;</li> <li>• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>DOCUMENT #18</u></b> Maryland Guidance for Individualized Education Program (IEP) Teams on Participation Decisions for the Alternate Assessments (all pages)</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #36</u></b> Professional Development PowerPoint – Maryland Guidance for Individualized Education Programs (IEP) Teams on Participation Decisions for the Alternate Assessments</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #22</u></b> MSAA Spring 2017 Testing Coordinator’s Training PowerPoint (pp. 15, 34-40)</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #23</u></b> Training Sign in Sheets from Spring 2017 Testing Coordinator’s Training</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #17</u></b> Maryland Accommodations Manual – 2012, (Sections 7-9)</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #17</u></b> 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><b>Per MSAA</b> <b>Procedures for determining EL accommodation use:</b> 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><b>Information on accessibility tools and features for EL:</b> Document #22 provides specific information about accessibility tools and features.</p> <p><b>Guidance for selection of EL accommodations:</b> 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
<b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maryland

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.3 – Accommodations</b></p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities (SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504;</li> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);</li> <li>• Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> <li>• Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>DOCUMENT #22</u></b> MSAA Spring 2017 Testing Coordinator’s Training PowerPoint (pp. 15, 34-40)</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #23</u></b> Training Sign in Sheets from Spring 2017 Testing Coordinator’s Training</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #37</u></b> MSAA/NCSC Test Administrator Manual (pp. 20-24)</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #17</u></b> Maryland Accommodations Manual – 2012, (pp. 2-3)</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #17</u></b> Maryland Accommodations Manual – Appendix D: Unique Accommodations Request Form for State Assessments for Students with an IEP or 504 Plan</p>	<p><b>Per MSAA</b></p> <p><b>Available accommodations:</b> 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><b>EL accommodations:</b> 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><b>Appropriate and effective:</b> 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><b>Do not alter construct:</b> 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><b>Comparability of scores between accommodated and non-accommodated scores:</b> Peers were unable to locate evidence of studies examining comparability of accommodated and non-accommodated scores.</p> <p><b>Exceptional request:</b> 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>
<b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan and timeline for studying the effectiveness of MSAA accommodations, adherence to construct, and comparability of accommodated and non-accommodated scores.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maryland

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b></p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>MD Specific PARCC DOCUMENT #5.4a</u></b> PARCC SR/PNP</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #5.4b</u></b> PARCC Spring 2016 Accommodated Form Usage - State Report - MD</p> <p>Other relevant evidence <b><u>DOCUMENT #26</u></b> Monitoring Training PowerPoint</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #27</u></b> Observation Form</p> <p><b><u>MSAA DOCUMENT #26</u></b> Monitoring Training PowerPoint</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #27</u></b> Observation Form</p> <p>Other relevant evidence <b><u>DOCUMENT #17</u></b> Maryland Accommodations Manual – 2012, (pp. 2-2 and 2-3) and Tool SWD 5</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #37</u></b> Test Administration Manual</p>	<p><b>Per Maryland PARCC</b> 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><b>Per Maryland PARCC and MSAA</b></p> <p><b>Receive accommodations consistent with policies:</b> 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><b>Consistent with instruction:</b> 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><b>Consistent with IEP:</b> 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><b>Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures:</b>  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><b>Additional Evidence Requested for PARCC/State, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b>                      “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><b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR 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><b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</b></p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities;</li> <li>• The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply;</li> <li>• The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Maryland PARCC DOCUMENT #6.1a</u></b> PARCC Performance Level Setting Memo</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #6.1b</u></b> PARCC Performance Level Setting</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #6.1c</u></b> State_BOE_Pres_20150922</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #6.1d</u></b> MD_State_Specific-6.1d State_BOE_Pres_20150922_Cover_Letter_PARCC_PL_Setting</p> <p><b><u>MSAA DOCUMENT #01</u></b> 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><b><u>DOCUMENT #02</u></b> Maryland State Board of Education Minutes for February 25, 2015, Meeting/Adopting of the NCSC (all pages)</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #03</u></b> Code of Maryland Regulations for Test Administration and Data Reporting Procedures</p> <p><b><u>DOCUMENT #04, #05, #06</u></b> NCSC Core Content Connectors and Essential Understandings (all pages)</p>	<p><b>Per Maryland PARCC</b> 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><b>Per MSAA</b> 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 3<sup>rd</sup> 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><b>DOCUMENT #39</b></u> Performance Level Descriptors NCSC_MSAА	
<b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<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><b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b></p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p>State notes that this CE is documented under the NCSC Consortium submission.</p>	<p>See Consortium review</p>
<p><b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement – See MSAA peer review notes (2016)</b></p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maryland**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p>State notes that this CE is documented under the NCSC Consortium submission.</p>	<p>See Consortium submission peer review findings.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement – See MSAA peer review notes (2016)</b></p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maryland

