



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

January 3, 2019

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 March 2018.

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:

- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in high school (SAT): **Partially 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.*

The components that **partially meet requirements** do not meet a number of the requirements of the statute and regulations and/or MDOE will need to provide substantial additional information to demonstrate it meets the requirements. The Department expects that MDOE may not be able to submit all of the required information within one year.

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 and the ESSA. The Department expects that MDOE may be able to provide this additional information within one year.

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. 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 testing accommodations. These requirements are listed under critical elements 4.2, 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 respectively, along with the other evidence needed from the March 2018 peer review.

The specific list of items required for MDOE to submit is enclosed with this letter. Because the State has not fully satisfied the condition placed on the State's Title I, Part A grant award related to its State assessment system, the condition on MDOE's Title I, Part A grant award will continue. To satisfy this condition, MDOE must submit satisfactory evidence to address the items identified in the enclosed list as well as the items identified in the letter sent to you on June 5, 2018. Within 30 days of receipt of this letter, MDOE must provide to the Department a plan and timeline by which it will submit the additional documentation. If 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](mailto:OSS.Maine@ed.gov).

Sincerely,

/s/  
Frank Brogan  
Assistant Secretary  
for 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**

| <b>Critical Element</b>  | <b>Additional Evidence Needed</b>   |
|--|---|
| <b>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</b>    | <p>For the entire assessment system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State allows exemptions from test participation only for medical emergencies.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b>                           | <p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A plan and a timeline to address the alignment issues identified in the existing alignment studies, particularly in mathematics.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>2.2 – Item Development</b>                                      | <p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of 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. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This includes evidence that describes the item development process for the essay portion of the SAT reading/language arts test.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Evidence of guidelines for item writers with respect to fairness in the development and review process.</li> </ul>                          |
| <b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b>                        | <p>For the entire assessment system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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"> <li>○ Documentation of specific roles and responsibilities for individuals that monitor the administration of the tests.</li> <li>○ Expectations for local educational agency (LEA) staff in terms of monitoring test administrations.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>  |
| <b>2.5 – Test Security</b>   | <p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration.</li> <li>○ Detection of test irregularities.</li> <li>○ Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments.</li> <li>○ Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
| <b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b> | <p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence requested in critical element 2.1 will satisfy this critical element.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b>                 | <p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for high school as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</li> <li>• Evidence requested in critical element 2.1 will help to satisfy this critical element.</li> </ul>   |

| <b>Critical Element</b>                                 | <b>Additional Evidence Needed</b>   |
|---|---|
| <b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b>       | For the SAT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>4.1 – Reliability</b>                                | For the SAT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reliability results (including the results of the essay portion of the test). These results should include sub-group analysis for students with disabilities and English learners, specifically:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable.</li> <li>○ Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
| <b>4.2 – Fairness and accessibility</b>                 | For the SAT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the assessment is fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments, including data related to students with disabilities and English learners.</li> <li>• 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 Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act).</li> </ul>       |
| <b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b>                 | For the SAT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for the essay portion of the reading/language arts test.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>4.4 – Scoring</b>                                    | For the SAT reading/language arts test: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence the State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments (e.g., a plan to improve inter-reliability rates for scoring the essay portion of the test).</li> <li>• Evidence that the test reports reading/language arts assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</b>                  | For the SAT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State ensures that all forms of the reading/language arts administration adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years, specifically for test forms that contain different essay items.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b> | For the SAT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of 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.</li> </ul>  |

| <b>Critical Element</b>  | <b>Additional Evidence Needed</b>   |
|--|---|
| <b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b> | <p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the State’s process for ensuring that students with disabilities are included in the SAT with clear guidelines for accommodations and the receipt of college-reportable scores.</li> <li>• Evidence that students with disabilities are not denied the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>5.2 – Procedures for Including ELs</b>                        | <p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of communicating this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s).</li> <li>○ Guidance regarding selection of appropriate linguistic accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Evidence that English learners are not denied the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>5.3 – Accommodations</b>                                      | <p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has a process for reviewing exceptional accommodations requests.</li> <li>• Evidence that the State has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</li> <li>• As noted above in element 5.1 and 5.2, evidence that students with disabilities and English learners are not denied the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment (evidence submitted for element 5.1 and 5.2 will address this concern).</li> </ul>  |
| <b>5.4 – Monitoring Testing of Special Populations</b>           | <p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 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 the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 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"> <li>○ Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations.</li> <li>○ Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered.</li> <li>○ Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice.</li> <li>○ Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s individualized education program team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner.</li> <li>○ Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |

| Critical Element   | Additional Evidence Needed  |
|--|---|
| <b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</b> | For the SAT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the formal adoption of academic achievements standards</li> <li>• Evidence that the achievement standards are applied to all public school students.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b>                                     | For the SAT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State used a technically sound method and process for setting the reading/language arts standards that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards (specifically including the essay portion of the test) to ensure they are valid and reliable.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b>            | For the SAT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of how the 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.</li> <li>• Evidence that the State’s reading/language arts academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards (specifically, how the essay portion of the test aligns with the achievement standards).</li> </ul>   |
| <b>6.4 – Reporting (SAT)</b>   | For the SAT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of reporting that 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:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that:                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>▪ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand; and</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ A process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## March 2018 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 SAT Consortium

## Contents

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS .....</b>               | <b>3</b>  |
| 2.1 – Test Design and Development.....                             | 4         |
| 2.2 – Item Development.....  | 8         |
| 2.3 – Test Administration .....                                    | 11        |
| 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration.....                          | 14        |
| 2.5 – Test Security .....  | 17        |
| 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....       | 21        |
| <b>SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....</b>                | <b>24</b> |
| 3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....   | 25        |
| 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....                   | 29        |
| 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure .....                   | 33        |
| 3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables .....   | 39        |
| <b>SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER .....</b>                  | <b>41</b> |
| 4.1 – Reliability.....   | 41        |
| 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....                              | 43        |
| 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....                              | 45        |
| 4.4 – Scoring .....  | 47        |
| 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms .....                              | 50        |
| 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment .....                     | 51        |
| 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance.....              | 53        |
| <b>SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS .....</b>                  | <b>56</b> |
| 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities .....    | 57        |
| 5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....                            | 61        |
| 5.3 – Accommodations.....  | 64        |
| 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations ..... | 68        |
| <b>SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .</b>   | <b>70</b> |
| 6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....                           | 71        |
| 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards ..... | 74        |
| 6.4 – Reporting.....   | 77        |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

### **SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

| Critical Element   | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)  | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence   |
|--|---|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;"><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results;</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills);</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.</li> </ul> | <p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b><br/> <b>Evidence #2.1.1: SAT® Suite Technical Manual (October 2017)</b><br/>                     The technical manual describes the test design and test development process for the SAT assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 1 - 20 provide an overview of the assessment, including a description its purpose, test format and content, scores derived from the assessment and the intended use of results.</li> <li>• Pages 27 - 52 provide a detailed description of test development procedures.</li> <li>• Additionally, see the evidence presented in response to section 3 and 4 regarding the technical quality of the SAT.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.2: College Board + Connecticut; SAT® Suite of Assessments: Alignment to Connecticut Standards (October 2016)</b><br/>                     The College Board conducted an alignment study to determine how the SAT and its related assessment aligned to the Connecticut state standards. This document provides detailed information regarding the study findings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 16 - 101 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to the state’s standards for English Language Arts and Math in grades 11 and 12.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.3: College Board + Delaware; SAT® Suite of Assessments: Alignment to Delaware Standards (October 2016)</b><br/>                     The College Board conducted an alignment study to determine how the SAT and its related assessment aligned to the Delaware state standards. This document provides detailed information regarding the study findings.</p> | <p><b>Purposes and intended interpretations</b><br/> <b>Overall, peers would like to see more claims and evidence regarding how states are incorporating SAT scores into their high school accountability system. What studies or information is being collected?</b></p> <p>Pg 9 “Because it is more closely aligned to both high school instruction and post-high school requirements, the SAT serves as evidence of the hard work students have performed in high school”. Peers would like to see evidence for this claim.</p> <p><b>Test Designs and Blueprints</b><br/>                     2.1.8 Test Specs – detailed specs provided, when considered in conjunction with the individual states’ standards, does offer evidence of assessments that test whole range of standards, up to the limitations described in the “Connection to Content Standards.”</p> <p><b>Connection to Content Standards</b><br/>                     Mathematical practices described on page 43. Math content appears to be focused on linear, quadratic, and other polynomial function families. No mention of logarithmic or exponential families that are in the CCSS. Check Table A-3.11 Exponential functions listed in Table A-3.11. There does not appear to be an alignment to the state’s academic content standards in math.</p> <p>States are advised to document plans to assess the full breadth of the adopted standard, including for ELA use of technology, conducting research, speaking, and listening, which are not addressed by the SAT suite. Other standards not included in the SAT are described in the Alignment document 2.1.3 (e.g., Delaware)</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 SAT Consortium**

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)  | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence   |
|------------------|---|--|
|                  | <p>• Pages 16 - 106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to the state’s standards for English Language Arts/Literacy and Math in grades 11 and 12.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.4: College Board + Maine; SAT® Suite of Assessments: Alignment to Maine Standards (October 2016)</b><br/>The College Board conducted an alignment study to determine how the SAT and its related assessment aligned to the Maine state standards. This document provides detailed information regarding the study findings.</p> <p>• Pages 16 - 106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to the state’s standards for English Language Arts/Literacy and Math in grades 11 and 12.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.5: College Board + Michigan; SAT® Suite of Assessments: Alignment to Michigan Standards (2015)</b><br/>The College Board conducted an alignment study to determine how the SAT and its related assessment aligned to the Michigan state standards.</p> <p>This document provides detailed information regarding the study findings.</p> <p>• Pages 16 - 106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to the state’s standards for English Language Arts/Literacy and Math in grades 11 and 12.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.6: College Board + New Hampshire; SAT® Suite of Assessments: Alignment to New Hampshire Standards (October 2016)</b><br/>The College Board conducted an alignment study to determine how the SAT and its related assessment aligned to the New Hampshire state standards. This document provides detailed information regarding</p> | <p>SAT indicated there was an independent alignment study conducted in 2016, but this study was not provided for review.</p> <p>Connecticut – non-third party alignment (conducted by College Board, Oct. 2016) study of CT’s 2010 standards: acknowledges which standards are not assessed, namely, speaking and listening, construction mathematical representations.</p> <p>Delaware - non-third party alignment (conducted by College Board, Oct. 2016) study of DE’s 2010 standards: acknowledge which standards are not assessed, namely, speaking and listening and standards related to technology use.</p> <p>Illinois – (2010) acknowledges which standards are not assessed, namely, speaking, listening, presentations, capitalization, spelling, construction mathematical representations.</p> <p>Maine: (2010) standards not addressed: speaking, listening, presentations, capitalization, spelling, constructing mathematical representations, as well as “advanced” standards, such as vectors, matrices, using probability to make decisions.</p> <p>Michigan: acknowledges which standards are not assessed, namely, speaking, listening, presentations, capitalization, spelling, construction mathematical representations.</p> <p>New Hampshire: standards not addressed: speaking, listening, capitalization, spelling, and several writing standards in history/social studies, science, and technical subjects. Mathematical modeling is covered</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 SAT Consortium

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)   | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence   |
|---|--|--|
|   | <p>the study findings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 16 - 106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to the state’s standards for English Language Arts/Literacy and Math in grades 11 and 12.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.7: College Board + Illinois; SAT@ Suite of Assessments: Alignment to Illinois Standards (October 2016)</b></p> <p>The College Board conducted an alignment study to determine how the SAT and its related assessment aligned to the Illinois state standards. This document provides detailed information regarding the study findings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 16 - 106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to the state’s standards for English Language Arts/Literacy and Math in grades 11 and 12.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)</b></p> <p>This document provides details regarding how our test is constructed and includes test blueprints, evidentiary foundation, and examples of text complexity and sample questions. While we recommend that reviewers consider the entire development process.</p> | <p>differently than stated in NH standards.</p> <p><b>Item Descriptions for ELA and Mathematics</b></p> <p>The content specs and blueprint sections of Tech Manual Appendix 3 contain long lists of statements that could be used to infer what the items ask of students.</p> <p>Test specs document supplies the same descriptive information as Appendix 3, albeit with sample items. General descriptive information is given for broad swaths of item types.</p> <p>Detailed item descriptions, test development procedures and guiding principles, and sample items (2.1.8, Sections III and IV). “Important Features” details the type of skills, thinking, expected to be assessed by items.</p> |
| <b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b>  |  |  |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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., higher-order thinking skills);</li> </ul> |  |  |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

