



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Robert G. Hasson, Jr.
Commissioner of Education
Maine Department of Education
23 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333-0023

June 5, 2018

Dear Commissioner Hasson:

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

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 MDOE's submission and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that the components of your assessment system meet some, but not all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of section 1111(b)(1) and (3) of the ESEA, 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:

- General assessments in mathematics and reading/language arts for grades 3-8 (emPowerME): **Partially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA**
- 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 and ESSA**

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.

- AA-AAAS for grades 5, 8 and high school in science (Personalized Alternate Assessment Portfolio-Science (PAAP-Science)): **Does not meet requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**

The assessment that **substantially meets the requirements of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB**, meets most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. The assessment that **partially meets requirements** does not meet a number of the requirements of the statute and regulations of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB. The Department expects that MDOE may be able to provide this additional information within one year.

I have concluded that the PAAP-Science **does not meet** the requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB. This means that the PAAP-Science will require substantial work by the State to revise this assessment. The PAAP-Science does not meet 28 of the 30 peer review requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB. In addition, in its current design, the PAAP Science **does not meet** requirements of the ESEA, as amended by ESSA. Section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vi) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, only authorizes an individual State assessment to be based partially upon a portfolio. Because the PAAP-Science is based entirely upon a portfolio of student work, it is therefore not permitted in its current design under the statute. MDOE will need to redesign or replace the PAAP-Science such that it complies with the statute. Under the orderly transition authority in section 4(b) of the ESSA, I am granting MDOE until January 5, 2021, to submit evidence of an AA-AAAS that meets the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA.

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 MDOE 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 several of the State's assessments meet some 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. In addition to the concerns noted above about the PAAP-Science, Department staff carefully reviewed MDOE 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 MDOE assessments need to meet two additional requirements related to Universal Design for Learning and alternate academic achievement standards. These requirements are listed under critical elements 4.2 and 6.3 respectively, along with the other evidence needed from the August 2017 peer review.

The specific list of items required for MDOE to submit is enclosed with this letter. Because the emPowerME partially met the requirements and the PAAP-Science did not meet the requirements, the Department is placing a condition on the State's Title I grant award related to those components of the assessment system. To satisfy this condition, MDOE must submit satisfactory evidence to address the items identified in the enclosed list. MDOE must submit a plan and timeline within 30 days outlining when it will submit all required additional documentation for peer review. The Department will also host regular (e.g., quarterly) 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. Additionally, the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) will monitor progress on matters pertaining to requirements in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) related to the participation of students with disabilities in Title I assessments. Insufficient

progress to address such matters may lead OSERS to place a condition on MDOE's IDEA Part B grant award.

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

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

If you have any questions, please contact Mario Nunez of my staff at: OSS.Maine@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

Jason Botel

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

Enclosures

cc: Nancy Godfrey, Assessment Coordinator

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

Overall Finding: For the Personalized Alternate Assessment Portfolio-Science (PAAP-Science), evidence that the assessment format meets the requirements of Section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vi) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). This section of the statute prohibits an individual State assessment that is based entirely upon a portfolio.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments	For the entire assessment system, Maine Department of Education (MDOE) should provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State allows exemptions from test participation only for medical emergencies. • Documentation of policies that all English learners (other than recently arrived English learners who may be exempted from one administration of the reading/language arts assessment in their first 12 months of schooling in the United States) are included in the statewide assessments, including evidence that it clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.
1.5 – Participation Data	For the entire assessment system, MDOE should provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of assessment participation data showing that all students, disaggregated by student groups and assessment types, including migrant students, are included in the State’s assessments. • Evidence that there are procedures in place to ensure that each student is tested and counted and that the participation rate is calculated for each required assessment and student group.
2.1 – Test Design and Development	For the eMPowerME reading/language arts and mathematics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State’s test design and test development process aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, in particular in grades 3-8 for reading/language arts and grades 3-5 for mathematics. • Evidence of processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., evidence that the assessment measures higher-order thinking skills). • Evidence regarding the usability of the assessments, as it relates to the technology used to deliver the assessments. For the PAAP-Science: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the rationale for the reduced breadth within each grade and/or comparison of intended content compared to grade-level science academic content standards; • Evidence that the cognitive complexity of the assessments is appropriately challenging for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the design for the assessments supports the development of assessments that are technically sound, specifically that: (1) the design does not involve selection of tasks for the assessment based on anticipated or actual student performance, and (2) is not based on “teaching to the test.” • Evidence that the assessments are designed and developed to measure achievement for each student assessed on content linked to Maine’s grade-level academic content standards for the grade in which each tested student is enrolled.
<p>2.2 – Item Development</p>	<p>For the eMPowerME:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State has in place 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. Examples include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A description of the process used to ensure that item types are tailored for assessing the content standards in terms of content; ○ A description of the process used to ensure that item types are tailored for assessing the content standards in terms of cognitive process; and ○ A description of procedures for pilot and field testing. • Evidence that items are developed by individuals with content expertise, experience as educators, and experience and expertise with children with disabilities, English learners and other student populations in Maine. <p>For the PAAP-Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Maine uses reasonable and technically sound procedures in the development of tasks for the assessments (e.g., samples of item specifications that include documentation of the requirements for student work and samples of exemplars for illustrating levels of student performance) to ensure that the tasks are cognitively challenging for students.
<p>2.3 – Test Administration</p>	<p>For the PAAP-Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Maine has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, in particular clear and detailed instructions to teachers tailored for the administration of individual tasks, for selecting Levels of Complexity for students, for providing levels of assistance without interfering with the construct being measured, and for scoring student work. ○ Maine 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.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>For the Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.
<p>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</p>	<p>For the eMPowerME, MSAA, and PAAP-Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State adequately monitors the test administration to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. This includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Documentation of specific roles and responsibilities for individuals that monitor the administration of the tests. ○ Expectations for local educational agency (LEA) staff in terms of monitoring test administrations.
<p>2.5 – Test Security</p>	<p>For the eMPowerME, MSAA, and PAAP-Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State has established and implemented policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Detection of test irregularities. ○ Remediation following any test security incidents (e.g., exposure of items during the testing window).
<p>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</p>	<p>For the MSAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Maine has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically guidelines for districts and schools.
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p>	<p>For the eMPowerME:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Maine has documented 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, such as by an external alignment study 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. <p>For the PAAP-Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that each of Maine’s alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards for science show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards for the grade in which each tested student is enrolled.
<p>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</p>	<p>For the eMPowerME:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation that the assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>For the PAAP-Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation that the assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.
<p>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</p>	<p>For the eMPowerME and the PAAP-Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation that the scoring and reporting structures of the 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 (e.g., documentation of the process by which the subscore categories were developed and statistical analyses supported the use of those subscore categories). <p>For the MSAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that item response theory assumptions of test unidimensionality are met.
<p>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p>	<p>For the eMPowerME and PAAP-Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables (e.g., correlational analysis of test scores with other related measures).
<p>4.1 – Reliability</p>	<p>For the PAAP-Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of improved reliability and precision (e.g., improved reliability estimates, smaller conditional standard errors of measure). <p>For the MSAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of estimated reliability for the reading/language arts tests that include data from the constructed response operational writing items.
<p>4.2 – Fairness and accessibility</p>	<p>For the eMPowerMe and PAAP-Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the State supports and enhances the accessibility of the assessments through appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities, and, to the extent practicable, by incorporating principles of universal design for learning (section 1111(b)(2)(B)(xiii) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA). <p>For the eMPowerMe:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of how the State addresses potential item bias identified in differential item functioning analyses. Evidence that persons knowledgeable in the assessment of children with disabilities and English learners were involved in the development of test items. <p>For the PAAP-Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that persons knowledgeable in the assessment of English learners with disabilities were involved in the development of test items.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum	For the eMPowerMe and PAAP-Science: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Maine has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, especially for low-achieving students.
4.4 – Scoring	For the PAAP-Science: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Maine 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, specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Documentation of procedures for each test administration to ensure the reliability of teacher descriptions of Levels of Assistance provided during test administration. ○ Documentation of the numbers and percentage of portfolios determined to be unscorable for each tested grade. ○ Evidence that the scoring of performance tasks includes adequate procedures and criteria based on the content assessed. ○ Clarification of the procedures for calculating the final score, including the dimensions included, rationale for the procedures and how the lowest and highest obtainable scores for each performance level relate to the cut scores. For the MSAA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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"> ○ Adequate procedures and criteria for ensuring and documenting inter-rater reliability; ○ Clear scoring rubrics, comprehensive instructions for raters, adequate training of raters, and evaluation of inter-rater reliability.
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	For the eMPowerMe: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Maine ensures that all forms yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years (e.g., interpretations of test score equating data).
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	For the eMPowerMe: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Maine administers the paper and large print test forms as accommodations OR: • Followed a design and development process that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Supports comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments, and ○ Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	For the PAAP-Science: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Maine 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 the assessments.
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	For all State assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Maine 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 individualized education plan teams to inform decisions about student assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide 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; • Provide guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities; and • Ensure 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 LEA or State policy. For the PAAP-Science: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.
5.2 – Procedures for Including ELs	For all State assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Maine 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 LEAs, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); ○ Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; ○ Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.
5.3 – Accommodations	For the eMPowerMe: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Maine ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (see evidence requested under critical element 5.2). • Evidence that Maine 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

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Maine has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.
<p>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</p>	<p>For the entire assessment system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Maine 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; ○ Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; ○ Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; ○ Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s individualized education plan team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; and ○ Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.
<p>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</p>	<p>For the eMPowerMe:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; ○ The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; and ○ The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) at least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels. <p>For the PAAP-Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a single set of labels for the levels of achievement defined for Maine’s alternate academic achievement standards and a single set of alternate academic achievement standards that include descriptions of