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;</li> <li>• The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;</li> <li>• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;</li> <li>○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><u><b>Maryland PARCC DOCUMENT #6.4a</b></u> Accessing and Utilizing PARCC Reports power point presentation (pages: 3-11 and 14-15)</p> <p><u><b>DOCUMENT #6.4b</b></u> PARCC Participation Memo</p> <p><u><b>DOCUMENT #6.4c</b></u> PARCC Participation Report</p> <p><u><b>DOCUMENT #6.4d</b></u> <a href="http://reportcard.msde.maryland.gov/participation/PARCC/2015_99AAAA.pdf">http://reportcard.msde.maryland.gov/participation/PARCC/2015_99AAAA.pdf</a></p> <p><u><b>MSAA DOCUMENT #38</b></u> Code of Maryland Regulations – Reporting</p> <p><u><b>DOCUMENT #39</b></u> Performance Level Descriptors Training PowerPoint</p> <p><u><b>DOCUMENT #40</b></u> Email notification of Reporting Window</p>	<p><b>Per Maryland PARCC</b></p> <p><b>Classroom level reports:</b> 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><b>Itemized reports:</b> 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><b>Participation rates:</b> Document 6.4c is participation report from PARCC for the State.</p> <p><b>Per MSAA</b></p> <p><b>Reporting by proficiency level:</b> Document #38 is policy requiring annual reporting. Document #39 shows reporting of student achievement by proficiency level</p> <p><b>Percent not tested:</b> Document #39 slides 2,3,4,6 and 22 show summary reports that include number tested and not tested.</p> <p><b>Interpretive guides:</b> Peers could not find interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of assessment results.</p> <p><b>Itemized score analyses:</b> 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"> <li>○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</li> <li>• The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>		<p><b>Individual reports:</b> Document #38 is policy requiring annual reporting of individual scores.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of MSAA assessment results.</li> </ul>		

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

**U. S. Department of Education –  
NCSC  
Peer Review of State Assessment Systems  
August 2017 State Assessment Peer  
Review Notes for the NCSC 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 NCSC ASSESSMENT  
CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION**

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

<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.3 – Test Administration.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2.5 – Test Security .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>4.1 – Reliability.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>4.4 – Scoring.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>5.3 – Accommodations .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>6.4 – Reporting .....</b>	<b>26</b>

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results;</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills);</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.</li> </ul>	<p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; p. 82 (Chapter 3, Study #5, Vertical Coherence)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 72-75 (Relationship of the CCCs to Grade-level CCSS Academic Content Standards: Alignment Question #1)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; p. 65 (English Language Arts)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; p. 28-29 (Adoption of Prioritized Academic Grade-Level Content)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 25-30 (Item Development)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; p. 64 (Table 2-15b)</p>	<p><b>NCSC 15:</b> The Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015 was previously submitted for peer preview. At the time the technical manual was constructed, writing items were not part of the operational test.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> p. 28. The writing panelists indicated that the focal KSAs/Essential Understandings provided some evidence of the writing claim but fell short of providing full evidence in support of it.</p> <p>Of the three content areas, only writing panelists indicated that many of the focal KSAs/Essential understandings at higher grades represented skills identical to those at the lower grades.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> p. 83. The results from the Mathematics, Reading, and Writing Relationship Studies indicated that the prioritized academic grade-level content targets and their alignment to intended college and career ready standards was strong with regard to content centrality, performance centrality, and DOK.</p> <p>Results of the End of the Test Survey (EOTS) were not located in NCSC 15.</p> <p>While the NCSC Coordinated Peer Review Response lists “Balancing reading and writing items” as part of the process described on pgs.</p>

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 66-67 (Operational Design; Operational Core Items and Embedded Field Test Items; Specifications)</p> <p><b>NCSC 10:</b> Guide for Score Report Interpretation; pp. 27-34 (Performance Level Descriptors for ELA)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; p. 187 (Reporting of the Writing Prompt (Field Test))</p> <p><b>NCSC 100:</b> Writing Timeline (2013-2015 Writing Timeline)</p>	<p>25-30, there is only one mention of balancing reading and writing, and it is just listed as a “factor” on p. 26. Peers were not clear on how decisions about balancing reading and writing for the ELA tests were made.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> pgs. 33-34 describes the Item Content Review Focus Group Reports for Math and for Reading. It is not clear if this not done for writing.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> p.65.The three CCCs prioritized for writing at each grade level consist of one CCC assessed by a Constructed Response item and two CCCs assessed by Student Response (SR) items. The CR writing items were considered field-test items and did not count toward the student’s score.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> p. 64. The writing CR items (prompts) were field tested as part of the 2015 administration, so are not represented as part of the actual ELA distribution of content shown in Table 2-15b. This table shows that writing comprises 19-21% of the overall ELA Blueprint across all grade levels but the guidelines on the same page account for 30%. It is assumed that the CR items will fill the additional 10-11%.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Page 73. The one major change that was made to the Pilot Phase 2 forms for the operational assessment was the addition of writing sessions to create a full ELA test.</p>