| 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 SAT Consortium**

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)  | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence   |
|---|---|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;"><b>2.2 – Item Development</b></p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p> | <p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b></p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 28 – 34 describe the processes used to ensure the fairness of the assessment.</li> <li>• Pages 27 - 52 provide a detailed description of test development procedures.</li> <li>• Pages 108 - 114 describe the evidentiary foundation for the decisions made about the content included in the SAT.</li> <li>• Pages 120 - 133 describe the College Board pilot study of the predictive validity of the SAT.</li> <li>• Pages 133 - 135 describe how the SAT assesses student readiness for college.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board SAT Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire and Illinois</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 7 - 8 in each of the alignment documents contain a section called The Alignment conducted their alignment study.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please refer to the sections identified as evidence in support of Critical Element 2.2.</li> </ul> | <p>Is there information regarding the demographic characteristics of the item writers and reviewers? Do the states that use this assessment as an accountability assessment have teachers on the committees?</p> <p>Who are the “independent experts’ active in the field” and what is the set of criteria they use to judge an item?</p> <p>Where are the item writer guidelines that are described on page 41 (PDF page 50) of the technical manual? Is there diversity in the item writer pool or the review process?</p> <p>Tech Manual, Page 32 –lists typically classroom teachers. Is that enough to show representation from different ethnic and socio-economic groups to screen for sensitivity and fairness. Are there tables of the reviewers? For items, passages, forms?</p> <p>Page 32, 46. “The guidelines provided to our fairness reviewers as they review test questions and stimuli are summarized in this chapter.” The guidelines were not provided for review for verification of the process/procedures used.</p> <p>Evidence provided for cognitive complexity is minimal</p> <p>Lists 2.1.2 – 2.1.7 – state alignment documents. State alignment documents do not address cognitive processes alignment</p> <p>Lists 2.2.1 – this document discusses the predictive validity of the old test and proposed revisions to the SAT</p> <p>Lists 2.2.2 – this document is a study focused on the validity of using the SAT for college admission decisions. It does not address cognitive processes</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 SAT Consortium

| Critical Element   | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence   |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | Lists 3.2.2 – Summary of cognitive lab. More details about the methodology, content, and interpretations are needed to provide a convincing argument that the high level cognitive processes purported to be assessed are indeed drawn upon by students as they engage with the SAT. |
| <b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b>   |  |  |
| <p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Evidence of reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of guidelines for item writers in fairness within the development and review process.</li> </ul> |  |  |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

| 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 SAT Consortium**

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)  | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence  |
|---|---|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;"><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>• Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments;</li> <li>• If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul> | <p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b><br/> <b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b><br/>         • Pages 53 - 59 describe the standardized test administration procedures for standard administrations and for administration of the test with accommodations.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.1: The SAT School Day Supervisor Manual (Spring 2017)</b><br/>         This manual provides instructions for supervisors who are responsible for overseeing the administration on how to prepare for test day, protocol for reporting test irregularities, and guidance on how to maintain test security.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.2: The SAT School Day Test Room Manual (Spring 2017)</b><br/>         This manual provides instructions for associate supervisors (also referred to as test room coordinators) who will proctor the exam. This manual contains test day scripts for standard test administrations.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b><br/>         This manual provides instructions for supervisors who will be responsible for registering students for testing accommodations and managing nonstandard test administrations.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.4: SAT School Day Test Center Supervisor Training (2016)</b><br/>         This PowerPoint deck contains the basic information presented to all Test Center Supervisors in online and in-person training sessions and reviews policies, procedures and best</p> | <p>Documentation in the administration manuals appears to be sufficient, except for accommodation administration.<br/>         2.1.1 establishes standardized procedures and 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3, &amp; 2.3.4 communicate these procedures</p> <p>Communication procedures appear to be sufficient across the different administration manuals for assessments administered to the general population. Training webinar slides are also informative for accommodations and how to get them approved.<br/>         3.5 – Accommodations Webinar; however, this does not adequately address how to administer read aloud or scribe accommodations<br/>         2.3.3: detailed instructions and procedures<br/>         2.3.5: training for testing with accommodations</p> <p>Does College Board collect information to ensure that school officials in every state have been trained and can administer the assessment under standardized conditions?</p> <p>Rosters may be maintained at the state level. Should SAT get a copy?</p> <p>2.3.7 There is no agreement in this form that the individual has participated in any training. No evidence that training occurred.</p> <p>There was no verification of training participation.</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 SAT Consortium**

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)   | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|--|--|
|   | <p>practices related to SAT test administration. This deck may have been customized for state partners based on particular local requirements. Please refer to the submissions of our state partners for additional information and evidence of test center supervisor training.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.5: SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017)</b><br/>This PowerPoint deck contains the basic information presented to all SSD supervisors via online and in-person training sessions and reviews the policies and procedures related to nonstandard SAT administrations. This deck may have been customized for state partners based on particular local requirements. Please refer to the submissions of our state partners for additional information and evidence of accommodations training.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.7: SAT Testing Staff Agreement</b><br/>Prior to test day, all testing staff must sign this agreement to signify that they accept the conditions and requirements of SAT administration.</p> |  |
| <b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b>  |  |  |
| <p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:<br/>Provide evidence to address policies and procedures for standardized test administration that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, specifically administration with accommodations, that is, read aloud and scribe;</li> <li>• Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s assessment receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments, including verification of training.</li> </ul> |  |  |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

| 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;"><b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p> | <p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b><br/>The below information lists the resources the College Board provides to the states to support uniform standardized test administration procedures across districts and schools.</p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 55 describes the roles and responsibilities of different test administration staff, delineates the qualifications testing staff should possess, and explains the training testing staff should receive.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.1: The SAT School Day Supervisor Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 4 - 32: The College Board provides guidance on the number of staff needed to proctor and examination, how to set up test administration rooms and seating plans to facilitate implementation, and how to use the Supervisor irregularity form. The manual also includes a suggested timeline for when proctors and other test administration staff should be trained.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.2: The SAT School Day Test Room Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 3 - 12 include information on how to monitor test administration and report testing irregularities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 13 - 23 include information on how to</li> </ul> | <p>The Technical Manual describes detailed requirements of test administrators (see p. 53), including qualifications, timing, test materials, and observation during testing. Specifications are provided for accommodations and handling of materials. Irregularity reports must be completed by administrators. A manual is provided for a Test Day Supervisor who is responsible for supervising all activities related to testing. Training is mandatory for Test Day Supervisors.</p> <p>However, the College Board does not provide guidance on specific monitoring procedures (e.g., protocols, forms, or schedule) to ensure administration of the assessment with fidelity across districts and schools. For example, will some schools be observed by a State or district representative who is not the Test Day Supervisor? This can be considered a State responsibility, should States provide such information.</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 SAT Consortium**

| 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>monitor the test administration and report testing irregularities that may take place during a nonstandard test administration.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.4: SAT School Day Test Center Supervisor Training (2016)</b><br/>                     This PowerPoint deck contains the basic information presented to all Test Center Supervisors in online and in-person training sessions and reviews policies, procedures and best practices related to SAT test administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 9 - 36 review all of the actions that should take place before, during, and after the test administration. This section of the presentation clearly delineates the responsibilities of test center supervisors, proctors, monitors, and other staff.</li> </ul> |  |
| <b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>   |  |  |
| <p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the SAT Day, evidence of how the State monitors administration to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</li> </ul> |  |  |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

| 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 SAT Consortium**

| Critical Element   | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)  | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence  |
|--|---|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;"><b>2.5 – Test Security</b></p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> </ul> | <p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b><br/> <b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 58 - 59 describe the procedures the College Board has designed to maintain test security at all times.</li> <li>• Pages 66 - 68 describe the College Board’s post-test analysis, which is conducted as a component of the company’s test security procedures.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.1: The SAT School Day Supervisor Manual (Spring 2017)</b><br/> This manual provides guidance for supervisors who are responsible for overseeing the administration on how to maintain test security:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 8 – 9 describe the information supervisors should communicate to staff in order to maintain test security. Seating policies, devised to reduce the possibility of cheating, are described in this section.</li> <li>• Pages 12 – 13 describe how supervisors should prepare student for test day and includes information on items and behaviors that are not allowed in the test area.</li> <li>• Pages 14 - 26 provide instructions on how to receive and securely store materials until test day, and how to report on test administration irregularities.</li> <li>• Pages 39 - 40 include a sample irregularities report that supervisors use to begin investigation of test administration issues.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.2: The SAT School Day Test Room Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 1 - 12 provide instruction on standardized</li> </ul> | <p><b>Prevention of assessment irregularities</b><br/> Manuals provide sufficient documentation of recommended procedures. States should supply evidence that proctors have been trained. Perhaps local policies for checking in on test rooms that procedures have been implemented according to the documentation.</p> <p><b>Detection of irregularities</b><br/> 2.3.1 pp. 39-40: form to report irregularities<br/> 2.1.1 pp. 66-68: statistical analysis for irregularities<br/> 2.3.4 pp. 23-30</p> <p>Unclear how states participate in monitoring, auditing, and evaluating these procedures,</p> <p><b>Investigations of irregularities</b><br/> SAT internal processes are described in 2.5.2 and 2.5.3; however, 2.5.3 is very high level and points to confidential procedures for investigating suspect scores.<br/> 2.5.3 - 2.5.2: How and Why ETS Questions Scores (College Board Program) in cases not due to test irregularities<br/> Unclear how states participate in monitoring, auditing, and evaluating these procedures</p> <p>Should the state documentation also contain procedures for how local incidents are investigated and remediated?<br/> Generally, scores are canceled with the student’s knowledge, and there are various options offered to the student to remedy their records. See 2.5.2 for many details.<br/> 2.5.3 –no specifics for remediation are provided.<br/> Unclear how states participate in monitoring, auditing, and evaluating these procedures</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 SAT Consortium**

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)  | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence   |
|------------------|---|--|
|                  | <p>testing procedures devised to maintain security during test administration. Information in this section includes how to maintain security in the testing room and report administration irregularities.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b><br/>                     • Pages 13 - 23 provide instruction on standardized testing procedures devised to maintain security during nonstandard test administrations. Information in this section includes how to maintain security in the testing room and report administration irregularities.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.4: SAT School Day Test Center Supervisor Training (2016)</b><br/>                     • Pages 23 - 30: The College Board trains test administration staff (including supervisors, coordinators, and administrators) on how to report and address irregularities they may encounter on test day.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.5.1: SAT School Day Registration and Questionnaire Guide (2017)</b><br/>                     This brochure provides important information for students so that they may prepare for test day.<br/>                     • Pages 15 – 21 provide information on test security procedures, what will be allowed into testing rooms, and how to report suspicious behavior.<br/>                     • Pages 25 – 26 and 27 - 30 describe processes that may take place in order to conserve test integrity and maintain test security.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.5.2: Why and How ETS Questions Scores (College Board Programs) (2016)</b></p> | <p>2.5.2 &amp; 2.5.3 – ETS procedures for handling irregularities</p> <p>Does SAT conduct any analysis on the irregularity reports or conduct any statistical analysis on potential irregularity issues? This evidence was not provided. Substantial evidence provided illustrated proactive steps to prevent issues but not much about post-irregularity issues. The ETS report indicates it does review individual student level cheating issues. Peers are unclear about how College Board reviews potential school-wide, district-wide, or state-level issues? Are there any reports or analysis done for the state at a school/district level?</p> <p>SAT did not provide specifics on remediation- what does the state do and how does SAT inform the SEA?</p> <p>The state documentation will need to include procedures on how local incidents are investigated and remediated.</p> <p>Individual states should provide evidence that these procedures are implemented and how they deal with detected irregularities (whether detected at test time or during post-test analysis at ETS).</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 SAT Consortium**

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)  | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|---|--|
|   | <p>This document describes the ways that ETS, our testing subcontractor, investigates cases that may affect the validity of test scores.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.5.3: Investigation and Remediation of SAT Irregularities (2018)</b></p> <p>This document provides a high level overview of the procedures the College Board undertakes to investigate irregularities and remediate any recurring issues.</p> |  |
| <p><b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b></p>   |   |  |
| <p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:<br/>           Evidence of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration with documentation of training.</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities but no specific data was provided to verify this process.</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> </ul> |   |  |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