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting	<p>the competencies associated with each achievement level.</p> <p>For the eMPowerMe:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Maine 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, e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Individual judgments by round for the standard setting study to that document the technical soundness of the standards setting process; and ○ Evidence that demonstrates the sizes of the standards-setting panels were adequate to set technical sound academic achievement standards or evidence of a review of the academic achievement standards that confirms they are technical sound (e.g., a confirmatory study). <p>For the PAAP-Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Maine used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable for the alternate academic achievement standards formally adopted by the State.
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards (including additional ESSA requirement section 1111(b)(1)(E))	<p>For the eMPowerMe:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Maine’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>For the PAAP-Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that shows: that Maine’s alternate academic achievement standards for science for each tested grade are linked with the grade-level academic content standards for the grade in which each tested student is enrolled. <p>For the MSAA and PAAP-Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 ESEA, as amended by ESSA.
6.4 – Reporting	<p>For the eMPowerME:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Maine 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. • Evidence that Maine provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>each administration of its assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards, including performance-level descriptors established as part of the State’s standards-setting process for its academic achievement standards;○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;● Evidence that Maine follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. <p>For the PAAP-Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Evidence that Maine provides individual student reports that are available in alternate or accessible formats for parents who request such formats.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

August 2017 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

Contents

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)..... 8
- 1.5 – Participation Data (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 10

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS 11

- 2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 12
- 2.2 – Item Development..... 14
- 2.3 – Test Administration 17
- 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)19
- 2.5 – Test Security 21
- 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 23

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 24

- 3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 24
- 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 25
- 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure 26
- 3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables 27

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER 28

- 4.1 – Reliability..... 28
- 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 29
- 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... 30
- 4.4 – Scoring 31
- 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 32
- 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment 33
- 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance 34

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS 35

- 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 36
- 5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 38
- 5.3 – Accommodations..... 39
- 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations 40

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 41

- 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students 41
- 6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 44
- 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 46
- 6.4 – Reporting..... 48

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

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 style="text-align: center;">1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State.</p>	<p>General Academic Content Standards R/LA & Math 01: Title 20-A, Part 3, Chapter 222, § 6201 Legislative intent (pdf) 02: Title 20-A, Part 3, Chapter 222, § 6202 Assessment program established (pdf) 03: Title 20-A, Part 3, Chapter 222, § 6208 Legislative intent (pdf) 04: SP0705, LD 1800, item 1, 124th Maine State Legislature: An Act to Adopt the Common Core State Standards Initiative (pdf) 05: Maine Learning Results include the Common Core State Standards (jpg)</p> <p>Science Evidence 105 lists the formal adoption of the standards and evidence 104 (p. 80-103) lists the actual science content standards themselves</p>	
<p>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science specify what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school to succeed in college and the workforce; contain content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.</p>	<p>01: Title 20-A, Part 3, Chapter 222, § 6201 Legislative intent (pdf) 02: Title 20-A, Part 3, Chapter 222, § 6202 Assessment program established (pdf) 03: Title 20-A, Part 3, Chapter 222, § 6208 Legislative intent (pdf) 04: SP0705, LD 1800, item 1, 124th Maine State Legislature: An Act to Adopt the Common Core State Standards Initiative (pdf) 05: Maine Learning Results include the Common Core State Standards (jpg)</p>	<p>Maine adopted the Common Core Standards in 2011, which peers believe are rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.</p>
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p align="center">1.3 – Required Assessments</p> <p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments (based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate academic achievement standards-AAAS) in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). 	<p>07: Maine_DOE_Operational_Procedure_Manual_April_2016 (pdf) Section 1: 1.2 State requirements (p. 2; pdf) 08: eMPower_ME_School_TCM_FINAL (p.4, pdf) 09:RFP_201508154_Maine_Education_Assessments_Math&ELA_pp.1-4 (pdf) 10: DOE_a.m.Workshop_Slides (p.16, ppt) 11-1.3: Maine DOE sends out assessment communications via District Assessment Coordinators emails, MEA listserv announcements, and DOE Newsroom/Priority Notices. (pdf)</p>	<p>State-specific - Overall:</p> <p>Maine provided evidence that the State’s assessment system includes both annual general and alternate assessments in reading/ELA and mathematics in each grade 3-8 and in High School, and annual general statewide and alternate assessment in Science at least once in each grade span of 3-5, 6-9 and 10-12.</p>
<p>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u>_x_</u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

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
---	--	---

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p align="center">1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</p> <p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system; • For English learners (EL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment; ○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years. 	<p>All students: MSAA #106 is excerpt from Operations Procedures Manual that states that all students must be tested. PAAP Sci #115, pp. 1-9 says all students must be tested, except that it list the same emergency exemptions noted below from MSAA #107 OpProc, p. 8.</p> <p>MSAA #107 OpProc, p. 8. ED allows emergency exemptions from testing only for medical emergencies. Maine allows exemptions for a broader set of reasons, notably within five broad areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Emergency/Serious Illness: <input type="checkbox"/> Severe Emotional Distress <input type="checkbox"/> Death in the Immediate Family <input type="checkbox"/> Agency Involvement: Involvement by an outside agency such as Department of Health and Human Services or detention by law enforcement pending adjudication. <input type="checkbox"/> Exigent Circumstance: A situation that doesn't meet any of the above criteria. <p>CWD: PAAP Sci 112, p. 1 says all special education students in Maine must participate in State assessments.</p> <p>ELs: [Note: Staff could not open 107 Assessment of English Learners .JPG]</p> <p>MSAA #107 OpProc, p. 7 states “All EL students in grades 3-8 and in the 3rd year of high school, including those who were enrolled in a United States school for the first time on or after January 1, 2014, as indicated in the appropriate field in ICSE “Date</p>	<p>Overall: All Students: Maine has not adequately addressed this requirement. Although MSAA #106 (State Assessment Operations Procedure Manual) states that all students must be tested, PAAP Science #115 lists emergency exceptions for not testing students: medical emergency/serious illness, severe emotional distress, death in the immediate family, agency involvement and “exigent circumstance”, which is defined as “a situation that does not meet any of the above criteria”. ED allows testing exceptions for testing students if there is a documented medical emergency, Therefore, the exceptions listed on #115 allow for more than emergency medical situations and for situations that “does not meet the above criteria” (which could be <i>any</i> situation).</p> <p>CWD: PAAP Science #112 states that all special education students must participate in State assessments.</p> <p>EL: Maine has not adequately addressed this requirement. According to #07 Maine ODE Operational Procedures Manual (p.9, 2.11.8), Maine allows for a one-time exemption from the ELA/Reading statewide assessments for recently arrived EL, provided that they participated in the ACCESS for ELLs during the testing window or were administered the W-APT or MODEL if enrolled after the ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 testing window. There is no exemption for recently arrived EL from the mathematics or science assessment for English learners.</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 Maine – General assessments