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		Tier 1 prompts were included in the overall ELA score for 2015. Tier 2 writing prompts were field tested in ELA in each grade. It is unclear if Tier 2 writing prompts been included as part of operational tests.
<b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b>		
“State must provide evidence to support the NCSC test design criteria for the writing portion of the reading/language arts AA-AAAS. This will also impact evidence for related critical elements in sections 3 and 4”		
<b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State must provide evidence to support the NCSC test design criteria for the operational writing portion of the reading/language arts AA-AAAS. This will also impact evidence for related critical elements in sections 3 and 4. No new relevant information was presented.</li> </ul>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>• Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments;</li> <li>• If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>	<p><b>NCSC 1:</b> Test Administration Manual 2015; p. 13 (Sample Test Items)</p> <p><b>NCSC 1:</b> Test Administration Manual 2015; pp. 16-17, 19, 24 (Test Administration Training Requirements)</p> <p><b>NCSC 8:</b> System User Guide for Test Administrators; pp. 65-67 (Keyboard-Only Navigation Shortcuts, Technology Requirements)</p> <p><b>NCSC 9:</b> System User Guide for Test Coordinators; pp. 72-73 (Technology Requirements)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 94-95 (Administration Support, NCSC Service Center, Additional Supports)</p>	<p><b>NCSC 1, 8, 9, and 15:</b> The Test Administration Manual 2015, the System User Guide for Test Administrators, the System User Guide for Test Coordinators were previously submitted for peer preview.</p> <p><b>NCSC 1:</b>p. 13, 16. Availability of sample items does not ensure that all students are familiar with the item format and online functionality. As a starting point, TAs are asked to review and complete the sample items with students Additionally, a policy statement and possibly some systematic documentation may be warranted.</p> <p><b>NCSC 1:</b> p.19. TCs must complete the NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Coordinators, including NCSC accommodations.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b>pp.94-95. Numerous examples of test administrative support and technical support through the NCSC Service Center during test administration were provided It appears that TAs and students do not have access to sample items in writing.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> p. 95. The Tip Sheet described on of might be meeting this need. The tip sheets developed in each year should probably be aggregated and given out at the beginning of</p>

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
		the next year to help alert folks to commonly occurring issues. This meets the needs of the troubleshooting guide.
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide, then State must):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that State established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the NCSC/MSAA assessments that include:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence of a troubleshooting guide for the NCSC/MSAA to address technology-related contingency plans.</li> <li>○ Evidence of policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration (including the assessment delivery devices, accessibility tools and features available for students, and item formats) prior to testing.</li> <li>○ Evidence of training to ensure consistency of administration across districts and schools.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that State established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the NCSC assessments that include:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence of policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration in writing (including the assessment delivery devices, accessibility tools and features available for students, and item formats) prior to testing.</li> <li>○ Evidence of training to ensure consistency of administration across districts and schools.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>2.5 – Test Security</b></p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> </ul>	<p><b>NCSC 1:</b> Test Administration Manual 2015; pp. 16-17 (Responsibilities for Test Administrators)</p> <p><b>NCSC 1:</b> Test Administration Manual 2015; p.13 (Open Response: Foundational Reading)</p> <p><b>NCSC 123:</b> Architecture and Technology System Requirements; pp. 53-56; 64-69 (Component Transport; Security)</p>	<p><b>NCSC 1:</b> Test Administration Manual 2015 was previously submitted for peer review.</p> <p>NCSC noted that individual states handle investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. Training modules 1 and 2 were dedicated to testing irregularities and testing integrity.</p> <p><b>NCSC 5:</b> p. 31. TAs must follow their state procedures. Pages 33-36. The peers noted the quiz for TAs regarding inappropriate test practices is low level and an educator could likely pass it without taking the training.</p> <p>Note: While states have specific responsibility in test security, the underlying architecture responsibility is with NCSC. States using NCSC will need to be aware of their responsibility as part of Test Security.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide then State must):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the NCSC/MSAA, documentation of a process to prevent, detect, report, investigate, and remediate assessment regularities.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X_ No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> <li>• If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul>	<p>No evidence was provided.</p>	<p>See Element 2.1</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b></p> <p>For the NCSC/MSAA, as noted in element 2.1, evidence that demonstrates its assessments measure the full breadth and depth of the State’s content standards (writing). Following that, the State will need to document adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, including evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards. This will also effect other critical elements in sections 3 and 4.</p>		
<p><b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the NCSC as noted in element 2.1, evidence that demonstrates its assessments measure the full breadth and depth of the State’s writing (ELA) content standards. Following that, the State will need to document adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, including evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards for writing.</li> </ul>		