| 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 SAT Consortium**

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)   | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence  |
|---|--|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;"><b>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</b></p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results;</li> <li>• To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> <li>• To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 58 - 59 describe the procedures the College Board has designed to maintain test</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.1: The SAT School Day Supervisor Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <p>This manual provides guidance for supervisors who are responsible for overseeing the administration on how to maintain test security:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 12 – 13 describe how supervisors should prepare student for test day and includes information on items and behaviors that are not allowed in the test area.</li> <li>• Pages 14 - 26 provide instructions on how to receive and securely store materials until test day, and report on test administration irregularities.</li> <li>• Pages 39 - 40 include a sample irregularities report that supervisors use to begin investigation of test administration issues.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.2: The SAT School Day Test Room Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 1 - 12 provide instruction on standardized testing procedures devised to maintain security during test administration. Information in this section includes how to maintain security in the testing room and report administration irregularities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 13 - 23 provide instruction on standardized testing procedures devised to maintain security during nonstandard test administration. Information in this section includes how to maintain security in the testing room and report administration irregularities.</li> </ul> | <p><i>College Board Information Security Policy (2014)</i> is a confidential document. It is in the process of being updated.</p> <p><i>College Board Guidelines for the Release of Data (2009)</i> is in the process of being updated.</p> <p>In the 2009 College Board guidelines for the release of data, it states the College Board owns the data. Is this still true for states that administer the SAT statewide?</p> <p>More information is needed to describe the process used if a data breach occurs and what steps are taken.</p> <p>Updated guides for the security policy and release of data would be useful and are needed.</p> <p>How does the SAT protect the integrity of its test materials in development, administration, and storage and use of results?</p> <p>No evidence was provided regarding the security measures used to protect the item bank or test bank.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence related to test security before and during test administration is submitted</li> <li>• Two documents, not submitted, are in process of being updated: College Board Information Security Policy and College Board Guidelines for the Release of Data. These should be submitted for review when updated.</li> </ul> <p>2.1.1, pp. 58-59</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peers had difficulty understanding evidence 2.6.2 – high level, vendor-developed overview of Axway products. How are these applicable to and used within the SAT program?</li> </ul> |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)   | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence  |
|------------------|--|---|
|                  | <p><b>Evidence #2.3.4: SAT School Day Test Center Supervisor Training (2016)</b><br/>           • Pages 23 - 30: The College Board trains test coordinators, and administrators) on how to report and address irregularities they may encounter on test day.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.5.1: SAT School Day Registration and Questionnaire Guide (2017)</b><br/>           This brochure provides to students information about how the College Board secures their data and personally identifiable information.<br/>           • Pages 26 – 36 describe the College Board privacy policy as it relates to students. This section also provides information regarding instances where scores may be canceled due to testing irregularities or misconduct, and how students may securely send their scores to colleges and university systems.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.6.1: Description of Test Management and Reporting System (2017)</b><br/>           This document provides an overview of the security of the College Board online test management and reporting system.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.6.2: Axway Secure Transport Data Sheet (2017)</b><br/>           The College Board provides data files to the state using an SFTP ad-hoc file transfer process provide by Tumbleweed, a secure managed file transfer (MFT) site managed by Axway. This data sheet, created by Axway, provides a high-level overview of all of their Secure Transport products, including their web-based SFTP service.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.6.3: Description of Confidential College Board Information Security Policy (2017)</b></p> | <p>SAT indicates and N of 15. Each state will also have individual reporting requirements.</p> <p>Note: some of the suggested documents relate to cheating, not securing student data.</p> <p>Information on paper storage and retrieval secure handling was not discussed sufficiently. How is security handled as tests are transported from SAT to the schools? Printing, shipping to schools?</p> |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

| Critical Element   | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)  | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>The College Board has created a high level policy document that describes the processes in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of student level data. The policy is confidential, so this summary provides high level information regarding what the policy contains.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.6.4: College Board Privacy Policy (January 15, 2016)</b><br/>This policy is currently accessible at <a href="http://www.collegeboard.org/privacy-policy">www.collegeboard.org/privacy-policy</a>. The document, as it appeared on this site on August 31, 2017, is submitted as evidence. It describes the College Board Data Privacy policy and privacy statements.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.6.5: College Board Guidelines for the Release of Data (2009)</b><br/>This white paper describes the guidelines for the release of data obtained from test results to third party research institutions. Page 14 lists no releasable data elements for the SAT.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.6.6: ETS Legal Privacy and Security Notice</b><br/>ETS manages the online test rostering system for the SAT. This document provides ETS' legal privacy and security notice.</p> |  |
| Section 2.6 Summary Statement  |   |  |
| <p><u>  </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:<br/>Policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data during test development, administration, and storage and use of results;</li> <li>• College Board Information Security Policy and College Board Guidelines for the Release of Data should be submitted for review when updated.</li> </ul> |   |  |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

| <b>Critical Element</b>  | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>  | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>  |
|--|--|--|
| <p><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> <li>• If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul> | <p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math, no evidence will be provided related to a specific state’s alternate assessment.</b></p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 1 - 20 provide an overview of the assessment, including a description its purpose, test format and content, scores derived from the assessment and the intended use of results.</li> <li>• Pages 107 - 139 examine the validity of the SAT and includes information on the evidentiary foundations behind the test content, concordance between the current and previous version of the SAT, and the relationship between SAT scores and first-year grade point average, as well as the relationship between SAT scores and college and career readiness benchmarks.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tables A-3.1 – A-3.15 in Appendix 3 (pages 11-35) provide test content specifications and content domains and descriptions.</li> <li>• Appendix 5 (pages 37 – 65) provides additional detail regarding how statistical indices were computed.</li> <li>• Appendix 6 (pages 66 – 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> <li>• Appendix 7 (pages 321 - 396) displays the results of analyses performed to evaluate the validity of the SAT.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.1: An SAT Validity Primer (January 2015)</b></p> | <p>What studies has or will College Board conduct regarding the results of the assessment about high school instruction? Or how states will be using the results in their accountability system? Predictive validity of college readiness is one thing but for the purposes of states, the question is also “how do we get students to be college career ready?” What inferences are states making about schools and school instruction if they have many students who are college ready or few students who are college ready and what evidence will be collected around these claims?</p> <p><b>Documentation of Independent Alignment</b></p> <p>Alignment studies indicated that the standards were not completely aligned, Please provide additional evidence as requested in critical element 2.1. Pg. 11 in the Delaware study states, “the redesigned assessments are not mysterious or tricky. They are completely transparent. They focus on the knowledge and skills that are worthy of practice.” Again, there is little evidence to support this claim without an independent alignment study or access to a test form or test items.</p> <p>SAT does not assess Speaking and Listening. Thus states should supply plans for how those domains are or will be assessed if Speaking and Listening is part of the state standards. Also, since the essay is optional, what evidence does the state supply to show that the full breadth of the writing standards is assessed?</p> <p>Per 2.1.2 – 2.1.7 introduction note, an independent review of alignment of the SAT to the CT standards was proposed for 2016; document 2.1.2 indicates a revision in January 2018, but this revised document was not included.</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 SAT Consortium**

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)   | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence   |
|------------------|--|--|
|                  | <p>This paper provides validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores and important college outcomes. The evidence provided in this paper is based on a previous version of the SAT. Pages 131 – 135 of the <i>SAT Suite Technical Manual</i> describe how the new version of the SAT correlates with the previous version of the assessment.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.2: The Redesigned SAT® Pilot Predictive Validity Study: A First Look (2016)</b><br/>           This white paper provides preliminary validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores resulting for the redesigned SAT and important college outcomes. The College Board is in the process of completing a validity study to replicate the findings of this white paper with a large, nationally representative sample. The study will examine students in the entering college class of fall 2017, the first full cohort to be admitted to college with the new SAT. For more information regarding this planned study, please refer to page 152 of the SAT Technical Manual.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire and Illinois</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 7 - 9 of each document describe how alignment between the standards and the assessment is determined.</li> <li>• Pages 16 - 106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to each respective state’s English Language Arts/Literacy and Math standards for grades 11 and 12.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.1.1: SAT Practice Test 8 (2017)</b><br/>           This practice test is a version of a form that was used for a 2016 SAT test administration. The sample test includes the optional essay, answer key, answer sheet</p> | <p>The third party independent alignment review mentioned in the documentation as planned for 2016 was not provided.</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 SAT Consortium

| Critical Element   | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|--|--|
|  | and instructions on how to score the test                  |  |
| <b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b>   |  |  |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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. An independent alignment review is needed.</li> </ul> |  |  |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

| 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 SAT Consortium

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)  | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence   |
|---|---|--|
| <p><b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p> | <p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math: Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 1 - 20 provide an overview of the assessment, including a description its purpose, test format and content, scores derived from the assessment and the intended use of results.</li> <li>• Pages 107 - 139 examine the validity of the SAT and includes information on the evidentiary foundations behind the test content, concordance between the current and previous version of the SAT, and the relationship between SAT scores and first-year grade point average, as well as the relationship between SAT scores and college and career readiness benchmarks.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tables A-3.1 – A-3.15 in Appendix 3 (pages 11 – 35) provide test content specifications and content domains and descriptions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)</b></p> <p>This document provides information on the evidentiary foundations of the English Language Arts and Math domains of the SAT, the test specifications that describe how the SAT measures those content domains and a description of our test development processes.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.1: An SAT Validity Primer (January 2015)</b></p> <p>This paper provides validity evidence on the</p> | <p>Lists 2.1.2 – 2.1.7 – state alignment documents. The DE doc does not address cognitive processes alignment</p> <p>Lists 2.2.1 – this document discusses the predictive validity of the old test and proposed revisions to the SAT</p> <p>Lists 2.2.2 – this document is a study focused on the validity of using the SAT for college admission decisions. It does not address cognitive processes</p> <p>Lists 3.2.2 – Summary of cognitive lab study – why is this document marked as a draft? It is very short, does not give the items used in the study, nor does it name the cognitive processes each item was intended to evoke. It does not make explicit what evidence led to which conclusions. Plus, the number of items used in this study is very small (i.e., 10 math and 13 ELA). More details about the methodology, content, and interpretations are needed to provide a convincing argument that the high level cognitive processes purported to be assessed are indeed drawn upon by students as they engage with the SAT. This statement seems to contradict the summary.</p> <p>Cognitive study seemed like a summary of the study without any analysis. What were the specific interview questions? Besides vocabulary and wording being difficult, how did the students perform on the items they thought were hard or easy? How did the students perform? How did this research influence item development? Any ELL or special education students included? How does this study validate the intended and appropriate cognitive processes based on the states’ academic content standards?</p> <p>3.2.2, p. 4, cog lab study: <b>Conclusion</b> states, “The cognitive processes lab study conducted using TAPs provided important feedback to College Board content experts during the development of questions</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 SAT Consortium**

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)   | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence  |
|------------------|--|---|
|                  | <p>relationship between SAT scores and important college outcomes. The evidence provided in this paper is based on a previous version of the SAT. Pages 131 – 135 of the <i>SAT Suite Technical Manual</i> describe how the new version of the SAT correlates with the previous version of the assessment.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.2: The Redesigned SAT® Pilot Predictive Validity Study: A First Look (2016)</b><br/>This white paper provides preliminary validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores resulting for the redesigned SAT and important college outcomes. The College Board is in the process of completing a validity study to replicate the findings of this white paper with a large, nationally representative sample. The study will examine students in the entering college class of fall 2017, the first full cohort to be admitted to college with the new SAT. For more information regarding this planned study, please refer to page 152 of the SAT Technical Manual.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire and Illinois</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 7 - 9 of each document describe how alignment between the standards and the assessment is determined.</li> <li>• Pages 16 - 106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to each respective state’s English Language Arts/Literacy and Math standards for grades 11 and 12.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.2.1: Summary of Validity Evidence for Cognitive Processes (2018)</b><br/>This document provides an overview of how the</p> | <p>for the SAT. Since the newly-designed question types presented in the study were ultimately incorporated into the Redesigned SAT, the study also provides important validation of the cognitive processes students use when approaching these and other questions now on the test.” However, data and analysis in support of this statement was not provided.</p> <p>2.2.1-Tech Manual, pp. 132-3: “the results of this pilot study showed that new SAT scores remain as predictive of college success as old SAT scores. This is important to note as the redesign of the SAT was first and foremost focused on more closely aligning the content and skills tested on the SAT with those content and skills that research indicates are critical for college success. In making these important changes to the test, that the strong predictive validity was also maintained is an important accomplishment of the redesign.” However, there was no evidence that the development and selection of 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 provided.</p> <p>3.2.1 – lists much of the alignment evidence provided by ETS, however, it’s not clear that these were conducted by external content experts to align with cognitive processes.</p> <p>3.2.2 (Revised) – Report provides some evidence that test-takers are not using intended cognitive processes, especially in mathematics, for some items. Limited number of items.</p> <p>More evidence needed to indicate that the items are really tapping into the cognitive processes as</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 SAT Consortium**