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>Entered US School”, must participate in the MEA for Mathematics through standard administration, through administration with accommodations, or through the alternate assessment (NCSC). For the ELA/Literacy, ELs who were enrolled in a United States school for the first time on or after January 1, 2014, as indicated in the appropriate field in ICSE “Date Entered US School”, have a one-time exemption provided that they participated in the ACCESS for ELLs during the testing window or were administered the W-APT or MODEL if enrolled after the ACCESS for ELLs testing window.”</p> <p>MSAA #108: Maine allows the recently arrived exemption.</p>	<p>However, Maine does not explicitly state that EL students (other than recently arrived EL) are not exempt from statewide test taking. Maine explicitly state the inclusion of other groups and subgroups in statewide assessments (document #12 (Maine DOE Assessment Program, a one page JPEG) referred to document #07, Maine DOE Operational Procedure Manual, pp.5-9). This document does not contain a statement that EL (other than recently arrived) must take the statewide assessments in ELA/reading, math and science at the appropriate grade levels or bands..</p>
Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Maine 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, specifically that Maine allows exemptions only for medical emergencies – • Maine must provide evidence that the State requires the inclusion of EL students (other than recently arrived EL) in ELA/Reading, Math and Science statewide assessments throughout all public elementary and secondary school, and that it clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p align="center">1.5 – Participation Data</p> <p>The State’s participation data show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system. In addition, if the State administers end-of-course assessments for high school students, the State has procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates on each required assessment and provides the corresponding data.</p>	<p>13: ME_State_NCLB_Report_Card_2015-16 (p.2; pdf)</p> <p>82: Maine Peer Review Evidence 6.4 Reporting Public (pdf)</p>	<p>Maine has not adequately addressed this requirement. Maine provided partial evidence that all students are included in the State’s assessment system, as exemplified by the 2015-16 State Report Card. However, the evidence provided (#13 and #82) is for 2015-16 (reflecting assessment data from the 2014-15 assessments). Also, some student subgroup data is altogether missing (i.e. migrant), and reporting data on this subgroup participation data is required by ED. The evidence submitted with #82 (a screen shot of the State’s data page) does not show student subgroup participation data. Additionally, Maine did not provide evidence related to their administration of end-of-course assessments for high school students, and if the State has procedures in place to insure that each student is tested and counted and participation rate is calculated for each required assessment and group.</p>
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maine must provide more information on the State’s assessment participation data showing that all students, disaggregated by student groups and assessment types, are included in the State’s assessments. Maine must provide evidence related to their administration of end-of-course assessment for high school students. • Maine must provide evidence that there are procedures in place to insure that each student is tested and counted and that the participation rate is calculated for each required assessment and student group. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.1 – Test Design and Development</p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; • Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14: tech manual, p. 1 provides a statement of the purposes and a broad statement about intended interpretations and uses • 17:eMPower test blueprints and 18: eMPower frameworks mapped to standards • 20: HumRRO_RiderA_Maine DoE eMPowerME 20170606 (pdf) • N/A: The assessments are not computer-adaptive. <p>PAAP Science Alt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence 122, p. 4 and 117 (p. 3-4) • Evidence 116 (p. 24) shows what the state has labeled as test blueprints, but they are very schematic and do not appear to have sufficient detail to meet this part of the critical element. The blueprints show that only three standards are assessed per grade level (and in fact each assessed standard is only assessed at one grade level). This does not appear to comply with the requirement to measure the full range of the content standards. • Evidence 110 Level of Complexity (p. 2, 8-16) provides some evidence that higher-order thinking skills are required; evidence 123 (alignment study) 	<p>General 3/8 R/LA & Math</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evidence provided is a report of a HumRRO alignment study that was going to be conducted August 3-4. What is documented is the plan for the study, following Webb alignment, with recruitment procedures for representativeness of panelists. The study plan appears suitable, but peers request that the State provide the final report once it is available along with a plan to address any issues that are revealed. <p>The fact that the items are already-developed Measured Progress items, purportedly developed to assess the CC standards, but then mapped onto the ME standards makes it crucial to see the results of the alignment study before making a firm determination on this Element.</p> <p>PAAP Science Alt</p> <p>Please provide documentation to support the assertion that the assessment measures the full range of standards.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	N/A	
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
<p>For General 3/8 R/LA & Math <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The final report of the HumRRO alignment study and an action plan to address any issues <p>For PAAP Science Alt <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation to support the assertion that the assessment measures the full range of standard 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.2 – Item Development</p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p>For General 3/8 R/LA & Math 14: 2015-16 MEA ELA & Math Technical Report (p. 21-23) 15:ME_Educational_Assessment_Math_and_ELA_Measured_Progress_Proposal (p. 90-118)</p> <p>For PAAP Science Alt: Since this is a portfolio assessment, the teachers are responsible for task selection. Evidence 126, sent to teachers, states, “If you have tried an LoC that is too difficult and you do not have time to re-teach, submit only the lower LoC.” This is reflected in the p values and discrimination values by item (evidence 122, Appendix D), which have a median of about .85 and discrimination of about .1. These indicate that the test is too easy, and that it does not provide useful information to inform pedagogy.</p>	<p>For General 3/8 R/LA & Math Maine educators did not appear to have been involved in the item development to date but there is an assertion that they will be involved beginning in 2016. What is the status of this involvement?</p> <p>Evidence 15 (p. 111) refers to an alignment study in 2016, which peers could not locate in the documentation. Was this study done? If so, please provide the report and if not, how did Maine ensure that reasonable and technically sound procedures were used?</p> <p>Peers noted that evidence 15 is a proposal, rather than documentation of completed work. Maine should submit evidence showing that the work actually took place in the manner described.</p> <p>For PAAP Science Alt: Provide evidence that the task pool provides sufficiently challenging tasks.</p> <p>Take steps (such as involving a second observer on a sample of assessments) to ensure the inclusion of appropriately challenging tasks.</p>
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>For General 3/8 R/LA & Math <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of Maine educator involvement in item development and review • Final report of the alignment study referred to in Evidence 15 (p. 111) • Documentation that work described in the proposal occurred in the manner described <p>For PAAP Science Alt:</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 Maine – General assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>x</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the task pool provides sufficiently challenging tasks. • A process (such as involving a second observer on a sample of assessments) to ensure the inclusion of appropriately challenging tasks 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>For General 3/8 R/LA & Math</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 08: eMPower_ME_School_TCM_FINAL (p. 1-23) and 21: eMPower_ME_TAM_v3 (p. 3-63) outline administration procedures and 22: Accessibility_Guide_MEA_eMPowerME_updated_3.3.16 specifically spells out what accommodations may be used, on what basis, and how to set them up for online or paper testing • Evidence 08, 21, and 26 (workshop slides) • Evidence 26 (test administration training slides) show clearly what the technical requirements are and how test administrators should perform workstation readiness checks before administration. Evidence 40 and 41 show test administrators and coordinators how to set up the tests in the online system, including accommodations. There is a clear chain of command beginning with the test administrator, going to the school coordinator, and then extending to District Test Coordinators (evidence 28). There are contingency plans not only for technology issues during test administration but also for a variety of other circumstances (e.g, students who become ill during a test, technical failures, fire drills, etc.) <p>For PAAP Science Alt:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence 116 • Evidence 133 and 134 <p>N/A: Although teachers submit portfolios electronically, the assessments are not technology-based.</p>	<p>Overall note: Peers noted that although email communication from the Maine DOE was clear, the number and frequency of the messages may reduce their effectiveness.</p> <p>For General 3/8 R/LA & Math</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The test administration manuals spell out the responsibilities for each role and provide clear instructions. The workshop slides (dated February 2016) in evidence 26 appear thorough but it is unclear who received the training and what procedure there is to ensure that all relevant personnel are trained and with what frequency training occurs. <p>For PAAP Science Alt:</p> <p>Evidence 116 (top of p. 11) documents that the tasks can be re-administered, re-taught, and re-administered indefinitely until the students succeed. Although peers realize that this is not unheard of in alternate assessment, it affects the standardization and interpretation of the results.</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 Maine – General assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 2.3 Summary Statement		
For General 3/8 R/LA & Math and for PAAP Alt Science		
<u> x </u> 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 Maine – General assessments

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p align="center">2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p>Consortium MSAA R&M: The Maine peer review submission cover sheet and indicate evidence for Maine for this critical element is entirely State-specific.</p> <p>State-specific MSAA R&M:</p> <p>PAAP Science: Evidence cited, #116, #134, #135, #136, is about basically front-end procedures and a principal certification (#135). In its index, Maine notes, “Maine DOE does not have the capacity to make a substantial number of visits statewide during the test administration. The Alternate Assessment Coordinator is primarily needed at the Department during testing to deal with issues and questions that arise. Maine relies heavily on Principals to monitor training and test administration. The Alternate Assessment Coordinator is available for questions throughout the test administration.” (Index, p. 9) At best, this is very limited and potentially not adequate.</p>	<p>what is needed from ME is to provide additional strategies to ensure that standardized test administration procedures for the PAAR alternate assessment are implemented with fidelity across Maine districts and schools.</p> <p>Examples of strategies could be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Develop a feasible monitoring plan for the administration of alternate assessments, •Annual training for the school principals or designees on Alternate Assessment testing administration protocols, •Develop and distribute among school districts a Q and A for Alternate Assessment Administration so that it may free some of the time of the Alternate Assessment Testing Administrator do conduct monitoring activities.
Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
<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"> • Evidence that 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 • A policy or indication that annual training is required at the district and school level for everyone involved in test administration • A remediation plan as well as the Test Security Handbook and the Caveon audit report of the state’s current practices 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.5 – Test Security</p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence 29, 30, 31, 32, and 35 • Evidence 31 and 32 • Peers could not locate evidence of a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence 35 is a webinar training on test security, but peers could not locate any policy or indication that <u>annual</u> training is required at the district and school level for everyone involved in test administration. <p>Maine provided sufficient evidence of policies and procedures to detect test irregularities. Peers noted, however, in evidence 47 that Maine documented a potential security breach that was treated as a technology glitch (when the test platform was left open for an extended period of time). This calls into question the very limited monitoring that has been done. The State has contracted for a recent Caveon audit of the program elements. The final report from this audit should be submitted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <p>There was no documentation provided of a consistent or representative monitoring/site visit process, which is important for detecting test irregularities. In the submission notes, MDOE staff indicated that they had done 2 site visits in the last testing year and it is unclear why these were chosen. They also indicated that they would be working on a process for monitoring in districts that “ask for, or are seen as more likely to require that level of support” (submission notes). This suggests issues, and a feasible monitoring plan that samples districts representatively, not just by perceived need, should be developed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maine needs to submit a remediation plan as