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
This will also affect other critical elements in sections 3 and 4.		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>No evidence was provided.</p>	<p>See Element 2.1.</p> <p>See 3.1 comment NCSC may consider cognitive lab or observational data to address validity evidence for this critical element.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b> For the NCSC/MCAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p>		
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the NCSC, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</li> </ul>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 179-183 (Dimensionality Analyses)</p> <p><b>NCSC 104:</b> Exploring Dimensionality within the 2015 NCSC Operational Administration Data 12-16; pp. 5-10 (Exploratory Factor Analysis), pp. 15-20 (Dimensionality Review Workshops; Further Investigation; Discussion)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15-B:</b> Appendix 2_2015 Tech Manual Appendix 2-K update   pp. 2-3 (Table B1; B2)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 123-124 (Calibration; Item Response Theory Results)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15-F:</b> Appendix 6_2015 Tech Manual Appendix 6-A – 6-L)</p>	<p><b>NCSC 104:</b> p.6. The Center for Assessment essentially confirmed results from 2015 Technical Manual. All grade/content combinations showed two dimensions except ELA at third and fourth grade.</p> <p><b>NCSC 104:</b> p. 20. The quantitative and qualitative (review committee) results suggested that some students favor a particular response option and that this favoritism is reflected as multidimensionality on certain forms. It was suggested that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Future form development and revision carefully consider the balance of the number of correct responses per selected response option, particularly in math.</li> <li>2. Students’ preferential selection of a given response option be studied further, potentially using qualitative means. Such behavior, if undesirable, could be corrected through revisions to the test administration procedure.</li> </ol> <p>It is unclear whether the above two suggestions were implemented and if so, whether they worked. It is recommended that the current data be factor analyzed.</p> <p><b>NCSC 104:</b> makes the case that the tests, as a whole, function unidimensionally even though there with a few students with an aberrant item selection behavior. NCSC refers to Test Characteristic Curves (TCC), Test Information Function (TIF) curves, and Conditional</p>

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		Standard Error of Measurement (CSEM) curves, and the IRT model fit analyses as evidence.
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b>                      For the NCSC/MSAA, additional evidence that supports the internal structure of the tests, specifically a plan and timeline for documenting how the test meets item response theory (IRT) assumptions of test unidimensionality.</p>		
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide evidence of how NCSC will address answer choice presentation and impact of scrolling in the administration of the test as evidenced by NCSC 104.</li> </ul>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>No evidence provided</p>	<p>No new relevant information was presented.</p> <p>It is possible to address this by providing data to show correlations between writing and other variables such as math, science, reading or any other norm tests.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b> For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p>		
<p><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the NCSC, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</li> </ul>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.1 – Reliability</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement.</li> </ul>	<p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 124-128; 171-177 (Item Response Theory Results; Chapter 8)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15-F:</b> Appendix 6_2015 Tech Manual Appendix 6-F</p> <p><b>NCSC 15-I:</b> Appendix 8_2015 Tech Manual Appendices 8-A and 8-B</p>	<p><b>NCSC 15, 15-F and 15-I:</b> Test Administration Manual 2015 plus the two appendices were previously submitted for peer preview.</p> <p>Statistical tables show ELA and Mathematics, but not Writing.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15-F:</b> p.5, Appendix 6. Example item-level fit plots for Tier 1 Writing Prompt I items were presented. The purpose seemed to be determining whether combined or single item scores should be used, reporting reliability for Writing.</p> <p>ELA scores used in the various statistical analyses contained between 19% and 22% writing items.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15: p. 187.</b> Tier 2 writing prompts were field tested in ELA in each grade this year to enable further research and examination of results. Further development is in progress with the intention of including Tier 2 writing prompts in the overall ELA score for students in the future. Writing SRs and Tier 1 prompts were included in the overall ELA score for 2015.</p> <p>It is unclear if there will be writing reliability data independent of ELA. The TAC meeting discussion reviewed the writing issue, but did not provide any guidance.</p>

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
		All data provided in evidence relates to field test writing items. No new evidence about operational items was presented.
<b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b> For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.		
<b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If NCSC implements CR operational writing items, appropriate studies must be conducted to determine reliability.</li> </ul>		