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)   | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence  |
|---|--|---|
|   | <p>evidence listed above is pertinent to the claim that the SAT assesses the intended cognitive processes related to English Language Arts/ Literacy and Math in grades 11 and 12</p> <p><b>Evidence #3.2.2: CONFIDENTIAL Summary of Cognitive Laboratory Study for the Redesigned SAT Conducted on March 16, 2013 (2018)</b></p> <p>This white paper summarizes the results of a study using Think-aloud Protocols conducted during the design process for the Redesigned SAT. The study provided evidence for how students were approaching and interpreting items in English Language Arts, Literacy, and Math.</p> | <p>indicated by the states' content standards.</p> <p>Cognitive processes study was conducted in 2013; updated study addressing more of the items should be conducted to address alignment with state standards</p> |
| <b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b>  |  |   |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul> |  |   |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

| 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 SAT Consortium

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)   | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence  |
|---|--|---|
| <p><b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p> | <p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b></p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 39 - 45 describe how test items are created and reviewed. This section describes the statistical indices computed to determine the appropriateness of items for use in operational forms of the SAT (i.e. equated p-values, r-biserials, and Mantel-Haenszel DIF.</li> <li>• Pages 47 - 49 describe how the College Board develops the optional SAT Essay test, which is administered by some of our state clients to assess student writing skills.</li> <li>• Pages 75 - 106 describe various psychometric analysis and their results. These procedures include scaling procedures, equating, analysis of normative information, reliability analysis and additional psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> <li>• Pages 107 - 139 examine the validity of the SAT, including the relationship between SAT scores and first-year grade point average as well as the relationship between SAT scores and college and career readiness benchmarks.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 5 (pages 37 – 65) provides additional detail regarding how statistical indices were computed.</li> <li>• Appendix 6 (pages 66 – 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> <li>• Appendix 7 (pages 321 – 396) displays the results of analyses performed to evaluate the validity of the</li> </ul> | <p>Benchmarks for Math and ERW were established using the previous version of the SAT (page 144 of the technical manual). These Benchmarks are purported to indicate 75% probabilities of earning a C or better in an introductory college level course.</p> <p>The sample score report, Evidence 5.1.4, was the evidence used to provide an overview of how scores and sub scores are reported. How does this relate back to the state standards and how can teachers use it? The sub score names on the score report do not match the sub domains of the content standards</p> <p>There are also studies linking the old SAT scores to the new SAT scores (concordance studies, p. 124 of the technical manual), but this text states explicitly that the scores are not interchangeable – likely due to different underlying structures of the old and new tests (e.g., relative weights of different content, etc.). With this in mind, the evidence of the use of SAT scores to predict college success seems adequate. But this does not indicate how the internal structure aligns to the state standards.</p> <p>3.3.2-3.37. Analyses of internal structure-item correlations and dimensionality of assessment are not consistent with standards and interpretation of results. The intercorrelations reveal a very large, but not perfect, correlation among sub scores of items. This is not strong evidence that the sub scores are measuring different underlying factors.</p> <p><b>2.1.1:</b> pp. 44, 45: description of DIF Analyses, with results in the appendix. <b>2.1.1.a,</b> pp. 50-63: results of DIF analyses indicate low or no DIF and does not include students with disabilities.</p> |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)  | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence  |
|------------------|---|---|
|                  | <p>SAT.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)</b><br/>                     This document provides details regarding how our test is constructed and includes test blueprints, evidentiary foundation, and examples of text complexity and sample questions. While we recommend that reviewers consider the entire document as evidence in support of this critical element, the following sections should be of particular interest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 41 – 69 provide test specifications and blueprints for the SAT Evidence-Based Reading and Writing test including scores and sub-scores consistent with the sub-domain structures of the academic content standards on which the interpretations and uses of results are based.</li> <li>• Pages 70 - 81 provide test specifications for the optional SAT Essay test.</li> <li>• Pages 132 – 158 provide test specifications and blueprints for the SAT Math test including scores and sub-scores consistent with the sub-domain structures of the academic content standards on which the interpretations and uses of results are based.</li> <li>• Pages 198 – 206 provide an overview of SAT development process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.1: Scaling for the SAT Suite of Assessments (2017)</b><br/>                     • Pages 66 – 74 describe the characteristics of SAT sub-score scaling</p> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.2: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report- Connecticut (April</b></p> | <p>DE, ME, and MI included correlations among sub scores on correlations between the Reading Test Score, the Writing and Language Test Score, the Evidence-Based Reading and Writing (ERW) Section Score, and the Dimension Scores on Essay. This provides evidence that these scores are only moderately correlated and measuring somewhat different constructs.</p> <p>However, no evidence was provided of a dimensionality (or factor) analysis of the SAT. There was no evidence provided that the sub scores are based on analyses.</p> <p>As states use the SAT as their accountability measure, the interpretations of the scores may be different than the originally intended use of SAT scores. Will College Board be studying this and produce research that is useful for states if they begin making claims that have not been previously studied on the SAT?</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 SAT Consortium**

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)   | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|------------------|--|--|
|                  | <p><b>2017)</b><br/>                     This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 Connecticut SAT school day administration. The report includes a variety of test analysis based on the data gathered from the test administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 15 - 28 provide Scale Score Moments, Intercorrelations and Reliability for the two SAT Forms administered on test day. The tables in this section provided information for by form and disaggregated by various subgroups.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.3: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report- Delaware (April 2017)</b><br/>                     This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 SAT school day administration. The report includes a variety of test analysis based on the data gathered from the test administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 15 – 22 provide Scale Score Moments, Intercorrelations and Reliability for the two SAT Forms administered on test day. The tables in this section provided information for by form and disaggregated by various subgroups.</li> <li>• Page 60 provide tables demonstrating correlations of three essay dimension scores and correlations between the Reading Test</li> </ul> <p>Score, the Writing and Language Test Score, the Evidence-Based Reading and Writing (ERW) Section Score, and the Dimension Scores on Essay.</p> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.4: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report – Maine (April 2017)</b><br/>                     This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 SAT school</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 SAT Consortium**

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)   | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|------------------|--|--|
|                  | <p>day administration. The report includes a variety of test analysis based on the data gathered from the test administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 15 – 21 provide Scale Score Moments, Intercorrelations and Reliability for the two SAT Forms administered on test day. The tables in this section provided information for by form and disaggregated by various subgroups.</li> <li>• Page 60 provide tables demonstrating correlations of three essay dimension scores and correlations between the Reading Test Score, the Writing and Language Test Score, the Evidence-Based Reading and Writing (ERW) Section Score, and the Dimension Scores on Essay.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.5: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report – Michigan (April 2017)</b><br/>           This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 SAT school day administration. The report includes a variety of test analysis based on the data gathered from the test administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 15 – 29 provide Scale Score Moments, Intercorrelations and Reliability for the two SAT Forms administered on test day. The tables in this section provided information for by form and disaggregated by various subgroups.</li> </ul> <p>Page 75 provide tables demonstrating correlations of three essay dimension scores and correlations between the Reading Test Score, the Writing and Language Test Score, the Evidence-Based Reading and Writing (ERW) Section Score, and the Dimension Scores on Essay.</p> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.6: SAT Suite of Assessments</b></p> |  |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)   | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|--|--|
|   | <p><b>Administration Report – New Hampshire (April 2017)</b><br/>                     This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 SAT school day administration. The report includes a variety of test analysis based on the data gathered from the test administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 15 – 21 provide Scale Score Moments, Intercorrelations and Reliability for the two SAT Forms administered on test day. The tables in this section provided information for by form and disaggregated by various subgroups.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.7: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report – Illinois (April 2017)</b><br/>                     This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 SAT school day administration. The report includes a variety of test analysis based on the data gathered from the test administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 18 – 26 provide Scale Score Moments, Intercorrelations and Reliability for the two SAT Forms administered on test day. The tables in this section provided information for by form and disaggregated by various subgroups.</li> </ul> |  |
| <p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p>   |  |  |
| <p><u>  </u>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide 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.</li> </ul> |  |  |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

| 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 SAT Consortium

| Critical Element   | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)  | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence  |
|--|---|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;"><b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p> | <p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b><br/> <b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b><br/>           • Pages 114 - 135 include information on concordance between the current and previous version of the SAT, the relationship between SAT scores and first-year grade point average, and the relationship between SAT scores and college and career readiness benchmarks.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.1: An SAT Validity Primer (January 2015)</b><br/>           This paper provides validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores and important college outcomes. The evidence provided in this paper is based on a previous version of the SAT. Pages 131 – 135 of the <i>SAT Suite Technical Manual</i> describe how the new version of the SAT correlates with the previous version of the assessment.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.2: The Redesigned SAT® Pilot Predictive Validity Study: A First Look (2016)</b><br/>           This white paper provides preliminary validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores resulting for the redesigned SAT and important college outcomes. The College Board is in the process of completing a validity study to replicate the findings of this white paper with a large, nationally representative sample. The study will examine students in the entering college class of fall 2017, the first full cohort to be admitted to college with the new SAT. For more information regarding this planned study, please refer to page 152 of the SAT Technical Manual.</p> <p><b>Evidence #4.7.1: Excerpt from TAC</b></p> | <p>The documentation showing the predictive relationships between the SAT and college success is adequate, particularly when taken with the evidence for the concordance studies between the old and new versions of the SAT.</p> <p><b>2.2.1:</b> Validity Primer provides strong predictive validity evidence, for a previous version of the SAT. Must rely on how well the old and new version correlate. <b>2.2.2:</b> Predictive validity study on new SAT provides evidence that new SAT has similar predictive validity, as claimed.</p> <p>College Board should consider conducting studies comparing other assessment programs like NAEP, SBAC or PARCC.</p> <p>SAT may wish to consider high school teacher grades and GPA as part of the evidence for this element to address career ready students and not just college bound students.</p> |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)  | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|---|--|
|   | <p><b>presentation regarding Validity Research</b><br/>                     The College Board presents validity evidence to the Technical Advisory Committees of our state partners. These slides are an excerpt from these presentations and covers information regarding College Board past, current and future validity studies.</p> |  |
| <b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b>  |   |  |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables, not necessarily associated with college success only.</li> </ul> |   |  |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

**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;"><b>4.1 – Reliability</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and SWD, EL, and forms administered with accommodations. and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement.</li> </ul> | <p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b><br/> <b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 75 - 106 describe various psychometric analysis and their results. These procedures include scaling procedures, equating, analysis of normative information, reliability analysis and additional psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 6 (pages 66 - 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #4.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report Table of Contents</b><br/> This document displays the contents of a typical post-administration Test Analysis Report for the national administration of the SAT. The College Board provides state level administration reports to its state partners.<br/> Please refer to evidence #3.3.2 – 3.3.7 for the state specific administration reports.</p> | <p>There was very little analysis, interpretation of the data, lack of data for EL and SWD provided for this critical element.</p> <p>Tables were available for all demographic groups, but did not provide any information on students with disabilities, EL, or tests administered with accommodations.</p> <p><b>Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population-</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was no information provided for EL and SWD.</li> </ul> <p><b>Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments</b><br/> Average CSEMs are reasonable to slightly large: most are 6 to 8% of score range.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population for students with disability, EL, and students who received accommodations.</li> </ul>   |   |  |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

| 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 SAT Consortium**

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)  | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence  |
|---|---|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;"><b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</b></p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p> | <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 21 - 26 provide an overview of College Board test development processes related to fairness.</li> <li>• Pages 27 - 52 provide a detailed description of test development procedures, including a description of item content and fairness reviews, item pre-testing and analysis, and information on the types of accommodations that are available to students.</li> <li>• Pages 60 - 74 describe the scoring procedures for the SAT, a description of how results are reported, and the item analysis that is performed on the operational items, including Differential Item Functioning (DIF) and Key Validation. The required qualifications for human scorers are also included in this section.</li> <li>• Pages 75 - 106 describe various psychometric analyses which are performed to identify any possible bias or inconsistent interpretations of assessment results across student groups.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 6 (pages 66 - 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <p>This manual provides instructions for supervisors who will be responsible for registering students for testing accommodations and managing nonstandard test administrations.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.5: SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017)</b></p> | <p>2.3.3 and 2.3.5 relate to fairness with respect to test administration, but not design, development, or analysis.</p> <p>Peers could not evaluate the criteria for fairness since the College Board did not provide the guidelines used for training experts. No items or training materials were provided.</p> <p>Design and Development</p> <p>2.1.1, page 22 “all questions are reviewed by external, independent reviewers who are asked to evaluate each question according to a set of criteria for content accuracy and fairness.” Who are the experts and what are the demographics of the reviewers?</p> <p>2.1.1, pp. 27-43: listed the test design procedures to ensure fairness, including item review for bias. The writers were instructed to read and use the white paper. It wasn’t evident that this was included in training.</p> <p>4.2.1: Universal Design was listed, but nothing was provided to verify its use. SAT provided comment in its listing that “College Board assessment writers are instructed to reference this paper regarding Universally Designed Assessment when creating assessment items for the SAT.” However, the peers noted there is no indication of this as part of the training and no verification this process was followed. Are items rejected during item review process that may indicate these practices are not implemented?</p> <p>Analysis</p> <p>2.1.1.a, pp. 50-63: results of DIF analyses indicate low or no DIF, however, no DIF evidence was provided for SWD, EI and no interpretation provided.</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 SAT Consortium**

| Critical Element   | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)  | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>This PowerPoint deck is presented to SSD supervisors via online training sessions and reviews the policies and procedures related to nonstandard SAT administrations.</p> <p><b>Evidence #4.2.1: Creating Better Tests for Everyone Through Universally Designed Assessments (2004)</b></p> <p>College Board assessment writers are instructed to reference this paper regarding Universally Designed Assessment when creating assessment items for the SAT.</p> |  |
| <b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b>   |   |  |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence for the 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, including the lack of any data related to students with disabilities and ELs.</li> </ul> |   |  |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)  | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence   |
|---|---|--|
| <p align="center"><b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b></p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p> | <p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b></p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 75 - 106 describe various psychometric analyses to study how the SAT assesses student performance across the full performance continuum.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 6 (pages 66 - 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #4.3.1: SAT Effectiveness at Representing Test Taker Achievement across the Performance Spectrum (2017)</b></p> <p>This document provides data regarding the SAT’s effectiveness at representing test taker achievement.</p> | <p>The graphs of different score distributions indicate that scores were earned across the continuum. Stated in 4.3.1, p. 3: “The normal curve with the corresponding mean and standard deviation is superimposed on each graph for comparison. The histograms show a reasonable spread of scores across the entire scale score range. The results reflect tests that well match the test taking population.”</p> <p>2.1.1.a: pp. 216 – 221 &amp; 4.3.1: CSEMs are almost identical across the score range, indicating similar precision across the spectrum (for low-, medium-, and high-achieving students).</p> |
| <p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p>   |   |  |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>   |   |  |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

| 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 SAT Consortium**

| <b>Critical Element</b>   | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>  | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>   |
|---|--|---|
| <p align="center"><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p> | <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 2 - 4 describe the scores derived from the assessment and the intended use of results.</li> <li>• Page 48 - 49 describes the inter-rater reliability statistics related to the essay portion of the assessment.</li> <li>• Pages 60 - 74 describe the scoring procedures for the SAT, a description of how results are reported, and the item analysis that is performed on the operational items, including Differential Item Functioning (DIF) and Key Validation. The required qualifications for human scorers are also included in this section.</li> <li>• Pages 75 - 106 describe scaling procedures, equating, analysis of normative information to support appropriate interpretations of the common score scales, reliability analysis and additional psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> <li>• Pages 133 - 135 describe the processes that were used to develop and validate the SAT benchmarks for college and career readiness.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 5 (pages 37 - 65) provides the essay scoring rubric and data to support the item analysis findings summarized in the technical manual.</li> <li>• Appendix 6 (pages 66 – 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.1: Scaling for the SAT Suite of Assessments (2017)</b></p> <p>This document describes the methodology and</p> | <p>The sample score report, Evidence 5.1.4, was the evidence used to get an overview of how scores and sub scores are reported.</p> <p>The subdivisions of the SAT do not map easily onto the Domains and Strands of the content standards.</p> <p>The state-specific alignment documents show how the standards fall into the different reported sections of the SAT</p> <p>Documentation provides evidence of scoring procedures and scoring involving human judgment; however, 3.3.3, 3.3.4, 3.3.5 do not provide I-RR; 3.3.7 does – how is this I-RR interpreted by states and ETS?</p> <p>The low IRR brings into question the validity of the scores for the essay test. What are SAT plans to address this issue?</p> <p>States that use the essay test should review and consider improvements in this section.</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 SAT Consortium**