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>plan/process for remediation following test security incidents. Maine has a contract (evidence 49) with Caveon Test Security, who will develop a Test Security Handbook and audit the state’s current practices by the end of August.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peers could not locate evidence of a plan/process for investigating alleged or factual test irregularities. Evidence 50 provides some data forensics that the vendor conducted but this does not suffice. 	<p>well as the Test Security Handbook and the audit report of the state’s current practices.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maine needs to submit a plan/process for investigating alleged or factual test irregularities.
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>For General 3/8 R/LA & Math</p> <p><u>x</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A policy or indication that <u>annual</u> training is required at the district and school level for everyone involved in test administration A feasible monitoring plan A remediation plan as well as the Test Security Handbook and the Caveon audit report of the state’s current practices A plan/process for investigating alleged or factual test irregularities Summary of detected irregularities in any given assessment year and disposition of those, as well as any policy changes made as a result 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence 8 and 21 • Evidence 29 and 30 • Evidence 52 (p. 68 and 73); Evidence 13 (report card) has a footnote that indicates the minimum n size for reporting (e.g., see p. 22 footnote: “Participation requires a minimum of 41 students in a subgroup and Performance requires a minimum of 10 students in a subgroup. Data are suppressed for any cell representing fewer than 10 students.”) 	
Section 2.6 Summary Statement		
<u> x </u> No additional evidence is required for General 3/8 R/LA & Math		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test blueprints (evidence 17 and 14, Appendix Q) provide some limited evidence to support alignment between standards and assessments, but the results from the planned alignment study by HumRRO are crucial to document adequate alignment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maine should submit the report of the HumRRO validity study along with a plan for addressing issues. <p>Peers noted that the planned study (to be conducted in August 2017) was for the 2015-2016 test. How will alignment of new forms be evaluated/what is the plan for ensuring ongoing alignment of new forms?</p> <p>Peers further noted that evidence 15 (p. 236) states, “Evidence for the validity of the Maine eMPower Plus Assessments test content will be described extensively in the technical manual.” However, the validity chapter (chapter IX) of the technical manual (evidence 14) does not include any actual validity evidence but is rather a two page section of definitions. Maine should insist that the vendor provide a fully responsive validity section for 2016-2017.</p>
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p> <p>For General 3/8 R/LA & Math</p> <p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final report of alignment study (as also requested in 2.2) and a plan for ensuring ongoing alignment of subsequent forms. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>Test blueprints (17 and 14, Appendix Q) provide some limited evidence to support alignment between standards and assessments; the HumRRO Webb alignment study will help to get at cognitive processes through DOK.</p>	<p>Maine should submit the report of the HumRRO validity study along with a plan for addressing issues.</p> <p>Maine should further document that the assessments tap intended cognitive processes (e.g., by conducting cognitive labs or statistical analysis of the test content.) DOK alone is not fully responsive to this critical element.</p>
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>For General 3/8 R/LA & Math</p> <p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final report of alignment study (as also requested in 2.2 and 3.1.) • Documentation that the assessments tap intended cognitive processes. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p>Evidence 14 p. 7-14: distribution of items across sub-domains p. 161: correlations of dimensions of the writing prompts p. 41 and Appendix I: DIF analyses p. 42: dimensionality analysis</p>	<p>In the submission notes, Maine indicates that they did not use the subscore categories commonly used in the eMpower product but rather that they created their own. Documentation of the process by which that was done should be provided.</p> <p>Maine should also provide statistical analyses supporting the use of the Maine-developed subscore categories, showing that they are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards.</p>
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>For General 3/8 R/LA & Math</p> <p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of the process by which the eMPowerME subscore categories were developed • Statistical analyses supporting the use of the Maine-developed subscore categories 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>Evidence 14, p. 62 shows that the state does not appear to have done any analyses to determine how the assessment scores are related to other variables: “...additional studies might be considered to provide evidence regarding the relationship of eMPowerME results to other variables.”</p> <p>In the peer review submission notes, the state indicates that it has budgeted \$25K/yr to supplement external validity studies. Evidence 15 (contract with Measured Progress) also indicates that studies will be conducted but there is no detail on the specific analyses that will be run.</p>	<p>Maine should provide results of the external validity study (or studies) documenting the relationship between scores and other variables.</p>
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>For General 3/8 R/LA & Math</p> <p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results of the external validity study (or studies) documenting the relationship between scores on the general assessment and other variables 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.1 – Reliability</p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement. 	<p>Evidence 14:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • p. 54-60: reliability for each grade test Appendix N: reliability for student groups Appendix O: inter-rater reliability • Appendix L: overall and CSEMs • Appendix P (p. 288) • N/A: Assessments are not computer-adaptive 	<p>Overall comment: Peers noted that there are significant numbers of very difficult items, especially in math, which has an obvious impact on reliability. Maine should problematize this rather than simply stating in the tech manual that item statistics are “generally acceptable and within expected ranges”.</p>
<p>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>For General 3/8 R/LA & Math <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 Maine – General assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<p>Evidence 14, p. 21-22 documents the test development process</p> <p>Evidence 15, p. 107-113, 141-142, 166-212: means of addressing accessibility in vendor proposal</p> <p>Evidence 22: accessibility guide and evidence 57: accommodations for paper-based test</p> <p>Appendix I: DIF analyses (2015-16)</p>	<p>The State’s processes for ensuring accessibility are appropriate, although peers noted that the results of DIF analyses flagged an unexpectedly large number of items and there was no indication of what steps were taken to address the issue.</p>
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>For General 3/8 R/LA & Math</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of how issues raised in the DIF analyses will be addressed in future test forms. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>Evidence 14, Appendix K (TIFs) and L (scale score charts)</p>	<p>Peers noted that the precision of the estimates was much stronger for the higher end of the continuum (high achieving students) (e.g., p. 7 of evidence 14, Appendix K), especially in math. Maine should address the lack of information for lower performing students.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>For General 3/8 R/LA & Math</p> <p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A plan to address the lower precision of estimates at the low end of the performance continuum. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>Evidence 14, chapter 5: scoring chapter in technical manual Evidence 14, Appendix F: essay writing Evidence 14, Appendix O: inter-rater reliability</p>	
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>For General 3/8 R/LA & Math <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 Maine – General assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p>Evidence 14, p. 5</p> <p>Evidence 58 (equating report)</p> <p>There is one form per year and forms are equated across years, as shown in the equating report. It appears that the data were just analyzed and there is no text explanation in the version of the document provided (only tables).</p>	<p>Maine should provide the final version of the equating report.</p>
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>For General 3/8 R/LA & Math</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The final version of the equating report 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<p>In addition to the online assessment, there are paper versions, large print versions, and Braille.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence 14, p. 23-24 The State provided Evidence 60, but this shows only how many administrations there have been of the online assessment across devices. Peers could not locate evidence of comparability across versions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maine needs to provide either a study demonstrating the comparability of paper, large print, and Braille versions to the online test or reference comparable studies conducted by others.
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>For General 3/8 R/LA & Math</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of comparability of paper, large print, and Braille versions to the online test. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p>Evidence 15, p. 32-34, 232-234 (contract specifying the expectations for analyses of reliability, validity, and fairness)</p> <p>Evidence 14, chapter IX (documentation of proposed studies)</p> <p>Evidence 61-63 (TAC minutes)</p>	
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>For General 3/8 R/LA & Math <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 Maine – General assessments

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards; • States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs; • Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment; • Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities; • Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities; • Includes instructions that students eligible to be 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence 65 (guidance to IEP teams) • Evidence 65 (guidance to IEP teams) • Evidence 65, 22 (accessibility guide) • Evidence 22 (accessibility guide) and 57 (accommodations for paper version) • Evidence 22, 57, and 65 • Evidence 22 <p>Peers could not locate a specific statement that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA. Peers, however, think that the State complies with the spirit of the element; the issue is simply wording.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peers could not locate documentation 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maine should provide documentation of eligibility based on any IDEA disability category. • Maine should provide documentation 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.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments); The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum. 		
<p>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>For General 3/8 R/LA & Math</p> <p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of eligibility based on any IDEA disability category Documentation 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 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peers could not locate procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodations. We intuit that the Language Acquisition Plan referred to in p. 21 is involved, but documentation was not found. • Evidence 22 lists accessibility tools and features available to all students and accommodations for ELs • Peers could not locate guidance regarding how to select appropriate accommodations for English learners from the list provided. 	<p>Peers could not locate documentation of plans to communicate these procedures to parents. Maine should provide documentation to this effect.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maine should provide documentation for the procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodations. • Maine should provide guidance regarding how to select appropriate accommodations for English learners from the list provided.
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>For General 3/8 R/LA & Math</p> <p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation that it clearly communicates inclusion procedures for ELs to districts, schools, teachers, and parents. • Documentation for the procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodations. • Guidance regarding how to select appropriate accommodations for English learners from the list provided. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence 14, p. 26, Appendix E Evidence 21, p. 10 Accommodations available to students are fairly common in statewide assessment, but peers could not locate any documentation of the appropriacy of them. Evidence 07, p. 13-15 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maine should provide evidence to demonstrate the appropriacy of the available accommodations. One possible manner would be to reference the CCSSO accommodations guidance.
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
For General 3/8 R/LA & Math		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence to demonstrate the appropriacy of the available accommodations. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. 	<p>Applies to all bullets:</p> <p>Peers could not locate any evidence of a monitoring plan for test administration for special populations, nor did we find evidence of systematic monitoring.</p>	<p>Maine should provide a monitoring plan for test administration for special populations. This does not necessarily entail state visits or a costly process but could involve things as simple as checklists completed by second in-school observers verifying the accommodations.</p>
<p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>For General 3/8 R/LA & Math</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maine should provide a monitoring plan for test administration for special populations 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; • The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peers could not locate formal adoption of the academic achievement standards, although we did see an indication that they had been approved (evidence 71, Appendix M). • Peers could not locate documentation that clearly states that the grade-level academic achievement standards apply to all public elementary and secondary students, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. • Evidence 71 and 72 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maine should provide documentation of formal adoption. • Maine should provide documentation that clearly states that the grade-level academic achievement standards apply to all public elementary and secondary students, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

Section 6.1 Summary Statement

<p>For General 3/8 R/LA & Math</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of formal adoption of academic achievement standards. • Documentation that clearly states that the grade-level academic achievement standards apply to all public elementary and secondary students, with the exception of
--