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b></p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p><b>NCSC 15:</b> p. 19. To allow the widest possible range of students to demonstrate what they know and can do and to be able to make valid inferences about the performance of all students who participate in an assessment, universally designed assessments are developed from the beginning with an eye toward maximizing fairness.</p>	<p>See Element 2.1.</p> <p>The use of UDL (Universal Design for Learning) is designed to meet the full continuum.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b> For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p>		
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p><b>NCSC 15: Operation Assessment Technical Manual 2015</b>  p. 105 -110 –training of scorers – on field-test items  p. 114 –Inter-rater reliability on Field Test Writing CR items  p. 187 Reporting of field-test Writing Prompt</p> <p><b>NCSC 10: Guide for Score Report Interpretation</b>  pgs. 27-34: Performance Level Descriptors for Writing are embedded in ELA</p>	<p>See Element 2.1.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> p. 188 – Some states opted to not report writing. It is unclear if this was true in 2016-17 as well as 2015.</p> <p>No new evidence was presented regarding training of raters, scoring rubrics, or evaluation of inter-rater reliability, other than on field-test writing items. It is unclear if this same process used for operational writing items.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b>  For the NCSC/MSAA, evidence of documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols designed to produce reliable results and facilitate score interpretations for constructed-response items in reading/language arts and mathematics and also operational writing items. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Adequate procedures and criteria for ensuring and documenting inter-rater reliability;</li> <li>○ Clear scoring rubrics, comprehensive instructions for raters, adequate training of raters, evaluation of inter-rater reliability; and</li> <li>○ Documentation that the model-data fit issue identified in item 3.3 has been resolved.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the NCSC, evidence of documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols designed to produce reliable results and facilitate score interpretations for constructed-response items in reading/language arts and mathematics and also operational writing items. Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Adequate procedures and criteria for ensuring and documenting inter-rater reliability;</li> <li>○ Clear scoring rubrics, comprehensive instructions for raters, adequate training of raters, and evaluation of inter-rater reliability.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC 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"> <li>• Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>• Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<p><b>NCSC 1:</b> Test Administration Manual 2015; pp. 9, 24 (Overview of NCSC AA-AAS; Accommodations)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 67-68 (Table 2-16; Table 2-17)</p>	<p><b>NCSC 1 and 15:</b> The Test Administration Manual 2015 and the Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015 were previously submitted for peer preview.</p> <p>The use of a paper-based presentation of test item/s is a state-specific policy. (P.9 and Appendix A).</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> p. 13. NCSC created and adopted policies for accessibility and item features that resulted in flexible assessment design and delivery (computer vs paper based). On p. 89, they refer to paper version of items as an accommodation.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b></p> <p>For NCSC/MSAA, evidence either that paper versions of the assessments are an accommodation or an analysis of the comparability of the meaning and interpretation of the assessment results across the technology-based and paper-based versions of the assessments.</p>		
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b></p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p><b>NCSC 17:</b> Post-Operational NCSC Research Studies; pp. 1-15</p> <p><b>NCSC 106:</b> Final Project Meeting Agenda</p> <p><b>NCSC 107:</b> Final Project Meeting Evaluation</p> <p><b>NCSC 109:</b> Estimating and Evaluating Student Growth</p> <p><b>NCSC 110:</b> Evaluating Precision of NCSC Scores</p> <p><b>NCSC 111:</b> Future Test Development</p> <p><b>NCSC 112:</b> Item Difficulty Study</p> <p><b>NCSC 113:</b> Managing Assessment Assets</p> <p><b>NCSC 116:</b> Part Perf analysis as of 12-20-16</p> <p><b>NCSC 117:</b> Part Rate Follow-up as of 12-26-</p> <p><b>NCSC 118:</b> UKY Communication White Paper Final</p> <p><b>NCSC 119:</b> UKY Communicative Competence Policy Brief Final</p> <p><b>NCSC 120:</b> UKY On-line Learning Final</p> <p><b>NCSC 121:</b> UNCC 4 Studies 9-16</p> <p><b>NCSC 122:</b> UNCC How Teach Standards</p>	<p><b>NCSC 17:</b> The Post-Operational NCSC Research Studies was previously submitted for peer preview.</p> <p>Writing scores were not analyzed independent of ELA.</p> <p>12 research reports documenting NCSC support for studies to do ongoing research for evaluating and improving the assessment system. The evidence provided are final reports. It is unclear if there are plans to do more research in the future. In NCSC 107, members indicated in using the information provided from studies to improve the system for the future.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b></p>		
<p>For NCSC/MSAA, evidence of a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of the assessments for future years</p>		
<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> <li>• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;</li> <li>• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>	<p><b>NCSC 2:</b> Guidance for IEP teams on participation decisions</p>	<p>See 5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p><b>NCSC 2:</b> p. 3-3. If ELLs have an IEP that calls for the alternate assessment, they will be included in this test. Accommodations will be determined for ELLs in the same way they are determined for all students taking this assessment.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15-B,</b> p. 6-7 accommodation            “All key information in dominant language is also available in prevalent first languages for second language learners” is listed as “allowed.” But this does not appear in any of the materials for TAs. (This is also pertinent for Critical Element 5.3.)</p> <p>It would be helpful if this is accommodation is communicated for TA use. Clarification should be provided to TAs regarding the accommodations listed as allowed.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide, then State must):</b>            For the NCSC/MSAA, evidence that 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); and</li> <li>o Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:            For the NCSC evidence that 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); and</li> </ul>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li></ul>		