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)   | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|------------------|--|--|
|                  | <p>scale development process for the SAT Suite of Assessments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 8 - 11 provide a description of the scores derived from the SAT and an overview of how the scores were developed.</li> <li>• Pages 16 – 24 describe how the scaling study was designed.</li> <li>• Pages 25 – 40 describe the characteristics of SAT scaling.</li> <li>• Pages 66 – 74 describe the characteristics of SAT subscore scaling.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.3: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report – Delaware (April 2017)</b><br/>           This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 SAT school day administration, and includes information on the inter-rater reliability of the essay test included in the SAT. Please refer to pages 51 of 68 – 63 of 68 for information on inter-rater (single rater) reliability, percentages of agreement, correlation coefficient, and kappa statistics.</p> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.4: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report – Maine (April 2017)</b><br/>           This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 SAT school day administration, and includes information on the inter-rater reliability of the essay test included in the SAT. Please refer to pages 51 of 68 – 63 of 68 for information on inter-rater (single rater) reliability, percentages of agreement, correlation coefficient, and kappa statistics.</p> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.5: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report – Michigan (April 2017)</b><br/>           This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 SAT school</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 SAT Consortium**

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)   | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|--|--|
|   | day administration, and includes information on the inter-rater reliability of the essay test included in the SAT. Please refer to pages 65 of 84 – 79 of 84 for information on inter-rater (single rater) reliability, percentages of agreement, correlation coefficient, and kappa statistics. |  |
| <b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b>  |  |  |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide evidence of established and documented standardized essay scoring procedures and protocols that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of adequate inter-rater reliability.</li> </ul> |  |  |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

| Critical Element   | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)   | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence  |
|--|--|---|
| <p align="center"><b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</b></p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p> | <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 39 - 49 describe how the test is constructed to ensure multiple forms of the assessment are comparable</li> <li>• Pages 82 - 90 describe equating procedures and results for the SAT.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 6; Tables A-6.3.2 through A-6.3.5 (pages 72 - 78) show data and sample sets related to the equating procedures described in pages 82 - 90 of evidence 2.1.1.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.2: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report- Connecticut (April 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 2 provides an executive summary which describes the number of forms used in the April 2017 administration of SAT SD in Connecticut.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.5: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report- Michigan (April 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 2 provides an executive summary which describes the number of forms used in the April 2017 administration of SAT SD in Michigan.</li> </ul> | <p>Documentation adequately provided for this critical element</p> <p>Peers noted it would have been helpful for an opportunity to review the forms or an independent audit of the multiple test forms.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b></p>  |  |   |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>  |  |   |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

| <b>Critical Element</b>   | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>   | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b> |
|---|---|---|
| <p align="center"><b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b></p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>• Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul> | <p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math. The SAT has been administered in English and as a pencil and paper assessment.</b></p> | <p>This critical element does not apply to this review.</p>                           |
| <p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p>   |   |   |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>   |   |   |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

| 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 SAT Consortium**

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)   | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence  |
|---|--|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;"><b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b></p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p> | <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 1 - 20 provide an overview of the assessment, including a description its purpose, test format and content, scores derived from the assessment and the intended use of results.</li> <li>• Pages 107 – 135 examine the validity of the SAT and includes information on the evidentiary foundations behind the test content, concordance between the current and previous version of the SAT, and the relationship between SAT scores and first-year grade point average, as well as the relationship between SAT scores and college and career readiness benchmarks.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tables A-3.1 – A-3.15 in Appendix 3 (pages 11 - 35) provide test content specifications and content domains and descriptions.</li> <li>• Appendix 5 (pages 37 - 65) provides additional detail regarding how statistical indices were computed.</li> <li>• Appendix 6 (pages 66 – 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> <li>• Appendix 7 (pages 321 – 396) displays the results of analyses performed to evaluate the validity of the SAT.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 198 – 206 provide an overview of SAT development process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.1: An SAT Validity Primer</b></p> | <p>4.7.1: “Initial findings from this large-scale study will be available in 2019.”</p> <p>No evidence of independent studies of alignment</p> <p>No evidence of states’ systems for monitoring and improving related to examples of evidence related to critical element</p> <p>Since states are using SAT as an accountability measure, evidence and claims will result in different needs which results in different studies to support this use.</p> <p>The College Board should plan to study the use of the SAT for state accountability vs. a predictive test for college admission.</p> <p>Evidence from the 2019 study and TAC recommendations may provide some information in meeting this element.</p> |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)  | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|------------------|---|--|
|                  | <p><b>(January 2015)</b><br/>           This paper provides validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores and important college outcomes. The evidence provided in this paper is based on a previous version of the SAT. Pages 131 – 135 of the <i>SAT Suite Technical Manual</i> describe how the new version of the SAT correlates with the previous version of the assessment.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.2: The Redesigned SAT® Pilot Predictive Validity Study: A First Look (2016)</b><br/>           This white paper provides preliminary validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores resulting for the redesigned SAT and important college outcomes. The College Board is in the process of completing a validity study to replicate the findings of this white paper with a large, nationally representative sample. The study will examine students in the entering college class of fall 2017, the first full cohort to be admitted to college with the new SAT. For more information regarding this planned study, please refer to page 152 of the SAT Technical Manual.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire and Illinois (2015 - 2018)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 7 - 9 of each document describe how alignment between the standards and the assessment is determined.</li> <li>• Pages 16 - 106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to each respective state’s English Language Arts/Literacy and Math standards for grades 11 and 12.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.1.1: SAT Practice Test 8 (2017)</b><br/>           This practice test is a version of a form that was used for a 2016 SAT test administration. The</p> |  |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)   | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|--|--|
|   | <p>sample test includes the optional essay, answer key, answer sheet and instructions on how to score the test.</p> <p><b>Evidence #4.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report Table of Contents</b><br/>                     This document displays the contents of a typical post-administration Test Analysis Report for the national administration of the SAT. The College Board provides state level administration reports to its state partners. Please refer to evidence #3.3.2 – 3.3.7 for the state specific administration reports.</p> <p><b>Evidence #4.7.1: Excerpt from TAC presentation regarding Validity Research (February 2017)</b><br/>                     The College Board presents validity evidence to the Technical Advisory Committees of our state partners. These slides are an excerpt from these presentations and covers information regarding College Board past, current and future validity studies.</p> |  |
| <p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b></p>   |  |  |
| <p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of 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</li> </ul> |  |  |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

### **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 SAT Consortium**

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)   | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence  |
|---|--|---|
| <p align="center"><b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards;</li> <li>• States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs;</li> <li>• Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment;</li> <li>• Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities;</li> <li>• Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;</li> <li>• Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic</li> </ul> | <p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math, so no evidence will be provided related to a specific state’s alternate assessment. The state will determine which students take the general or the alternate assessment. Below we provide documentation regarding the accommodations that the College Board provides for administrations of the general assessment.</b></p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 49 – 52 describe the types of available allowable accommodations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <p>This manual provides instructions for supervisors who will be responsible for registering students for testing accommodations, and managing the test administration for students who require testing accommodations.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.5: SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017)</b></p> <p>This PowerPoint deck is presented to SSD supervisors via an online training session and reviews the policies and procedures related to SAT administrations for students who require testing accommodations.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.1: Pages from the College Board Students with Disabilities website. (accessed September 1, 2017)</b></p> <p>This document provides images of the College Board web pages regarding the accommodations request and approval process. This information is available through the College Board website -</p> | <p><b>Participation Requirements for Students with Disabilities</b></p> <p>There is an online request system for accommodations for students with disabilities listed on page 58 of the technical manual.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All evidence is specific to the SAT; evidence required by states is not provided in this document.</li> </ul> <p>The evidence of the process used by the states lacks clarity, such as does the state upload a file detailing accommodations for efficient and effective data reporting? It is unclear based on the screen shots in the PowerPoint (2.3.5 webinar) whether this process is used.</p> <p><b>Decisions by IEP team based on individual need</b></p> <p>Since 1/1/2017, students receive the same accommodations on the SAT as they do routinely use in assessment situations based on the accommodations provided on the IEP. The request must still be submitted on the SAT online system as a simplified request.</p> <p>Some accommodations are listed on page 59(2.1.1) but a complete list and instructions for administering the accommodations are not provided.</p> <p>5.1.1 and 5.1.2 contains screens from the webpages, where more instructions are listed in detail for each type of accommodation and how to request it. The College Board stated that the accommodation list is not complete. A complete list of the approved accommodations should be provided.</p> <p>Clarity needs to be provided with respect to the</p> |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

| Critical Element   | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)  | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence   |
|--|---|--|
| <p>achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments);</li> <li>The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.</li> </ul> | <p><a href="https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities">https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities</a></p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.2: College Board Typical Accommodations (accessed October 2, 2017)</b><br/>This document provides information regarding typical testing accommodations available for SAT test administrations. This information is available through the College Board website - <a href="https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities/typical-accommodations">https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities/typical-accommodations</a>.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.3: Support for Students with Temporary Physical/ Medical Conditions</b><br/>This form is used to request testing support for students with temporary impairments (caused by injury, accident, etc) who cannot postpone their tests.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.4: Reports for Students who Test with State Allowed Accommodations</b><br/>Students who test using state allowed accommodations will receive test results that are marked with an “SAA” label. These screen shots show how the designation appears on their reports.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.5: Parent Consent Form Templates</b><br/>The College Board provides a template that district and school administrators may use to attain parental consent to administer the SAT with testing accommodations to particular students. This resource is optionally used by our state partners.</p> | <p>flow of information between ETS and the SAT about requesting accommodations, particularly when these are not on an IEP and if the request is denied. How is this information provided to the state?</p> <p><b>Guidelines for IEP Team Decision-making, including accommodations</b><br/>The SAT did not provide any evidence on the IEP team decision-making process for selection of accommodations.</p> <p><b>Accessibility Features and Selection of Appropriate Accommodations</b><br/>Evidence appears to be adequate for this piece of the critical element.</p> <p><b>Parent Notification</b><br/>Evidence 5.1.5 is the parent notification form for requesting accommodations that are not SAT identified. SAT has a form to request accommodations that will exclude the student’s score for college.<br/>Is SAT providing any guidance to states/IEP team use on score reporting for state approved accommodations and its impact on use of non-reportable scores for college admission purposes?</p> <p>Peers were not provided information about what information parents receive about SAT accommodations. There is a statement on the request form that the score may be non reportable, but there is no detail to explain to parents on the accommodation use.<br/>The student score report indicates that the score is non reportable due to SAA accommodations</p> |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

| Critical Element   | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence   |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>What do states share with parents about accommodations and possible implications on score reporting to colleges?</p> <p>States may provide this information but SAT did not provide information for the parent.</p> <p>States will need to provide information on accommodations if SAT does not provide. An accommodation manual detailing the selection, use, and reporting of test accommodations and implications would be beneficial for parents and teachers.</p> |
| <b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b>   |  |  |
| <p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:<br/>Provide evidence of guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards;</li> <li>• States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs;</li> <li>• Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment;</li> <li>• Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;</li> </ul> |  |  |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

| 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 SAT Consortium**

| <b>Critical Element</b>   | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>   | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>   |
|---|---|---|
| <p><b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> <li>○ Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;</li> <li>○ Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul> | <p>The College Board's policies and procedures are designed to ensure that appropriate testing accommodations are made available to students with disabilities, including English learners with a diagnosed disability. Students who are approved for and using testing accommodations at their school through a current Individualized Education Program (IEP) 504 Plan, or Formal Written Plan will have those same accommodations automatically approved for taking the SAT®, PSAT™10, PSAT/NMSQT®, SAT Subject Tests™, and AP® Exams. Please refer to the evidence provided in response to critical elements 5.1 and 5.3 for additional information regarding College Board accommodations processes.</p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 50 - 51 describe the types of accommodations available to English learners.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <p>This manual provides instructions on how to administer the SAT to English Learner students who are required to test with additional supports such as glossaries or translated instructions. Refer to pages iv, vi, and 30 for those instructions.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.2.1: College Board-Approved Word-to-Word Glossaries for the SAT® Suite of Assessments (2017)</b></p> <p>This document lists the word-to-word glossaries that the College Board has approved for use with the SAT by English Learner students. The state education agency decides which students can use these language supports. These supports do not require an accommodations request and provide</p> | <p>There was no guidance provided on the selection process for the two accommodations provided. The test directions may be read, but are the questions also read for the mathematics?</p> <p>Directions for administration of the two accommodations all EL may use (2.3.3, pp iv, vi, 30) and (5.2.2). There is a separate request for additional time for EL under 5.2.2.</p> <p><b>Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s)</b></p> <p>States are advised to produce the evidence on accommodations. SAT supplies options for ELs, but LEAs decide which students receive these accommodations.</p> <p>Although all ELs may use word-word dictionaries and translated directions (2.1.1, pp. 50-51), there are no procedures provided to determine whether an EL should be assessed with these accommodations.</p> <p>Accessibility tools and features are not addressed, but accommodations are listed on page 60.<br/>1/1/2017 – state-funded daytime administrations – instructions in several native languages provided; glossaries available too.</p> <p>SAT appears to delegate this to the state by stating only two questions to be answered: Is the requested accommodation(s) in the student’s plan?<br/>Has the student used the accommodation(s) for school testing? (see Evidence 5.1.1) It is not clear if there is a different system for EL or SWD?</p> <p>The evidence (2.3.5 webinar) suggests that extended</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 SAT Consortium**