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p>Evidence 71 (standard setting report) Evidence 73</p>	<p>The standard setting process was technically sound overall. However, Maine should justify why the panels were so small, and, in all cases, 2 or 3 members smaller than planned. The limited panel size has clear meaning for both the representativeness of the panels and the stability of their recommendations.</p> <p>Peers’ concern about both the small size and the representativeness of the panels is exacerbated by the curious lack of information about the panelists’ individual judgments in the MP report. We could not locate anything in this report that illustrates the range of panel judgments, an essential element of assessing the quality of a standard-setting activity. Showing the medians (in theta terms only) is simply inadequate.</p> <p>A further cause of non-trivial concern is simply the size of the panels. I would be troubled by standard-setting panels of 8-10 members – as originally requested by ME. However, 3 of the 6 panels had only 7 members and the others had only 8.</p> <p>Recognizing that ME is small, peers find that a panel size of 7 or 8 is unlikely to generate the breadth of expertise, experience, and perspectives that this process demands. It’s fine to say that the panels included “representative samples of general and special educators, administrators, and curriculum specialists” and to ask the prospective panelists a broad set of questions concerning their qualifications. However, it strains credibility to think that 7 selected panelists would possibly adequately represent the set of expertise sought.</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 Maine – General assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 6.2 Summary Statement		
<p>For General 3/8 R/LA & Math</p> <p><u>x</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Justification of the small sample size for the standard setting study (e.g., a confirmatory study). Can such a small group adequately represent the entire State? • Individual judgments by round for the standard setting study 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p>Evidence 71, p. 3 indicates only that the ALDs were developed by the vendor. Peers could not locate documentation of the process by which they were developed.</p>	<p>Maine should provide evidence to address this critical element (e.g., description of the way the ALDs were developed, showing that the grade-level content standards were used as the main reference in their creation.</p>
<p>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>For General 3/8 R/LA & Math</p> <p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A description of the way the ALDs were developed, showing that the grade-level content standards were used as the main reference in their creation, or some other means of showing that the State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">6.4 – Reporting</p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration; • The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results; • The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement; ○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors); ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; ○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peers reviewed evidence 79 and 80, which are public reports, but they do not show results at each proficiency level (only at or above expectations). • Evidence 81 (sample report) Peers could not locate interpretive guides. • Evidence 81 and 85 (alternate versions of score report); Peers noted that the ALD statements used in standards setting are different than the ones in the score reports. • Evidence 86-88 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maine should provide a public report that shows results at each proficiency level. • Maine should provide an interpretive score guide. • Maine should explain the differences between the performance labels used in standards setting and the ones in the score reports. • Maine has provided sufficient evidence to address this part of the critical element. Peers did note that the timelines for delivering score reports do not appear to be “as soon as practicable”.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – General assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. 		
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
<p>For General 3/8 R/LA & Math</p> <p><u>x</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A public report that shows results at each proficiency level. • An interpretive score guide. • Explanation of the differences between the student performance labels and descriptors used in standards setting and the ones in the score reports.. 		

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

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

August 2017 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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 Maine – Alternate Assessment
(Math and R/LA)

Contents

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).....	8
1.5 – Participation Data (reviewed by Department staff only).....	10
SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS	11
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	12
2.2 – Item Development.....	14
2.3 – Test Administration	17
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)	19
2.5 – Test Security	21
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....	23
SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....	24
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	24
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	25
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	26
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	27
SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER	28
4.1 – Reliability.....	28
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	29
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	30
4.4 – Scoring	31
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	32
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	33
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance.....	34
SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS	35
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	36
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	38
5.3 – Accommodations.....	39
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	40
SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .	41
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students	41
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....	44
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	46
6.4 – Reporting.....	48

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment
(Math and R/LA)**

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State.</p>	<p>Evidence 102 (formal adoption of Common Core by the legislature)</p>	<p>Most of the Evidence cited by the State is unrelated to the Element, but #102 is on-point.</p>
<p>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science specify what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school to succeed in college and the workforce; contain content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.</p>	<p>Peers reviewed the evidence cited, but could not locate the standards themselves.</p>	<p>Please provide reading/language arts and math content standards.</p>
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic content standards in reading/language arts and math. <p>:</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 Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p align="center">1.3 – Required Assessments</p> <p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments (based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate academic achievement standards-AAAS) in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). 	<p>07: Maine_DOE_Operational_Procedure_Manual_April_2016 (pdf) Section 1: 1.2 State requirements (p. 2; pdf) 08: eMPower_ME_School_TCM_FINAL (p.4, pdf) 09:RFP_201508154_Maine_Education_Assessments_Math&ELA_pp.1-4 (pdf) 10: DOE_a.m.Workshop_Slides (p.16, ppt) 11-1.3: Maine DOE sends out assessment communications via District Assessment Coordinators emails, MEA listserv announcements, and DOE Newsroom/Priority Notices. (pdf)</p>	<p>State-specific - Overall:</p> <p>Maine provided evidence that the State’s assessment system includes both annual general and alternate assessments in reading/ELA and mathematics in each grade 3-8 and in High School, and annual general statewide and alternate assessment in Science at least once in each grade span of 3-5, 6-9 and 10-12.</p>
<p>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

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
---	--	---

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p align="center">1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</p> <p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system; • For English learners (EL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment; ○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years. 	<p>NOTE TO PEERS DO NOT COMPLETE OR REVIEW-ED STAFF REVIEWS THIS EVIDENCE</p> <p>All students: MSAA #106 is excerpt from Operations Procedures Manual that states that all students must be tested. PAAP Sci #115, pp. 1-9 says all students must be tested, except that it list the same emergency exemptions noted below from MSAA #107 OpProc, p. 8.</p> <p>MSAA #107 OpProc, p. 8. ED allows emergency exemptions from testing only for medical emergencies. Maine allows exemptions for a broader set of reasons, notably within five broad areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Emergency/Serious Illness: <input type="checkbox"/> Severe Emotional Distress <input type="checkbox"/> Death in the Immediate Family <input type="checkbox"/> Agency Involvement: Involvement by an outside agency such as Department of Health and Human Services or detention by law enforcement pending adjudication. <input type="checkbox"/> Exigent Circumstance: A situation that doesn't meet any of the above criteria. <p>CWD: PAAP Sci 112, p. 1 says all special education students in Maine must participate in State assessments.</p> <p>ELs: [Note: Staff could not open 107 Assessment of English Learners .JPG]</p>	<p>NOTE TO PEERS DO NOT COMPLETE OR REVIEW-ED STAFF REVIEWS THIS EVIDENCE</p> <p>State-specific - Overall: All Students: Maine has not adequately addressed this requirement. Although MSAA #106 (State Assessment Operations Procedure Manual) states that all students must be tested, PAAP Science #115 lists emergency exceptions for not testing students: medical emergency/serious illness, severe emotional distress, death in the immediate family, agency involvement and “exigent circumstance”, which is defined as “a situation that does not meet any of the above criteria”. ED allows testing exceptions for testing students if there is a documented medical emergency. Therefore, the exceptions listed on #115 allow for more than emergency medical situations and for situations that “does not meet the above criteria” (which could be <i>any</i> situation).</p> <p>CWD: PAAP Science #112 states that all special education students must participate in State assessments.</p> <p>EL: Maine has not adequately addressed this requirement. According to #07 Maine ODE Operational Procedures Manual (p.9, 2.11.8), Maine allows for a one-time exemption from the ELA/Reading statewide assessments for recently arrived EL, provided that they participated in the ACCESS for</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