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>5.3 – Accommodations</b></p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities (SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504;</li> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);</li> <li>• Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> <li>• Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>	<p><b>NCSC 2:</b> Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions; pp. 3-4 (Introduction; Description of the [NCSC Alternate Assessment]; Participation Decisions)</p> <p><b>NCSC 2:</b> Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions; p. 5 (Do Not Use the Following as Criteria for Participation Decisions)</p> <p><b>NCSC 2:</b> Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions; p. 8 (How do I know if the [NCSC Alternate Assessment] is appropriate for an ELL with an IEP whose language proficiency makes it difficult to assess content knowledge and skills?) Participation Decisions Document; pp. 52-63 (Student Profile Example C) pp. 12-18 (Appendices A-C)</p> <p><b>NCSC 1:</b> Test Administration Manual 2015; p. 23 (Table 11. NCSC Assessment Features) p. 24 (Accommodations) pp. 44-56 (Assessment Features)</p> <p><b>NCSC 5:</b> Test Administration Training for Test Administrators; p. 66 (What are test accommodations?)</p> <p><b>NCSC 8:</b> System User Guide for Test Administrators; pp. 18; 26-28 (Accommodations: Before Test &amp; After Test)</p>	<p><b>NCSC 1, 2, 5, 8, 15-B, 15, and 15-F:</b> were previously submitted for peer preview.</p> <p><b>NCSC 2:</b> p. 7. “An ELL should be considered for the alternate assessment if (a) his/her intellectual functioning indicates a significant cognitive disability using assessments in his/her home language as appropriate, and (b) he/she meets the other participation guidelines for the [NCSC Alternate Assessment]”. Frequently Asked Questions</p> <p><b>NCSC 5:</b> pgs. 23-24. All accessibility features and accommodations listed in each student’s IEP are applicable to each eligible participant, including English Learners. Accessibility features are also listed in the training for TA.</p> <p><b>NCSC 5:</b> p. 66. Each state in the NCSC consortium has its own process by which unique/non-traditional accommodations are processed for approval</p> <p><b>NCSC 5:</b> p. 66. “Accommodations are changes in the materials or procedures of the assessment that do not alter the construct being measured.” “If a student requires an Accommodation for the assessment that is not currently in his/her IEP, please see TAM, Appendix A. State Specific Information.” The accommodations were designed to remove construct-irrelevant barriers related to individual characteristics that would interfere</p>

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>NCSC 15-B:</b> Appendix 2; 2015 Tech Manual Appendix 2-B update 2.pdf; ELA Appendix C</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; p. 88 (Documentation of Accommodations)</p> <p><b>NCSC 1:</b> Test Administration Manual 2015; p. 34 (Accommodations: After Test)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15-F:</b> Appendix 6; 2015 Tech Manual (Appendix 6-L – Accommodation Freqs-2.pdf)</p> <p><b>NCSC 101:</b> NCME 2016 Accessibility Presentation; (Appendix 6-L – Accommodation Freqs-2.pdf)</p> <p><b>NCSC 102:</b> NCME 2016 Accessibility Handout); Accessibility: Consideration of the Learner, the Teacher, and Item Performance</p>	<p>with the measurement of the target construct.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> p. 61. Recommendations for areas of further study included the use of accommodations. It is not clear if further study was completed. If so, what were the results?</p> <p>In <b>NCSC 15-B</b>, p. 6-7. the accommodation “All key information in dominant language is also available in prevalent first languages for second language learners” is listed as “allowed.” But this does not appear in any of the materials for TAs. (This is also pertinent for Critical Element 5.2.)</p> <p>Several studies are cited, but none seem to address the question of whether the accommodations provided allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</p>

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide, then State must):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For both the NCSC/MSAA, evidence that the accommodations provided (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</li> <li>• Evidence that appropriate accommodations for English learners are available.</li> <li>• For the NCSC/MSAA, evidence that the State has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the NCSC, evidence that the accommodations provided do not alter the construct being assessed, and allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</li> </ul>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;</li> <li>• The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;</li> <li>• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;</li> <li>○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>NCSC 103:</b> Reporting Timeline (2014-2016)</p> <p><b>NCSC 10:</b> Guide for Score Report Interpretation; pp. 24-26 (Appendix A: Individual Student Report)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 132-138 (Chapter 7: Standard Setting)</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 139-140 (Chapter 7: Standard Setting)</p> <p><b>NCSC 124:</b> ADE November 2015 Examiner Newsletter; p. 7 (NCSC 2015 Reports)</p>	<p><b>NCSC 10 and 15:</b> were previously submitted for peer preview.</p> <p>An expanded timeline with additional important dates for Alternate Assessment would be helpful. Testing window dates (March-May) were included in the Examiner Newsletter (p. 7).</p> <p>Student reports were delivered through an online reporting portal as soon as the reports and data had been verified and approved for each administration.</p> <p><b>NCSC 124:</b> AZ process is provided as an example of the reporting process.</p> <p>No evidence is provided regarding individual student reports being 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.</p>

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>descriptors);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;</li> <li>○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide then State must):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● For the NCSC/MSAA evidence of a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> <li>● For the NCSC/MSAA, evidence that individual student reports are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● For the NCSC evidence of a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration</li> <li>● For the NCSC, evidence that individual student reports are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand. No new relevant information was presented.</li> </ul>		

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

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

## February 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes for the NCSC/MSAA Assessment Consortium **RESUBMISSION**