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)  | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence   |
|---|---|--|
|   | <p>college reportable scores to students.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.2.2: College Board translated instructions for the SAT (2017)</b></p> <p>The College Board provides translated test instructions to English language learners in the following languages: (a) English, (b) Arabic, (c) Chinese, (d) Haitian Creole, (e) Polish, (f) Russian, (g) Portuguese, (h) Spanish, and (i) Vietnamese. The state education agency decides which students can use these language supports. These supports do not require an accommodations request and provide college reportable scores to students.</p> | <p>time for ELs is a state accommodation only which has implications for score reporting and perhaps unintended consequence for the student because the score may not be reported for college admission.</p> <p>What is the decision-making process, how is this communicated to the EL team, how is this reported back to the state?</p> <p>It should be clear if this is used for a state test, which accommodations are provided and reported, who makes the selection decision, and how this is reported back to the state?</p> <p>Clarity between SAT and State guidance is needed for this element.</p> <p>Please provide the report regarding the effectiveness of the extended time accommodation for ELs.</p> <p>More evidence regarding the inclusion of ELs and accommodations is needed.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b></p>   |   |  |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:<br/> Evidence of communicating this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> <li>○ Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;</li> <li>○ Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul> |   |  |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

| 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 SAT Consortium**

| <b>Critical Element</b>  | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>  | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>  |
|--|--|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;"><b>5.3 – Accommodations</b></p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504;</li> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);</li> <li>Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> <li>Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul> | <p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math, so no evidence will be provided related to a specific state’s alternate assessment. The state will determine which students take the general or the alternate assessment. Below we provide documentation regarding the accommodations that the College Board provides for administrations of the general assessment. The processes described below apply to students with disabilities who are native English speakers and those who are English language learners.</b></p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 49 – 51 describe the types of available allowable accommodations, including a description of the supports available for English learners.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.5: SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017)</b></p> <p>This PowerPoint deck is presented to SSD supervisors via an online training session and reviews the policies and procedures related to SAT administrations for students who require testing accommodations. All students with documented disabilities, including English learners, can request and are approved for disability accommodations.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.1: Pages from the College Board Students with Disabilities website. (accessed September 1, 2017)</b></p> <p>This document provides images of the College</p> | <p>SAT did not provide any information to ensure that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL)</p> <p>SSD and State Allowed Accommodations are treated differently by the College Board but it is not clear how this impacts state accountability requirements that ensure access for all students.</p> <p>No evidence of any College Board studies on their accommodations and the impact on student scores to validate the accommodations. Although the College Board indicated a study on extended time will be conducted, no evidence of a plan and timeline was provided to verify this statement.</p> <p>There was no data provided on the types and frequency of accommodation approval requests.</p> <p>Pg. 25. Technical manual: “the vast majority of students who are approved for and using testing accommodations at their school through a current IEP or 504 plan have those same accommodations automatically approved for taking the College Board assessment.” How many students automatically qualify and get approved? How many students do not qualify automatically and get approved or not approved? How is the decision made?</p> <p><b>Ensures Availability/Appropriateness/Selection for SWD and EL</b></p> <p>States should supply evidence of how LEAs select accommodations for SWD and EL.</p> <p>There was no evidence provided to address whether the accommodations do not alter the construct being assessed, and allow meaningful</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 SAT Consortium

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)  | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence   |
|------------------|---|--|
|                  | <p>Board web pages regarding the accommodations request and approval process. All students with documented disabilities, including English learners, can request and are approved for disability accommodations. This information is available through the College Board website - <a href="https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities">https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities</a></p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.2: College Board Typical Accommodations (accessed October 2, 2017)</b><br/>This document provides information regarding typical testing accommodations available for SAT test administrations. This information is available through the College Board website - <a href="https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities/typical-accommodations">https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities/typical-accommodations</a>.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.3: Support for Students with Temporary Physical/ Medical Conditions</b><br/>This form is used to request testing support for students with temporary impairments (caused by injury, accident, etc.) who cannot postpone their tests.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.4: Reports for Students who Test with State Allowed Accommodations</b><br/><b>Student who test with State Allowed Accommodations receive a non-college reportable score. This document shows the online and paper-based score report that these students obtain. In adherence to applicable state and federal accessibility laws, College</b></p> <p>Board reports and resources are designed to meet accessibility standards including Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.</p> | <p>interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</p> <p>Is the read-aloud test format available for the Reading test? How is this not interfering with the tested construct?</p> <p>Per the sample score report for tests given with State Allowed Accommodations (5.1.4), scores may not be used for college admission or scholarship purposes, indicating they are not valid for these decisions. Where are the studies providing evidence that accommodated forms scores are valid for other uses such as tracking college and career readiness?</p> <p><b>Process for exceptional accommodation request</b><br/>Special cases addressed in 2.3.5 include changes to previously requested accommodations and transfer students.<br/>Slide 4, 2.3.5 indicates that SAT reviews requests for other accommodations.<br/>SAT has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed but data was not provided on the impact such accommodations may have on score reportability for state accountability vs. SAT college reporting.</p> <p>The SAT did not provide evidence that the accommodations 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</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 SAT Consortium**

| Critical Element   | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)   | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence  |
|--|--|---|
|  | <p><b>Evidence #5.1.5: Parent Consent Forms Templates</b></p> <p><b>The College Board provides to its state clients templates that they may use to obtain parental consent for students to test with College Board approved accommodations or State Allowed Accommodations. The template is included here as evidence of supports the College Board provides to the state.</b></p> | <p>for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b></p>  |  |   |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide</p> <p>Evidence that the State ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);</li> <li>• Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> <li>• Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed but data was not provided and/or does this impact the score as reportable or non reportable.</li> </ul> |  |   |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

| 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 SAT Consortium**

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)   | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence   |
|---|--|--|
| <p align="center"><b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b></p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul> | <p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math, so no evidence will be provided related to a specific state’s alternate assessment. The state will determine which students take the general or the alternate assessment. Below we provide documentation regarding the accommodations that the College Board provides for administrations of the general assessment. Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <p>This manual provides instructions for supervisors who will be responsible for registering students for testing accommodations and managing the test administration for students who require testing accommodations.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.5: SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017)</b></p> <p>This PowerPoint deck is presented to SSD supervisors via an online training session and reviews the policies and procedures related to SAT administrations for students who require testing accommodations.</p> | <p><b>State Policies Consistency</b><br/>What are state allowed accommodations that may not be accepted by SAT?</p> <p>Does College Board collect any information from states to ensure students receive the appropriate accommodations on the assessment?<br/>Is there any information on how many students do not receive or are denied accommodations via College Board’s process that should receive accommodations per state policy? Any studies?</p> <p><b>Consistent with instruction and IEP team process</b><br/>There is no evidence that SAT communicates about the accommodations use with IEP teams or the state.</p> <p><b>Administered with fidelity to TA procedures</b><br/>Is there any data to show that SAT has collected information from local test administrators regarding faithful implementation for special populations? The irregularities forms and procedures were included, but they seem to apply to the general population more than the special populations and accommodations.<br/>What training is provided to scribes and readers? This is critical training; slide 41 says training must be provided, but there is no further information.</p> <p><b>Process used to monitor compliance by districts with data to verify</b><br/>No State or SAT monitoring information is provided-either before, during, or post administration.</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 SAT Consortium

| Critical Element   | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b>   |  |  |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:<br/>           Evidence that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul> |  |  |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

### **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 |
|------------------|--|--|
|------------------|--|--|

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)  | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence  |
|---|---|---|
| <p><b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b></p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p> | <p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math, so no evidence will be provided related to a specific state’s alternate assessment.</b></p> <p><b>The College Board provides the below documentation to our state partners as support resources to be used during their standard setting process.</b></p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 120 - 133 describe how the benchmarks were determined and how they are related to college outcomes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board SAT Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire, and Illinois</b></p> <p>Each of these College Board produced documents contains a detailed alignment between the state standards and the SAT. Please refer to Critical Element 2.1 for the relevant sections. These documents were provided to each panelist as a reference that could be used during the Achievement standards setting process.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)</b></p> <p>Panelists were provided with this document as a reference that could be used during the standards setting process.</p> <p><b>Evidence #6.2.1: Final Report on the 2016 SAT Multi-State Standard Setting.</b></p> <p>This report summarizes the procedures used to obtain recommended cut scores from the standard setting panels, as well as the final cut</p> | <p><b>Method and Process</b></p> <p>Standard setting panels were rather small and lacked diversity, particularly in math. There was no EL representation on either standard setting panel.</p> <p>Process for setting achievement levels and descriptors appears to be sufficiently documented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6.2.1 references 4 states –does not include IL and MI.</li> <li>• Used Modified Angoff, p. 5</li> <li>• Description of Essay standard setting process is not included; only DE and ME did this standard-setting. What will other states do? P.73, Appendix J</li> <li>• P. 36 indicates that Math is aligned to CCSS; does not state the same for ERW</li> <li>• ALDs written by SME in 4 states – but no process described (p.4)</li> </ul> <p>2.1.1 pp, 120-135: setting benchmarks</p> <p>6.2.1, for CT, DE, ME, NH: standards setting procedures for the four states were documented. .</p> <p>Will the College Board be conducting any validity evidence on the achievement standards since states are using different points on the scale to make similar inferences (i.e., the group of states vs. Illinois)?</p> <p>IL and MI need to provide evidence of the standards setting process used.</p> <p>Is SAT going to provide evidence of validity of the different cut scores for IL. There was no information on the IL process for standard setting. The peers located the cut score for proficient but there was no process or ALD development provided. Page 10-11. 3.3.7. How is the different cut scores</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 SAT Consortium**

| Critical Element   | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)   | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence   |       |     |     |    |     |     |    |     |     |
|--|--|--|-------|-----|-----|----|-----|-----|----|-----|-----|
|  | scores that were agreed upon by the four states: Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, and New Hampshire. First, an overview of the standard setting meeting is presented, followed by a detailed description of the procedures and results. | addressed with 4 state participation in the standard setting?<br><table border="1" data-bbox="1354 316 1669 414"> <tr> <td>State</td> <td>EWR</td> <td>MSS</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IL</td> <td>540</td> <td>540</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DE</td> <td>480</td> <td>530</td> </tr> </table> | State | EWR | MSS | IL | 540 | 540 | DE | 480 | 530 |
| State  | EWR  | MSS  |       |     |     |    |     |     |    |     |     |
| IL   | 540  | 540  |       |     |     |    |     |     |    |     |     |
| DE   | 480  | 530  |       |     |     |    |     |     |    |     |     |
| <b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b>   |  |  |       |     |     |    |     |     |    |     |     |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards for IL and MI.</li> </ul> |  |  |       |     |     |    |     |     |    |     |     |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