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>MSAA #107 OpProc, p. 7 states “All EL students in grades 3-8 and in the 3rd year of high school, including those who were enrolled in a United States school for the first time on or after January 1, 2014, as indicated in the appropriate field in ICSE “Date Entered US School”, must participate in the MEA for Mathematics through standard administration, through administration with accommodations, or through the alternate assessment (NCSC).</p> <p>For the ELA/Literacy, ELs who were enrolled in a United States school for the first time on or after January 1, 2014, as indicated in the appropriate field in ICSE “Date Entered US School”, have a one-time exemption provided that they participated in the ACCESS for ELLs during the testing window or were administered the W-APT or MODEL if enrolled after the ACCESS for ELLs testing window.”</p> <p>MSAA #108: Maine allows the recently arrived exemption.</p>	<p>ELLs during the testing window or were administered the W-APT or MODEL if enrolled after the ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 testing window. There is no exemption for recently arrived EL from the mathematics or science assessment for English learners.</p> <p>However, Maine does not explicitly state that EL students (other than recently arrived EL) are not exempt from statewide test taking. Maine explicitly state the inclusion of other groups and subgroups in statewide assessments (document #12 (Maine DOE Assessment Program, a one page JPEG) referred to document #07, Maine DOE Operational Procedure Manual, pp.5-9). This document does not contain a statement that EL (other than recently arrived) must take the statewide assessments in ELA/reading, math and science at the appropriate grade levels or bands..</p>
<p>Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Maine 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, specifically that Maine allows exemptions only for medical emergencies. • Maine must provide evidence that the State requires the inclusion of EL students (other than recently arrived EL) in ELA/Reading, Math and Science statewide assessments throughout all public elementary and secondary school, and that it clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p align="center">1.5 – Participation Data</p> <p>The State’s participation data show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system. In addition, if the State administers end-of-course assessments for high school students, the State has procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates on each required assessment and provides the corresponding data.</p>	<p>13: ME_State_NCLB_Report_Card_2015-16 (p.2; pdf)</p> <p>82: Maine Peer Review Evidence 6.4 Reporting Public (pdf)</p>	<p>State-specific - Overall:</p> <p>Maine has not adequately addressed this requirement. Maine provided partial evidence that all students are included in the State’s assessment system, as exemplified by the 2015-16 State Report Card. However, the evidence provided (#13 and #82) is for 2015-16 (reflecting assessment data from the 2014-15 assessments). Also, some student subgroup data is altogether missing (i.e. migrant), and reporting data on this subgroup participation data is required by ED. The evidence submitted with #82 (a screen shot of the State’s data page) does not show student subgroup participation data. Additionally, Maine did not provide evidence related to their administration of end-of-course assessments for high school students, and if the State has procedures in place to insure that each student is tested and counted and participation rate is calculated for each required assessment and group.</p>
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p>–</p> <p>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maine must provide more information on the State’s assessment participation data showing that all students, disaggregated by student groups and assessment types, are included in the State’s assessments. Maine must provide evidence related to their administration of end-of-course assessment for high school students. <p>Maine must provide evidence that there are procedures in place to insure that each student is tested and counted and that the participation rate is calculated for each required assessment and student group.</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 Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.1 – Test Design and Development</p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; • Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design. 	<p>for MSAA R/LA &Math—coordinated submission and reviews</p> <p>No State-specific evidence provided</p>	
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>for MSAA R/LA &Math—see coordinated submission and reviews</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.2 – Item Development</p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p>for MSAA R/LA &Math—coordinated submission and reviews</p> <p>No State-specific evidence provided</p>	
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>for MSAA R/LA &Math—see coordinated submission and reviews</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 Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence 107 (test administration manual) Evidence 113 (accommodations) Evidence 116-118 (communication to educators via listserv) • Evidence 118 (memo to test coordinators), 119, 122 (training) • Evidence 125 lists the technology requirements. Peers reviewed evidence 112, but this is just a list of documents from the ME website and we could not see the actual contingency plans. 	<p>Peers noted that although email communication from the Maine DOE was clear, the number and frequency of the messages may reduce their effectiveness. Peers suggest a single, clear and complete set of instructions/directions on steps or procedures that need to be taken during the year and during the administration itself</p> <p>Please provide the actual technology contingency plan.</p>
<p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> For MSAA</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technology contingency plan 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p align="center">2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p>State-specific – MeCAS R&M Gr 3-8:</p> <p>Consortium MSAA R&M: The Maine peer review submission cover sheet and directions from Don Peasley indicate evidence for Maine for this critical element is entirely State-specific.</p> <p>State-specific MSAA R&M:</p> <p>PAAP Science: Evidence cited, #116, #134, #135, #136, is about basically front-end procedures and a principal certification (#135). In its index, Maine notes, “Maine DOE does not have the capacity to make a substantial number of visits statewide during the test administration. The Alternate Assessment Coordinator is primarily needed at the Department during testing to deal with issues and questions that arise. Maine relies heavily on Principals to monitor training and test administration. The Alternate Assessment Coordinator is available for questions throughout the test administration.” (Index, p. 9) At best, this is very limited and potentially not adequate.</p>	<p>what is needed from ME is to provide additional strategies to ensure that standardized test administration procedures for the PAAR alternate assessment are implemented with fidelity across Maine districts and schools.</p> <p>Examples of strategies could be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Develop a feasible monitoring plan for the administration of alternate assessments, •Annual training for the school principals or designees on Alternate Assessment testing administration protocols, •Develop and distribute among school districts a Q and A for Alternate Assessment Administration so that it may free some of the time of the Alternate Assessment Testing Administrator do conduct monitoring activities.
<p>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</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"> • Evidence that 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 • A policy or indication that annual training is required at the district and school level for everyone involved in test administration • A remediation plan as well as the Test Security Handbook and the Caveon audit report of the state’s current practices 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.5 – Test Security</p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. 	<p>Peers see that Maine-specific evidence 115 is their test security agreement and evidence 129 outlines a clear protocol for detecting test irregularities. It appears that consortium evidence was submitted for the remaining parts of this critical element and would need to be evaluated for compliance.</p>	
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No state-specific evidence provided • Peers could not locate district and school guidelines for securing student data, privacy, and confidentiality. • Evidence 133 (waiver for small n size, p. 68, 73) and 110 shows a sample report card 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidance to districts and schools for securing student data, privacy, and confidentiality
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>For MSAA:</p> <p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidance to districts and schools for securing student data, privacy, and confidentiality 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. 	<p>for MSAA R/LA &Math—coordinated submission and reviews</p> <p>No State-specific evidence provided</p>	
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>for MSAA R/LA &Math—see coordinated submission and reviews</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>for MSAA R/LA &Math—coordinated submission and reviews</p> <p>No State-specific evidence provided</p>	
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>for MSAA R/LA &Math—see coordinated submission and reviews</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p>for MSAA R/LA &Math—coordinated submission and reviews</p> <p>No State-specific evidence provided</p>	
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>for MSAA R/LA &Math—see coordinated submission and reviews</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>for MSAA R/LA &Math—coordinated submission and reviews</p> <p>No State-specific evidence provided</p>	
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>for MSAA R/LA &Math—see coordinated submission and reviews</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.1 – Reliability</p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement. 	<p>for MSAA R/LA &Math—coordinated submission and reviews</p> <p>No State-specific evidence provided</p>	
<p>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>for MSAA R/LA &Math—see coordinated submission and reviews</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<p>for MSAA R/LA &Math—coordinated submission and reviews</p> <p>No State-specific evidence provided</p>	
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>for MSAA R/LA &Math—see coordinated submission and reviews</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>for MSAA R/LA &Math—coordinated submission and reviews</p> <p>No State-specific evidence provided</p>	
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>for MSAA R/LA &Math—see coordinated submission and reviews</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>for MSAA R/LA &Math—coordinated submission and reviews</p> <p>No State-specific evidence provided</p>	
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>for MSAA R/LA &Math—see coordinated submission and reviews</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p>for MSAA R/LA &Math—coordinated submission and reviews</p> <p>No State-specific evidence provided</p>	
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>for MSAA R/LA &Math—see coordinated submission and reviews</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<p>for MSAA R/LA &Math—coordinated submission and reviews</p> <p>No State-specific evidence provided</p>	
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>for MSAA R/LA &Math—see coordinated submission and reviews</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p>for MSAA R/LA &Math—coordinated submission and reviews</p> <p>No State-specific evidence provided</p>	
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>for MSAA R/LA &Math—see coordinated submission and reviews</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards; • States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs; • Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment; • Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities; • Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities; • Includes instructions that students eligible to be 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence 134-137 provide clear guidance about the differences between general assessments and alt assessments, including consequences thereof • No state-specific evidence submitted • Evidence 134 and 135 are the participation guidelines to determine which assessment is appropriate • Maine-specific evidence addressing accessibility tools and features includes training (evidence 119-122); evidence 113 is a table of accommodations; consortium evidence appears to have been submitted as well • Evidence 113 (table of accommodations) provides some guidance about the selection of appropriate accommodations; consortium evidence appears to have been submitted as well • Peers could not locate a specific statement that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA. • Evidence 137 is a FAQ document, but it appears to be a NCSC document that does not provide State-specific consequences of taking the alt: “Some states may have policies that use student assessment results in a way that affects student promotion or graduation. If a state plans to do 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cited evidence contains information that directly addresses this critical element, but it appears to be out of date (e.g., the bottom of the page in evidence 135 still references the 2014-15 Smarter Balanced assessment, which the State no longer uses); since the submission was of 2014-15 assessments, though, this is OK. <p>Please provide documentation that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA.</p> <p>Please provide a document with Maine-specific consequences.</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 Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments); The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum. 	<p>this, it must conduct studies to show that the assessment is appropriate for this purpose.” Maine DOE placed a note in the submission index indicating that “attaining proficiency is not a graduate requirement” but this should be communicated to parents or broader stakeholders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The state-specific evidence submitted (evidence 119 and 120) does not appear to address this part of the critical element. Consortium evidence should be examined. 	
<p>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>for MSAA R/LA &Math—•</p> <p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA. Revised documents in evidence 136 and 137 that include Maine-specific information 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence submitted by the State (evidence 135) does not address this part of the critical element; peers could not locate procedures for determining whether ELs should be assessed with accommodations. This may have been addressed by the consortium. • No state-specific evidence submitted • No state-specific evidence submitted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please provide documentation of procedures for determining whether ELs should be assessed with accommodations.
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</p> <p>for MSAA R/LA & Math—</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of procedures for determining whether ELs should be assessed with accommodations 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The evidence submitted (evidence 135, 113, and 139) does not appear to address this part of the critical element. Consortium evidence should be reviewed to determine compliance with this element. No state-specific evidence submitted No state-specific evidence submitted The evidence submitted (evidence 135 and 113) does not appear to address this part of the critical element. The submission notes that they are developing a new request form. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please provide documentation of a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.
<p>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>for MSAA R/LA &Math—</p> <p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. 	<p>Peers could not locate any evidence of a monitoring plan for test administration for special populations, nor did we find evidence of systematic monitoring.</p>	<p>The State’s submission notes indicate, “During 2014-2015 Maine DOE attempted to visit local districts, but did not secure an observation date”. Additional efforts are needed.</p> <p>Maine should provide a monitoring plan for test administration for special populations. This does not necessarily entail state visits or a costly process but could involve things as simple as checklists completed by second in-school observers verifying the accommodations.</p>
<p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>for MSAA R/LA & Math—</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A monitoring plan for test administration for special populations 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; • The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels. 	<p>Evidence 141 (letter from Acting Deputy Commissioner) documents formal adoption</p> <p>No further state-specific evidence provided. Consortium evidence should be reviewed for compliance with this critical element.</p>	<p>Describe the process of Maine's review of the NCSC-determined performance standards and how ME determined their appropriateness.</p>
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p> <p>for MSAA R/LA & Math—</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p>for MSAA R/LA &Math—coordinated submission and reviews</p> <p>No State-specific evidence provided</p>	
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>for MSAA R/LA &Math—see coordinated submission and reviews</p> <p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p>for MSAA R/LA &Math—coordinated submission and reviews</p> <p>No State-specific evidence provided</p>	
<p>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>for MSAA R/LA &Math—see coordinated submission and reviews</p> <p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">6.4 – Reporting</p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration; • The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results; • The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement; ○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors); ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; ○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence 110 (report card) • The evidence submitted (evidence 142 and 143) appears to be NCSC interpretation documents that have not been tailored to the State. • Evidence 143 provides clear guidance for parents and teachers • Evidence 144 and 145 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peers noted that evidence 110 references data from 2012-2013 and 2013-2014, meaning that it does not report results from the NCSC assessment, which only began to be administered in 2014-2015. In the report card provided, it is unclear whether the performance levels for students taking the general and the alternate were disaggregated. Please provide percentages at each proficiency level specifically for the alternate assessment. • Please provide interpretation documents that contain state-specific information. • Sufficient • Sufficient Peers noted that from the time the results were made available online, there was only two weeks for parents to download score reports. This seems to be an unreasonable time frame that might even encourage insecure storage because districts could be tempted to download them and save them locally.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine – Alternate Assessment (Math and R/LA)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. 		
<p>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</p> <p>for MSAA R/LA & Math—</p> <p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentages of students at each proficiency level specifically for the alternate assessment. • Score interpretation documents that contain state-specific information. 		