(follow up on evidence requested from 2016 and 2017 Peer Reviews)



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 MSAA ASSESSMENT  
CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION**

Contents—NOTE—The items shown below represent areas from the 2017 consortium peer review where additional evidence was requested

<b>SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.3 – Test Administration .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>4.1 – Reliability.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>4.4 – Scoring .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>5.3 – Accommodations.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>6.4 – Reporting.....</b>	<b>19</b>

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

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results;</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills);</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.</li> </ul>	<p>The State did not provide evidence in the February 2018 submission for this critical element.</p>	<p>No relevant evidence located.</p>

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b>                      State must provide evidence to support the NCSC/MSAA test design criteria for the writing portion of the reading/language arts AA-AAAS. This will also impact evidence for related critical elements in sections 3 and 4.</p> <p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</b>                      State must provide evidence to support the MSAA/NCSC test design criteria for the operational writing portion of the reading/language arts AA-AAAS. This will also impact evidence for related critical elements in sections 3 and 4.</p>		
<p><b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State must provide evidence to support the MSAA/NCSC test design criteria for the operational writing portion of the reading/language arts AA-AAAS. This will also impact evidence for related critical elements in sections 3 and 4.</li> </ul>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>• Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments;</li> <li>• If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>	<p>MSAA Timeline for adding in writing item samples to the MSAA PowerPoint by February 2018 and Practice site by June 2018.</p>	<p>Final slide on PowerPoint: Display new sample writing items to practice site June 2018.</p> <p>Evidence is not sufficient to the outstanding requirement.</p> <p>After the sample writing items are added to the practice test, MSAA should provide evidence that this work was done, and describe how the sample items reflect the different components of the writing assessment.</p>

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide, then State must):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that State established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the NCSC/MSAA assessments that include:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence of a troubleshooting guide for the NCSC/MSAA to address technology-related contingency plans.</li> <li>○ Evidence of policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration (including the assessment delivery devices, accessibility tools and features available for students, and item formats) prior to testing.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Evidence of training to ensure consistency of administration across districts and schools.</p> <p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that State established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the MSAA/NCSC assessments that include evidence of a policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration in writing (including the assessment delivery devices, accessibility tools and features available for students, and item formats) prior to testing.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that State established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the MSAA/NCSC assessments that include evidence of a policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration in writing (including the assessment delivery devices, accessibility tools and features available for students, and item formats) prior to testing.</li> </ul>		

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

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

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> <li>• If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul>	<p>The State did not provide evidence in the February 2018 submission for this critical element.</p>	<p>No relevant evidence located.</p>

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b>                      For the NCSC/MSAA, as noted in element 2.1, evidence that demonstrates its assessments measure the full breadth and depth of the State’s content standards (writing). Following that, the State will need to document adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, including evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards. This will also effect other critical elements in sections 3 and 4.</p> <p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As noted in element 2.1, evidence that demonstrates its assessments measure the full breadth and depth of the State’s writing (ELA) content standards. Following that, the State will need to document adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, including evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards for writing. This will also affect other critical elements in sections 3 and 4.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As noted in element 2.1, evidence that demonstrates its assessments measure the full breadth and depth of the State’s writing (ELA) content standards. Following that, the State will need to document adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, including evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards for writing. This will also affect other critical elements in sections 3 and 4.</li> </ul>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>The State did not provide evidence in the February 2018 submission for this critical element.</p>	<p>No relevant evidence located.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b> For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p> <p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</b> For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p>		
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</li> </ul>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p>MSAA Graphics Resizing Change Order 2017</p>	<p>MSAA scrolling issue evidence (validity based on internal structure)--change orders and an amendment to the MSAA contract with Measured Progress were created to address the scrolling issue. The peers noted how timely this issue was addressed by the MSAA.</p> <p>The change order generally indicates how the MSAA addressed answer choice presentation and impact of scrolling, but no evidence details the impact(s) of the implemented change orders.</p> <p>The MSAA may wish to consider pilot studies to address impact before full consortium implementation.</p> <p>While the change order was submitted, it is not clear exactly how this will impact dimensionality. Evidence must be provided that illustrates and provides data regarding the impacts after the change order has been implemented. The MSAA must submit evidence that item response theory (IRT) assumptions of test unidimensionality are met.</p>

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b>                      For the NCSC/MSAA, additional evidence that supports the internal structure of the tests, specifically a plan and timeline for documenting how the test meets item response theory (IRT) assumptions of test unidimensionality.</p> <p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide evidence of how NCSC will address answer choice presentation and impact of scrolling in the administration of the test as evidenced by NCSC 104 and MSAA11.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide evidence that item response theory (IRT) assumptions of test unidimensionality are met.</li> </ul>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>The State did not provide evidence in the February 2018 submission for this critical element.</p>	<p>No relevant evidence located.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b> For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p> <p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</b> For the MSAA/ NCSC, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p>		
<p><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For the MSAA/ NCSC, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</li> </ul>		