| 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 SAT Consortium

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)   | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence  |
|---|--|---|
| <p><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p> | <p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math, so no evidence will be provided related to a specific state’s alternate assessment. The College Board provides the below documentation to our state partners as support resources to be used during their standard setting process.</b></p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 21 - 26 describe the processes used to ensure the fairness of the assessment.</li> <li>• Pages 27 - 52 provide a detailed description of test development procedures.</li> <li>• Pages 108 - 114 describe the evidentiary foundation for the decisions made about the content included in the SAT.</li> <li>• Pages 120 - 133 describe how the benchmarks were determined and how they are related to college outcomes.</li> <li>• Pages 133 - 135 describe how the SAT assesses student readiness for college.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board SAT Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire, and Illinois</b></p> <p>Each of these College Board produced documents contains a detailed alignment between the state standards and the SAT. Please refer to Critical Element 2.1 for the relevant sections. These documents were provided to each panelist as a reference that could be used during the Achievement standards setting process.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)</b></p> <p>Panelists were provided with this document as a reference that could be used during the standards setting process.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.1: An SAT Validity Primer (January 2015)</b></p> <p>This paper provides validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores and important college outcomes. The</p> | <p><b>Challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards</b></p> <p>The description of process to develop ALDs is lacking in 6.2.1. The process is not described.</p> <p>Evidence that academic achievement standards are challenging was not provided.</p> <p>Will the College Board be conducting any validity evidence on the achievement standards since states are using different points on the scale to make similar inferences (i.e., the group of states vs. Illinois)?</p> <p>It is not clear how the ALDs represent the State’s academic content standards, the evidence shows alignment with the SAT benchmarks.</p> <p>Page 36.Appendix C. SAT states there is alignment with the state academic standards but there is no evidence or documentation provided to verify the statement.</p> <p>Page 45. 6.2.1. ALDs designed to describe SAT performance but not the state academic achievement standards or the depth of the coverage. An independent alignment study may address this element.</p> |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

| Critical Element   | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)  | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
|  | <p>evidence provided in this paper is based on a previous version of the SAT. Pages 131 – 135 of the SAT Suite Technical Manual describe how the new version of the SAT correlates with the previous version of the assessment.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.2: The Redesigned SAT® Pilot Predictive Validity Study: A First Look (2016)</b></p> <p>This white paper provides preliminary validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores resulting for the redesigned SAT and important college outcomes. The College Board is in the process of completing a validity study to replicate the findings of this white paper with a large, nationally representative sample. The study will examine students in the entering college class of fall 2017, the first full cohort to be admitted to college with the new SAT. For more information regarding this planned study, please refer to page 152 of the SAT Technical Manual.</p> <p><b>Evidence #6.2.1: Final Report on the 2016 SAT Multi-State Standard Setting.</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="661 808 1346 1019"> <tr> <td data-bbox="661 808 695 1019"></td> <td data-bbox="695 808 1312 1019"> <p>This report summarizes the procedures used to obtain recommended cut scores from the standard setting panels, as well as the final cut scores that were agreed upon by the four states: Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, and New Hampshire. First, an overview of the standard setting meeting is presented, followed by a detailed description of the procedures and results.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1312 808 1346 1019"></td> </tr> </table> |  | <p>This report summarizes the procedures used to obtain recommended cut scores from the standard setting panels, as well as the final cut scores that were agreed upon by the four states: Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, and New Hampshire. First, an overview of the standard setting meeting is presented, followed by a detailed description of the procedures and results.</p> |  |  |
|  | <p>This report summarizes the procedures used to obtain recommended cut scores from the standard setting panels, as well as the final cut scores that were agreed upon by the four states: Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, and New Hampshire. First, an overview of the standard setting meeting is presented, followed by a detailed description of the procedures and results.</p>  |  |  |  |  |
| <p><b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b></p>  |   |  |  |  |  |
| <p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of how the 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.</li> </ul> |   |  |  |  |  |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

| 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 SAT Consortium**

| <b>Critical Element</b>  | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>  | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>  |
|--|--|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;"><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;</li> <li>• The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;</li> <li>• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;</li> <li>○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;</li> <li>○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <p>The following documents are reference materials provided by the College Board to educators to support their use of the College Board reporting platform.</p> <p>In adherence to applicable state and federal accessibility laws, College Board reports and resources are designed to meet accessibility standards including Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.</p> <p><b>Evidence #6.4.1: K–12 Educator Brief: The College and Career Readiness Benchmarks for the SAT® Suite of Assessments (April 2016)</b><br/>This brochure explains how the SAT benchmarks were derived and how to interpret SAT test results. It also provides a set of frequently asked questions regarding the assessment reporting.</p> <p><b>Evidence #6.4.2: K-12 Educator Brief: The SAT® Suite of Assessments: Using Scores and Reporting to Inform Instruction (2015)</b><br/>This educator brief provides an overview of the different reports available to teachers, and how these reports can be used for curricular and intervention purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 23 - 41 display and explain the uses for sample reports available through the College Board reporting portal.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #6.4.3: SAT Understanding Scores 2017 (2017)</b><br/>This brochure provides information to educators regarding scoring benchmarks, how the assessment is scored and how to access score reports on the College Board reporting portal. It also provides a guide on how to interpret student score reports.</p> <p><b>Evidence #6.4.4: Professional Development</b></p> | <p>The College Board indicated it is developing a Spanish Language version of Evidence #6.4.3 for the 2018-19 school year but the peers did not receive any evidence to support the statement.</p> <p>SAT supplies the tools for reporting including assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address needs based on the SAT framework but not the state standards.</p> <p>States should supply evidence of such reports as generated and published.</p> <p>For the individual student reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No State evidence for each of these criteria is provided. Not clear if there is state material that accompanies the SAT score reports. What reports are delivered to parents – same as student reports?</li> <li>• SAT information is provided, but not connected to requirements for States.</li> <li>• How are achievement standards (PLDs) reflected on SAT reports?</li> <li>• If SAT is given in grade 11 for these states, all the SAT material only indicates that the SAT is grade 11 and grade 12 – how do states address grade 11 vs. 12 for reporting purposes?</li> <li>• An individual score report was not provided for review to address the reporting requirements.</li> </ul> <p>When do parents receive the reports with a guide to interpret the test results? Do teachers receive reports in time and with resources to help guide instruction? There is no information on the timeline for parent delivery.</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 SAT Consortium

| 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"> <li>The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>  | <p><b>Module #6: Using Scores and Reporting to Inform Instruction (2015)</b><br/>                     This PowerPoint presentation can be used to train educators on how to access, interpret and apply score report results to inform classroom instruction.</p> <p><b>Evidence #6.4.5: Facilitator Guide to Professional Development Module #6: Using Scores and Reporting to Inform Instruction (2015)</b><br/>                     This guide is a companion to the PowerPoint presentation and is intended as a support resource for administrators or district trainers who will be training their educators on how score reporting.</p> <p><b>Evidence #6.4.6: Educator Online Reporting Screen Shot Demo (February 2017)</b><br/>                     This PowerPoint shows the different reports that available through the College Board online reporting system.</p> | <p>Educators also have a dashboard for requesting a variety of reports.</p> <p>There is no process and timeline for delivery to parents for individual reports.</p> <p>There is no information on availability of alternate formats of the reports available upon request.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b></p>  |   |  |
| <p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>Evidence of reporting that facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;</li> <li>Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;</li> <li>Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</li> </ul> </li> <li>The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul> |   |  |

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

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## March 2018 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 Evidence in Support of the  
SAT

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..... 11  
2.2 – Item Development..... 12  
2.3 – Test Administration ..... 13  
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)14  
2.5 – Test Security ..... 15  
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 16

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 17**  
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 17  
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 18  
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure ..... 19  
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables ..... 20

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER ..... 21**  
4.1 – Reliability..... 21  
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 22  
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... 23  
4.4 – Scoring ..... 24  
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms ..... 25  
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment ..... 26  
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance..... 27

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS ..... 28**  
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities ..... 29  
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 33  
5.3 – Accommodations..... 36  
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations ..... 38

**SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 39**  
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students  
..... 39  
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 41  
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards ..... 43  
6.4 – Reporting..... 45

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

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

**SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS**

| Critical Element   | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)   | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence   |
|--|--|--|
| <p><b>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</b></p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State.</p> | <p>Maine Education and Maine Legislature – Maine Revised Statutes Title 20-A: excerpts (hereby referred to as Title 20-A)</p> <p>ME-01: Title 20-A, Part 3, Chapter 222, § 6201 Legislative intent (pdf)</p> <p>ME-02: Title 20-A, Part 3, Chapter 222, § 6202 Assessment program established (pdf)</p> <p>ME-03: Title 20-A, Part 3, Chapter 222, § 6208 Legislative intent (pdf)</p> <p>ME-04: SP0705, LD 1800, item 1, 124th Maine State Legislature: An Act To Adopt the Common Core State Standards Initiative (pdf)</p> <p>ME-05: Maine Learning Results include the Common Core State Standards (jpg)</p> | <p>Note from ME (this was a note provided from the State to support their submission): Maine statute directs the State Board of Education, the Department of Education and school administrative units to employ a high degree of creativity in developing content standards and performance indicators and to explore a wide range of program and options so that the standards adopted will reflect the highest possible expectations and assessments will be of the highest possible quality.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required.</p>  |  |  |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine Evidence in Support of the SAT**

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)  | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence   |
|---|---|--|
| <p><b>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</b></p> <p>The State’s academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science specify what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school to succeed in college and the workforce; contain content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.</p> | <p>ME-01: Title 20-A, Part 3, Chapter 222, § 6201 Legislative intent (pdf)<br/>                     ME-02: Title 20-A, Part 3, Chapter 222, § 6202 Assessment program established (pdf)<br/>                     ME-03: Title 20-A, Part 3, Chapter 222, § 6208 Legislative intent (pdf)<br/>                     ME-04: SP0705, LD 1800, item 1, 124th Maine State Legislature: An Act To Adopt the Common Core State Standards Initiative (pdf)<br/>                     ME-05: Maine Learning Results include the Common Core State Standards (jpg)<br/>                     ME-06: Why New Standards? (jpg)</p> | <p><i>Note from ME: The State of Maine adopted the Common Core State Standards in 2011.</i></p> <p>Note: The peers did not see evidence of broad stakeholder involvement (e.g., request for public comment) before adoption, by emergency rules, of Common Core State Standards.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b></p>   |   |  |
| <p><u>  X  </u> No additional evidence is required.</p>   |   |  |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine Evidence in Support of the SAT**

| <b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>  | <b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>  | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>   |
|--|---|--|
| <p align="center"><b>1.3 – Required Assessments</b></p> <p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments (based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate academic achievement standards-AAAS) in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12);</li> <li>• Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12).</li> </ul> | <p>(from august 2017 peer notes)</p> <p>07: Maine_DOE_Operational_Procedure_Manual_April_2016 (pdf)<br/>Section 1: 1.2 State requirements (p. 2; pdf)</p> <p>08: eMPower_ME_School_TCM_FINAL (p.4, pdf)</p> <p>09:RFP_201508154_Maine_Education_Assessments_Math&amp;ELA_pp.1-4 (pdf)</p> <p>10: DOE_a.m.Workshop_Slides (p.16, ppt)</p> <p>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><b>State-specific - Overall:</b></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><b>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>  |   |  |
| <p>X_ No additional evidence is required.</p>  |   |  |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine Evidence in Support of the SAT**

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

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

| 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;"><b>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</b></p> <p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system;</li> <li>• For English learners (EL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment;</li> <li>○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <p>(from august 2017)</p> <p><b>All students:</b><br/>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"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Medical Emergency/Serious Illness:</b></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Severe Emotional Distress</b></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Death in the Immediate Family</b></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Agency Involvement:</b> Involvement by an outside agency such as Department of Health and Human Services or detention by law enforcement pending adjudication.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Exigent Circumstance:</b> A situation that doesn't meet any of the above criteria.</li> </ul> <p><b>CWD:</b><br/>PAAP Sci 112, p. 1 says all special education students in Maine must participate in State assessments.</p> <p><b>ELs:</b> [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,</p> | <p><b>State-specific - Overall:</b><br/><b>All Students:</b><br/>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><b>CWD:</b><br/>PAAP Science #112 states that all special education students must participate in State assessments.</p> <p><b>EL:</b><br/>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</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 Evidence in Support of the SAT**

| <b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>  | <b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>   | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>   |
|--|--|---|
|  | <p>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).<br/>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>the mathematics or science assessment for English learners.<br/>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> |
| <b>Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>   |  |   |
| <p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> |  |   |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine Evidence in Support of the SAT**

| <b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>  | <b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>   | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>  |
|--|--|--|
| <p align="center"><b>1.5 – Participation Data</b></p> <p>The State’s participation data show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system. In addition, if the State administers end-of-course assessments for high school students, the State has procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates on each required assessment and provides the corresponding data.</p>   | <p>from August 2018 peer notes<br/>13: ME_State_NCLB_Report_Card_2015-16 (p.2; pdf)<br/><br/>82: Maine Peer Review Evidence 6.4 Reporting Public (pdf)</p> | <p><b>State-specific - Overall:</b><br/>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><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (from August 2017)</b></p>   |  |  |
| <p>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul> |  |  |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine Evidence in Support of the SAT