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

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

August 2017 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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 Maine (Alternate Assessment-
Science)

Contents

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).....	8
1.5 – Participation Data (reviewed by Department staff only).....	10
SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS	11
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	12
2.2 – Item Development.....	14
2.3 – Test Administration	17
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)	19
2.5 – Test Security	21
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....	23
SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....	24
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	24
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	25
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	26
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	27
SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER	28
4.1 – Reliability.....	28
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	29
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	30
4.4 – Scoring	31
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	32
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	33
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance.....	34
SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS	35
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	36
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	38
5.3 – Accommodations.....	39
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	40
SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .	41
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students	41
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....	44
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	46
6.4 – Reporting.....	48

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-
Science)**

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State.</p>	<p>Evidence 105 lists the formal adoption of the standards and evidence 104 (p. 80-103) lists the actual science content standards themselves</p>	
<p>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science specify what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school to succeed in college and the workforce; contain content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.</p>	<p>Evidence 110 and 104</p> <p>Peers located limited evidence of broad stakeholder involvement in the process by which the science standards (evidence 103) were developed, but we could not locate any for the AGLEs.</p>	<p>Please provide documentation of the process used to develop the standards and the AGLEs.</p>
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of the process by which the science standards and AGLEs were developed. <p>:</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 Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p align="center">1.3 – Required Assessments</p> <p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments (based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate academic achievement standards-AAAS) in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). 	<p>07: Maine_DOE_Operational_Procedure_Manual_April_2016 (pdf) Section 1: 1.2 State requirements (p. 2; pdf) 08: eMPower_ME_School_TCM_FINAL (p.4, pdf) 09:RFP_201508154_Maine_Education_Assessments_Math&ELA_pp.1-4 (pdf) 10: DOE_a.m.Workshop_Slides (p.16, ppt) 11-1.3: Maine DOE sends out assessment communications via District Assessment Coordinators emails, MEA listserv announcements, and DOE Newsroom/Priority Notices. (pdf)</p>	<p>State-specific - Overall:</p> <p>Maine provided evidence that the State’s assessment system includes both annual general and alternate assessments in reading/ELA and mathematics in each grade 3-8 and in High School, and annual general statewide and alternate assessment in Science at least once in each grade span of</p>
<p>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/>_x_ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p style="text-align: center;">1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</p> <p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system; • For English learners (EL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment; ○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years. 	<p>All students: MSAA #106 is excerpt from Operations Procedures Manual that states that all students must be tested. PAAP Sci #115, pp. 1-9 says all students must be tested, except that it list the same emergency exemptions noted below from MSAA #107 OpProc, p. 8.</p> <p>MSAA #107 OpProc, p. 8. ED allows emergency exemptions from testing only for medical emergencies. Maine allows exemptions for a broader set of reasons, notably within five broad areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Emergency/Serious Illness: <input type="checkbox"/> Severe Emotional Distress <input type="checkbox"/> Death in the Immediate Family <input type="checkbox"/> Agency Involvement: Involvement by an outside agency such as Department of Health and Human Services or detention by law enforcement pending adjudication. <input type="checkbox"/> Exigent Circumstance: A situation that doesn't meet any of the above criteria. <p>CWD: PAAP Sci 112, p. 1 says all special education students in Maine must participate in State assessments.</p> <p>ELs: [Note: Staff could not open 107 Assessment of English Learners .JPG]</p> <p>MSAA #107 OpProc, p. 7 states “All EL students in grades 3-8 and in the 3rd year of high school, including those who were enrolled in a United States school for the first time on or after January 1, 2014, as indicated in the appropriate field in ICSE “Date Entered US School”, must participate in the MEA</p>	<p>Overall: All Students: Maine has not adequately addressed this requirement. Although MSAA #106 (State Assessment Operations Procedure Manual) states that all students must be tested, PAAP Science #115 lists emergency exceptions for not testing students: medical emergency/serious illness, severe emotional distress, death in the immediate family, agency involvement and “exigent circumstance”, which is defined as “a situation that does not meet any of the above criteria”. ED allows testing exceptions for testing students if there is a documented medical emergency. Therefore, the exceptions listed on #115 allow for more than emergency medical situations and for situations that “does not meet the above criteria” (which could be <i>any</i> situation).</p> <p>CWD: PAAP Science #112 states that all special education students must participate in State assessments.</p> <p>EL: Maine has not adequately addressed this requirement. According to #07 Maine ODE Operational Procedures Manual (p.9, 2.11.8), Maine allows for a one-time exemption from the ELA/Reading statewide assessments for recently arrived EL, provided that they participated in the ACCESS for ELLs during the testing window or were administered the W-APT or MODEL if enrolled after the ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 testing window. There is no exemption for recently arrived EL from the mathematics or science assessment for English</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 Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
	<p>for Mathematics through standard administration, through administration with accommodations, or through the alternate assessment (NCSC). For the ELA/Literacy, ELs who were enrolled in a United States school for the first time on or after January 1, 2014, as indicated in the appropriate field in ICSE “Date Entered US School”, have a one-time exemption provided that they participated in the ACCESS for ELLs during the testing window or were administered the W-APT or MODEL if enrolled after the ACCESS for ELLs testing window.”</p> <p>MSAA #108: Maine allows the recently arrived exemption.</p>	<p>learners. However, Maine does not explicitly state that EL students (other than recently arrived EL) are not exempt from statewide test taking. Maine explicitly state the inclusion of other groups and subgroups in statewide assessments (document #12 (Maine DOE Assessment Program, a one page JPEG) referred to document #07, Maine DOE Operational Procedure Manual, pp.5-9). This document does not contain a statement that EL (other than recently arrived) must take the statewide assessments in ELA/reading, math and science at the appropriate grade levels or bands</p>
Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
<p>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Maine 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, specifically that Maine allows exemptions only for medical emergencies • Maine must provide evidence that the State requires the inclusion of EL students (other than recently arrived EL) in ELA/Reading, Math and Science statewide assessments throughout all public elementary and secondary school, and that it clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p align="center">1.5 – Participation Data</p> <p>The State’s participation data show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system. In addition, if the State administers end-of-course assessments for high school students, the State has procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates on each required assessment and provides the corresponding data.</p>	<p>13: ME_State_NCLB_Report_Card_2015-16 (p.2; pdf)</p> <p>82: Maine Peer Review Evidence 6.4 Reporting Public (pdf)</p>	<p>Maine has not adequately addressed this requirement. Maine provided partial evidence that all students are included in the State’s assessment system, as exemplified by the 2015-16 State Report Card. However, the evidence provided (#13 and #82) is for 2015-16 (reflecting assessment data from the 2014-15 assessments). Also, some student subgroup data is altogether missing (i.e. migrant), and reporting data on this subgroup participation data is required by ED. The evidence submitted with #82 (a screen shot of the State’s data page) does not show student subgroup participation data. Additionally, Maine did not provide evidence related to their administration of end-of-course assessments for high school students, and if the State has procedures in place to insure that each student is tested and counted and participation rate is calculated for each required assessment and group.</p>
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maine must provide more information on the State’s assessment participation data showing that all students, disaggregated by student groups and assessment types, are included in the State’s assessments. Maine must provide evidence related to their administration of end-of-course assessment for high school students. • Maine must provide evidence that there are procedures in place to insure that each student is tested and counted and that the participation rate is calculated for each required assessment and student group. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.1 – Test Design and Development</p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; • Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence 122, p. 4 and 117 (p. 3-4) • Evidence 116 (p. 24) shows what the state has labeled as test blueprints, but they are very schematic and do not appear to have sufficient detail to meet this part of the critical element. The blueprints show that only three standards are assessed per grade level (and in fact each assessed standard is only assessed at one grade level). This does not appear to comply with the requirement to measure the full range of the content standards. • Evidence 110 Level of Complexity (p. 2, 8-16) provides some evidence that higher-order thinking skills are required; evidence 123 (alignment study) • N/A 	<p>Please provide documentation to support the assertion that the assessment measures the full range of standards.</p>
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>for PAAP alternate science:</p> <p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation to support the assertion that the assessment measures the full range of standards. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.2 – Item Development</p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p>Since this is a portfolio assessment, the teachers are responsible for task selection. Evidence 126, sent to teachers, states, “If you have tried an LoC that is too difficult and you do not have time to re-teach, submit only the lower LoC.” This is reflected in the p values and discrimination values by item (evidence 122, Appendix D), which have a median of about .85 and discrimination of about .1. These indicate that the test is too easy, and that it does not provide useful information to inform pedagogy.</p>	<p>Provide evidence that the task pool provides sufficiently challenging tasks.</p> <p>Take steps (such as involving a second observer on a sample of assessments) to ensure the inclusion of appropriately challenging tasks.</p>
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p> <p>for PAAP alternate science:</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"> • Evidence that the task pool provides sufficiently challenging tasks. • A process (such as involving a second observer on a sample of assessments) to ensure the inclusion of appropriately challenging tasks 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence 116 • Evidence 133 and 134 • N/A: Although teachers submit portfolios electronically, the assessments are not technology-based. 	<p>Overall comment: Evidence 116 (top of p. 11) documents that the tasks can be re-administered, re-taught, and re-administered indefinitely until the students succeed. Although peers realize that this is not unheard of in alternate assessment, it affects the standardization and interpretation of the results.</p>
<p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] <p>:</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 Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p align="center">2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p>State-specific – MeCAS R&M Gr 3-8:</p> <p>Consortium MSAA R&M: The Maine peer review submission cover sheet and directions from Don Peasley indicate evidence for Maine for this critical element is entirely State-specific.</p> <p>State-specific MSAA R&M:</p> <p>PAAP Science: Evidence cited, #116, #134, #135, #136, is about basically front-end procedures and a principal certification (#135). In its index, Maine notes, “Maine DOE does not have the capacity to make a substantial number of visits statewide during the test administration. The Alternate Assessment Coordinator is primarily needed at the Department during testing to deal with issues and questions that arise. Maine relies heavily on Principals to monitor training and test administration. The Alternate Assessment Coordinator is available for questions throughout the test administration.” (Index, p. 9) At best, this is very limited and potentially not adequate.</p>	<p>what is needed from ME is to provide additional strategies to ensure that standardized test administration procedures for the PAAR alternate assessment are implemented with fidelity across Maine districts and schools.</p> <p>Examples of strategies could be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Develop a feasible monitoring plan for the administration of alternate assessments, •Annual training for the school principals or designees on Alternate Assessment testing administration protocols, •Develop and distribute among school districts a Q and A for Alternate Assessment Administration so that it may free some of the time of the Alternate Assessment Testing Administrator do conduct monitoring activities.