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

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

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>4.1 – Reliability</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement.</li> </ul>	<p>The State did not provide evidence in the February 2018 submission for this critical element.</p>	<p>No relevant evidence located.</p> <p>It is unclear if the MSAA implemented constructed response operational writing items.</p> <p>When MSAA implements constructed response operational writing items, appropriate studies must be conducted to determine reliability.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b> For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p> <p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If MSAA implements constructed response operational writing items, appropriate studies must be conducted to determine reliability.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When MSAA implements constructed response operational writing items, appropriate studies must be conducted to determine reliability.</li> </ul>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>The State did not provide evidence in the February 2018 submission for this critical element.</p>	<p>No relevant evidence located.</p> <p><i>Arizona Specific Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA) Policies</i> – this document mentions training, but does not specify if the training includes training for scoring.</p> <p>It is unclear if these policies are just for AZ or for all MSAA states.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ For the NCSC/MSAA, evidence of documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols designed to produce reliable results and facilitate score interpretations for constructed-response items in reading/language arts and mathematics and also operational writing items. Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Adequate procedures and criteria for ensuring and documenting inter-rater reliability;</li> <li>○ Clear scoring rubrics, comprehensive instructions for raters, adequate training of raters, evaluation of inter-rater reliability; and</li> <li>○ Documentation that the model-data fit issue identified in item 3.3 has been resolved.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence of documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols designed to produce reliable results and facilitate score interpretations for constructed-response items in reading/language arts and mathematics and also operational writing items. Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Adequate procedures and criteria for ensuring and documenting inter-rater reliability;</li> <li>○ Clear scoring rubrics, comprehensive instructions for raters, adequate training of raters, and evaluation of inter-rater reliability.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence of documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols designed to produce reliable results and facilitate score interpretations for constructed-response items in reading/language arts and mathematics and also operational writing items. Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Adequate procedures and criteria for ensuring and documenting inter-rater reliability;</li> <li>○ Clear scoring rubrics, comprehensive instructions for raters, adequate training of raters, and evaluation of inter-rater reliability.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> <li>• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;</li> <li>• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>	<p>Arizona Specific Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA) Policies</p> <p>Arizona – Multi State Alternate Assessment (MSAA) State Specific Guidance</p> <p>Accommodation Guidelines: <i>Selecting, Administering, and Evaluating Accommodations for Instruction and Assessment</i> July, 2017</p>	<p>EL Accommodations for MSAA--Any student that meets eligibility for the MSAA participation criteria will have access to the embedded accessibility tools including, Assessment Features, and Accommodations. If there is an additional tool or accommodation need, the Alternate Assessment Test Coordinator must contact the MSAA State Lead. This above section was also added into the MSAA State Specific Guidance Page for 2017.</p> <p>The procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s) and guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners should be expanded and strengthened, specifically with the addition of examples of accommodations decisions for sample profiles of students who are EL with disabilities that require them to take 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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide, then State must):</b>                      For the NCSC/MSAA, evidence that 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); and Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul> <p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 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:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); and</li> <li>• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.3 – Accommodations</b></p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504;</li> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);</li> <li>• Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> <li>• Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>	<p>Accommodation Guidelines: <i>Selecting, Administering, and Evaluating Accommodations for Instruction and Assessment</i> July, 2017</p> <p>C.E. 5.3 MSAA AZ Accommodation Reliability from 2017</p>	<p>The Accommodations Guidelines provide discussion about the importance of accommodations not altering the construct being tested (p. 8) and about the difference between accommodations and modifications (p. 10-11).</p> <p>ADE provided a table of reliability based on all students, those using assistive response, scribe, and sign for each grade level. There was no discussion provided how this data ensures that the accommodations used do not alter the construct being assessed, and 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. However, the peers evaluated the data and determined that this data addressed this critical element.</p>

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide, then State must):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For both the NCSC/MSAA, evidence that the accommodations provided (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</li> <li>• Evidence that appropriate accommodations for English learners are available.</li> <li>• For the NCSC/MSAA, evidence that the State has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the accommodations provided do not alter the construct being assessed, and allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;</li> <li>• The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;</li> <li>• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;</li> <li>○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;</li> <li>○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>C.E. 6.4 MSAA Student Report 2017_2018 New Message 101617. See mock-up of last sentence. The letter will now state “If you require this letter or child’s report in a different format, please contact your child’s teacher or school”.</p> <p>C.E. 6.4 MSAA 2017 MSAA Test Administration Manual (TAM)3.3.17 (with Alternate Format Updates 101617)</p>	<p>There was no evidence located related to the process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</p> <p>Evidence was provided to verify that individual student reports are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand.</p>

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide, then State must):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For the NCSC/MSAA evidence of a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> <li>For the NCSC/MSAA, evidence that individual student reports are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand.</li> </ul> <p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration</li> <li>Evidence that individual student reports are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand. No new relevant information was presented.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration</li> </ul>		

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