<p>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</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"> • Evidence that 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 • A policy or indication that annual training is required at the district and school level for everyone involved in test administration • A remediation plan as well as the Test Security Handbook and the Caveon audit report of the state’s current practices 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.5 – Test Security</p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence 116 (p. 15-16, code of conduct), 140 (security agreement), 141 (reporting irregularities), and 135 (principal’s certification of compliance) • Evidence 141 • Evidence 141 • Evidence 141 	<p>See comment in 5.4 below.</p>
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence 116, 141, and 142 • Evidence 145 • Evidence 148 (p. 68 and 73, minimum n size for reporting) 	
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence presented in 123 (alignment report) shows reasonable alignment between the assessment and the content standards • Evidence 109 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although peers believe that the alignment report provides some evidence of the test’s content validity, the concerns we raised about the reliability of the assessment (Element 4.1) have a substantial bearing on the test’s validity.
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p> <p>for PAAP science alternate:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>Evidence 123 (alignment study) provides a qualitative judgment of panelists about the cognitive complexity</p>	<p>The Alignment study summary supports qualitative judgment in this Element.</p> <p>Peers recognize that PAAP Science is in a state of flux at this time. However, we also note that formal “plans” for collecting additional data pertinent to this Element were written over 5 1/2 years ago.</p> <p>If PAAP is retained, the state needs to undertake precedures to improve item and test development to improve test reliability - in general and across the performance continuum.</p>
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p> <p>for PAAP alternate science:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p>N/A: The evidence submitted by the State does not appear to be relevant to this critical element. The State does not have sub-domains in its assessment.</p>	<p>Peers recommend that the State compute inter-correlations of scores on the three tasks at each grade level and report the results.</p>
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p> <p>for PAAP science alternate:</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"> • Run inter-correlations of scores on the three tasks at each grade level and report the results. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>Peers could not locate evidence documenting the relationship between score on this assessment and other variables, although plans to conduct studies to that effect were planned (evidence 150).</p>	<p>Since all or most of the students who took the PAAP also took the math/RLA NCSC alternate assessment, one means to address this critical element would be to correlate scores on the two.</p>
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>for PAAP alternate science</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"> • Correlate scores on the PAAP and the math/RLA NCSC assessment and submit the results. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">4.1 – Reliability</p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement. 	<p>Evidence 122</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • - Test reliability data for the statewide sample and for significant numbers of subgroups are available in the Tech Report, Appendix F • Standard errors of measurement are provided (p. 42) – statewide and by subgroup. It is likely that the small sample sizes limit the possibility of providing conditional standard errors of measurement; this should be stated in the Report. • Appendix G • N/A 	<p>Overall comment: Peers note that the reliability coefficients are disappointingly low (i.e., the low .70s) and standard errors are quite large (i.e., 7 in a scale of only 69 points for Gr. 5, 12 in a scale of 99 for Gr. 8, and 17 in a scale of 129 for high school.)</p> <p>Decision consistency values and related “reliability” data are also low (other than for scorer consistency which, for most items, was solid).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSEMs should be calculated and provided. (Using an item response model for test development does not preclude offering these data, as the State indicates in the submission notes.)
<p>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</p> <p>PAAP alternate science: <input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSEMs should be calculated and provided. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<p>Evidence 116 (accommodations manual, p.1-3, 8-10, 22-23) documents a variety of accommodations for students with a range of disabilities. It also outlines the purpose of the assessment, which is to provide access to students with even the most significant cognitive impairments.</p>	
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p> <p>for PAAP Alternate science:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>The evidence cited for this critical element does not seem relevant. (The State included a letter, evidence 126, that encourages teachers to provide tasks at the highest possible LoC, but there is no evidence that this occurs in practice based on the item statistics.)</p> <p>Peers located Appendix J (Evidence 122, cumulative score distributions), which show that students are clustered in the middle of the performance continuum.</p>	<p>CSEMs (requested above in section 4.1) would provide additional evidence.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p> <p>for PAAP alternate science</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"> • CSEMs (also requested above in section 4.1) 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>Evidence 116 (p. 12-14, 29) and 122 (p. 29-36) describe the scoring process, including a process for score arbitration.</p>	
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>for PAAP alternate science</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>for PAAP alternate science</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required (n/a)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<p>N/A</p>	
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p> <p>for PAAP alternate science</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required (n/a)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p>Evidence 150 includes narrative about tasks that were planned as of 2012. The submission notes indicate that some tasks were completed and others are on hold.</p>	<p>Please provide documentation of which tasks from evidence 150 were completed and which ones were on hold, and their findings.</p>
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p> <p>for PAAP alternate science</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"> • Documentation of which tasks from evidence 150 were completed and which ones were on hold, and their findings. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards; • States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs; • Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment; • Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities; • Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities; • Includes instructions that students eligible to be 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence 116 documents differences between the general and alternate assessments, but peers could not locate documentation that they communicate the effects of taking the alternate on students’ education. • Evidence 116 (p.22-23) • Evidence 120 • Evidence 116 • Evidence 152 • Evidence 120, p. 4-5 • Evidence 151 (parent brochure) informs parents that their child will be assessed on alternate achievement standards but it does not indicate consequences. • State did not provide a response to this part of the critical element in their submission, and peers could not locate documentation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please provide the communication that indicates consequences of taking the alternate assessment. • Maine should provide documentation (shared with parents) that provides an explanation of the consequences (if any) of their child taking the alternate assessment. • Documentation that shows a process for providing access to the general curriculum.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments); The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum. 		
<p>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>For PAAP alternate science:</p> <p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation (shared with parents) that provides an explanation of the consequences (if any) of their child taking the alternate assessment. Documentation that shows a process for providing access to the general curriculum. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. 	<p>Evidence 115 (p. 9), evidence 120 (p. 4), evidence 116</p>	<p>Specific guidance about the appropriate selection of accommodations for ELs of different proficiency levels should be provided.</p>
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>PAAP alternate science:</p> <p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific guidance about the appropriate selection of accommodations for ELs of different proficiency levels should be provided. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence 116, 120, 152 Evidence 116 Evidence 116 Evidence 116, p. 9 states, “If a task accommodation is needed for a student but is not listed above or approved for use on another state assessment, contact MDOE for approval of its use.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See summary note in 5.2
<p>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. 	<p>The State provided minimal evidence that test administration for special populations is monitored (evidence 135, Principal’s Certification of Proper Test Administration).</p>	<p>Maine should provide a monitoring plan for test administration for special populations. This does not necessarily entail state visits or a costly process but could involve things as simple as checklists completed by second in-school observers verifying the accommodations.</p>
<p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>For PAAP alternate science</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maine should provide a monitoring plan for test administration for special populations. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; • The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence 156 • Evidence 116, 118 (NCLB report card, which demonstrates participation rates of all students) • Evidence 157 and 158 <p>Evidence 122 (p. 47, cut scores) and 157 (descriptors)</p>	
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p> <p>For PAAP alternate science: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p>Evidence 154 (science general assessment standard setting) and evidence 155 (science alt assessment standard setting); well-documented, with data on individual judgments by round based on the ALDs</p>	<p>Peers noticed that the ALDs have four different labels and descriptions (c.f., evidence 157 and 158). Also, evidence 156 uses different labels than those agreed upon in the standard setting one month earlier (evidence 155). Please clarify.</p> <p>Peers are troubled by the small number of panelists. Per Evidence 154, the goal of standard setting was to have 15 panelists per grade (p. 4). The actual numbers were 10, 12, and 12 (P. 43). No explanation is provided. Peers also question whether a panel of 10 general educators and 2 special educators are the best group to establish performance standards for this population of students. We agree that having some general educators is good practice but the ratio of general to special ed seems quite high.</p>
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>For PAAP Alternate science</p> <p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please clarify why there are four different labels and descriptions for the ALDs. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p>Evidence 109</p>	
<p>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</p> <p>for PAAP alternate science</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">6.4 – Reporting</p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration; • The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results; • The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement; ○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors); ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; ○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence 118 (NCLB report card) • Evidence 151, 117, 160 • Peers could not locate any documentation of a policy or procedure for providing alternate score reports. • Peers reviewed the evidence provided but could not locate a timeline for report delivery. 	<p>Overall comment: Peers like the reports, which are attractive and easy to read. However, given the low reliability, large standard error, and low discrimination, the report gives the appearance of greater precision than it has.</p> <p>Specifically, the use of “probable error” could be misleading to readers used to seeing standard error or standard deviation (and not realizing they are not equivalent.)</p> <p>The use of “probable error” may be justified, but should be explicitly stated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the small n size, it is likely that the State could handle such requests on a case-by-case request, but this should be specified. • Please provide documentation of a timeline for report delivery.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine (Alternate Assessment-Science)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. 		
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> for PAAP alternate science</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of a process for handling requests for alternate versions of the score report. Documentation of a timeline for report delivery. 		

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