### **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 style="text-align: center;"><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results;</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills);</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.</li> </ul> | <p>ME-01: Title 20-A, Part 3, Chapter 222, § 6201 Legislative intent (pdf)</p> <p>ME-07: ME_Educational_Assessment_Math_and_ELA_Measured_Progress_Proposal (pp. 90, 96-101; pdf)</p> <p>ME-14: FINAL.BP54_IT.2017_Math-ELA.2016-17 (Rider A, Outcomes 2&amp;3, pp. 2-4; Outcome 12&amp;13, pp. 8-9; pdf)</p> <p>ME-15: Maine 2017 Essay Report (pp. 5-8; pdf)</p> <p>ME-16: SAT Alignment Final Report_revised 01042017 (pp. v-ix, 1-46; pdf)</p> | <p><b>Purpose</b><br/>Evidence was sufficient.</p> <p><b>Blueprints &amp; Processes</b><br/>ME-16: Well-designed alignment study between SAT and ME standards that identified misalignment; no evidence of how this will be addressed in the future. SAT was not developed to align with the ME content standards.</p> <p><b>CAT</b><br/>N/A</p> <p>Suggestion from peers: one option would be to supplement the SAT with additional items to address standards not tested.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement (see also SAT consortium notes)</b></p> <p><u>  </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A response to the HumRRO alignment study about how the State will address the misalignment or gaps.</li> </ul>  |   |   |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine Evidence in Support of the SAT**

| <b>Critical Element</b>  | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>   | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>   |
|--|---|---|
| <p align="center"><b>2.2 – Item Development</b></p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p> | <p>ME-07: ME_Educational_Assessment_Math_and_ELA_Measured_Progress_Proposal (pp. 113-115, 117-118; pdf)</p> | <p>ME-07: This proposal between Measured Progress and Maine doesn’t provide evidence of item development and item selection for the SAT. Nor did peers find evidence in other provided documents.</p> <p>SAT consortium peers reviewed relevant evidence for the SAT (non-essay portions), but neither group reviewed evidence related to the essay portion’s item development.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement (see SAT notes)</b></p>  |   |   |
| <p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of item development for the SAT, particularly for the essay.</li> </ul>   |   |   |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine Evidence in Support of the SAT**

| <b>Critical Element</b>  | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>  | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>  |
|--|--|--|
| <p align="center"><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments;</li> <li>If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul> | <p>ME-14: FINAL_BP54_FT.2017_Math_ELA.2016-17 (Rider A, Outcome 26, p. 18; Outcome 40, p.28; pdf)</p> <p>ME-17: DOE_pm_Workshop_Slides_2017 (pdf)</p> <p>ME-18: SAT Overview 2016-17 Maine DOE (pdf)</p> <p>ME-19: SSD Webinar for MEDOE Jan 2017 (pdf)</p> <p>ME-20: School Day –Maine April Admin Implementation Slides Jan 2016 (pdf)</p> <p>ME-21: 2.3 Maine DOE sends out assessment communications via District Assessment Coordinators emails, MEA listserv announcements, and DOE Newsroom/Priority Notices. (pdf)</p> <p>Note: peers listed all evidence referenced by the State, but crossed out those documents in which the peers did not find information relevant to the critical element.</p> | <p><b>Communicates to educators</b><br/>Sufficient evidence</p> <p><b>Procedures to ensure training procedures for all individuals responsible for administering the assessments</b><br/>Peers did not find evidence documenting that all individuals responsible for administering the assessments have been trained.</p> <p><b>Computer-based assessments</b><br/>SAT is not computer-based.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b></p>  |  |  |
| <p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence documenting that all individuals responsible for administering the assessments have been trained.</li> </ul>  |  |  |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine Evidence in Support of the SAT**

| 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"><b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>   | <p><b>State-specific – MeCAS R&amp;M Gr 3-8:</b></p> <p><b>Consortium MSAA R&amp;M:</b> 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><b>State-specific MSAA R&amp;M:</b></p> <p><b>PAAP Science:</b> 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"> <li>•Develop a feasible monitoring plan for the administration of alternate assessments,</li> <li>•Annual training for the school principals or designees on Alternate Assessment testing administration protocols,</li> <li>•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.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>   |  |   |
| <p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 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</li> <li>• A policy or indication that annual training is required at the district and school level for everyone involved in test administration</li> <li>• A remediation plan as well as the Test Security Handbook and the Caveon audit report of the state’s current practice</li> </ul> |  |   |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine Evidence in Support of the SAT**

| <b>Critical Element</b>   | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>   | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>   |
|---|---|---|
| <p align="center"><b>2.5 – Test Security</b></p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> </ul> | <p>ME-07: ME_Educational_Assessment_Math_and_ELA_Measured_Progress_Proposal (pp. 93-95, 134, 169, 172; pdf)</p> <p>ME-14: FINAL.BP54_IT.2017_Math-ELA.2016-17 (Rider A, Outcome 27-30, p. 17-19; Rider B, pp. 12-13; pdf)</p> <p>ME-22: CT 3675 Caveon Test Security Audit Contract (Rider A, pp. 1-5; pdf)</p> <p>ME-23: Maine DOE Security Audit Report Final Draft (pp. 10, 13; pdf)</p> <p>ME-35: Lessons Learned 2017-18 College Board-SAT</p> | <p><i>Note from ME: There were no test irregularities reported for Maine SAT during 2015-16 or 2016-17 test administration.</i></p> <p><b>Prevention &amp; Detection of irregularities</b><br/>Peers did not see procedures or documentation of how schools or districts report irregularities. Maine indicated that there were no test irregularities reported during 2015-16 or 2016-17, but ME-35 (p.2) indicates “currently no irregularities/invalidations are reported to DOE.”</p> <p><b>Remediation &amp; Investigation</b><br/>No remediation or investigation plan, if irregularities occur, was provided.</p> <p>Peers noted that the Caveon security study recognized that the State employs many exemplary practices with respect to security practices. The state didn’t provide evidence of these practices. The State should provide a plan or set of procedures to address the findings and recommendations of the Caveon security report.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b></p>   |   |   |
| <p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures or documentation of how schools or districts report irregularities</li> <li>• Remediation plan for addressing irregularities</li> <li>• Security incident response plan (in development, ME-23, p. 29)</li> <li>• Caveon Test Security Handbook for Maine (in development, ME-23, p. 29)</li> </ul>  |   |   |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine Evidence in Support of the SAT**

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)  | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence   |
|---|---|--|
| <p><b>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</b></p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results;</li> <li>• To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> <li>• To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.</li> </ul> | <p>ME-07: ME_Educational_Assessment_Math_and_ELA_Measured_Progress_Proposal (pp. 93-95, 164-169; pdf)</p> <p>ME-14: FINAL.BP54_IT.2017_Math-ELA.2016-17 (Rider A, Outcome 7, p. 7; Outcome 27-28, pp. 181-9; Outcome 30, p. 20; Outcome 37, pp. 24-26; Rider B p. 12; Rider E, pp. 1-7; pdf)</p> <p>ME-24: Maine Department of Education Policy for Reporting Public Data (pdf)</p> <p>ME-25: MAARS User Management Guide v1.1_20161219 (pdf)</p> | <p><b>Protect integrity of test and data during development, administration, storage, and use</b><br/>SAT consortium review addressed this.</p> <p><b>Secure student-level assessment data</b><br/>Sufficient evidence (ME-25)</p> <p><b>Protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students for reporting</b><br/>ME-24: minimum N of 5; peers noted that this is on the lower-end of what is typical.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b></p>   |   |  |
| <p><u>  </u>X_ No additional evidence is required</p>   |   |  |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine Evidence in Support of the SAT**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY**

| Critical Element   | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)   | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence   |
|--|--|--|
| <p><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> <li>• If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul> | <p>ME-14: FINAL.BP54_IT.2017_Math-ELA.2016-17 (Rider A, Outcome 12&amp;13, p. 10; Outcome 48-49, pp. 32-33; pdf)</p> <p>ME-16: SAT Alignment Final Report_revised 01042017 (pp. v-ix, 1-46; pdf)</p> <p>ME-26 - 2.1.4 College Board + Maine, Alignment to Maine Standards (pp. 1-15; pdf)</p> <p>ME-27: April 2017 SAT Q&amp;A Service – Released (pdf)</p> <p>ME-28: April 2017 SAT Q&amp;A Student Guide Released (pdf)</p> <p>ME-29: SAT Alignment Attendee List_07202016 (excel)</p> | <p><b>Adequate alignment</b></p> <p>ME-16: Well-documented and implemented third-party alignment study, however no response from the State about how they will address the findings: ME-16, p. viii: “Overall, the SAT is reasonably aligned to high school reading and writing portions of the CCSS, but somewhat less so for the math portions.”</p> <p>ME-26: College Board (internal) alignment study also identified gaps between SAT and Maine standards.</p> <p>Note: peers did not have SAT technical manual or other relevant documents, but know that they were reviewed by the SAT consortium.</p> <p>Suggestion from peers (same as in critical element 2.1): one option to assess the full range of the State content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity, would be to supplement the SAT with additional items to address standards not tested.</p> <p><b>Alternate assessments:</b> not evaluated in this review.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement (see SAT notes as well)</b></p> <p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State response to the issues and findings of the alignment studies (ME-16 &amp; ME-26).</li> </ul>   |  |  |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine Evidence in Support of the SAT**

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)                    | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence   |
|---|---|--|
| <p><b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p> | <p>ME-16: SAT Alignment Final Report_revised 01042017 (pp. 2, 27-32; pdf)</p> | <p>ME-16: In the HumRRO study, the expert judgment found misalignment of cognitive rigor between items and intended DOK of standards, for both ELA &amp; Writing and Math (e.g., if a standard is intended to be DOK 3 but the items are found to be DOK 2).</p> <p>Suggestion from peers (same as in critical element 2.1): one option to assess the intended cognitive processes would be to supplement the SAT with additional items to address standards not tested.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement (see also SAT notes)</b></p>  |   |  |
| <p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State response/plan to address the misalignment in the cognitive process portion of the alignment study.</li> </ul>                     |   |  |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine Evidence in Support of the SAT**

| <b>Critical Element</b>   | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>  | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>  |
|---|--|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;"><b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p> | <p>ME-15: Maine 2017 Essay Report (pp. 9-16; pdf)<br/>                     ME-16: SAT Alignment Final Report_revised 01042017 (pp. 25-27, 32-35; pdf)<br/>                     ME-30: Maine 2017 SAT Test Analysis Report (pp. 15-21, 35-39; pdf)<br/>                     ME-50: ME Evidence Reporting Confidential Samples (pdf)</p> | <p>ME-15: provides evidence that the essay subscores represented distinct dimensions, as evidenced by low to moderate correlations among subscores.</p> <p>ME-16: HumRRO alignment study indicates that caution should be taken when interpreting subscores; there was not adequate evidence that subscores represent different dimensions of the construct. Correlations among subscores were very high or “nearly perfect” (ME-16, p. 35; ME-30, pp. 14-21).</p> <p>Based on the findings in ME-16, the peers suggest the State should review the use and reporting of subscores on the non-essay portions of the SAT.</p> <p>Note: SAT consortium reviewed evidence for this element for the non-essay portions of the SAT. The state panel reviewed the ME-16 evidence related to the non-essay portions of the SAT found in the Maine and Delaware alignment study, which was NOT available to the SAT consortium reviewers. State panel also reviewed the dimensionality of the SAT essay (ME-15).</p> |
| <p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement (see SAT notes)</b></p>   |  |  |
| <p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State response to the unidimensionality of the SAT (non-essay portions) as found by the alignment study and correlations among subscores.</li> </ul>  |  |  |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine Evidence in Support of the SAT**

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)  | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence   |
|---|---|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;"><b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>  | <p>ME-07: ME_Educational_Assessment_Math_and_ELA_Measured_Progress_Proposal (pp. 237-242; pdf</p> | <p>ME-07: Correlations between SAT scores and HSGPA/FY college GPA were not from a sample of Maine students, but from a pilot study of “15 institutions” (p. 244).</p> <p>Peers could not locate any additional evidence of relationships of Maine SAT scores with other variables in other documents.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement (see SAT notes)</b></p>   |   |  |
| <p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relationship between Maine students’ SAT scores and other variables, such as correlations between SAT scores and other measures (e.g., HS GPA, math and ELA grades, NAEP scores, teacher judgments, or hours spent on homework).</li> </ul> |   |  |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine Evidence in Support of the SAT

### 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;"><b>4.1 – Reliability</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement.</li> </ul> | <p>ME-07: ME_Educational_Assessment_Math_and_ELA_Measured_Progress_Proposal (pp. 237-242; pdf)</p> <p>ME-14: FINAL.BP54_IT.2017_Math-ELA.2016-17 (Rider A, Outcome 49, p.32; pdf)</p> <p>ME-15: Maine 2017 Essay Report (pp. 7-8; pdf)</p> <p>ME-30: Maine 2017 SAT Test Analysis Report (pp. 2, 7, 14-21, 31-32; pdf)</p> | <p><b>Reliability, overall and conditional standard error of measurement of SAT (non-essay)</b><br/>Sufficient evidence of reliability overall and for racial/ethnic groups; but no information provided for SWDs and ELs (ME-30, pp. 14-21).<br/>Note: The State should confirm that results reported overall (ME-30, p. 14) are for all Maine students, not just those with college reportable SAT scores.</p> <p><b>Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification (non-essay)</b><br/>Sufficient evidence of classification accuracy (ME-30, pp. 30-32).</p> <p><b>Reliability, overall and conditional standard error of measurement, and consistency and accuracy of categorical classifications of SAT essay</b><br/>Peers did not find information related to reliability, standard error of measurement, or consistency and accuracy of categorical classifications for the SAT essay scores. (Peers did locate inter-rater reliability information for the SAT essay portion, ME-15.)</p> <p><b>Computer-adaptive tests</b><br/>N/A.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement (see SAT notes)</b></p> <p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the SAT (non-essay), reliability evidence addressing all points of this critical element for all Maine student groups, specifically SWDs and ELs.</li> <li>• Confirm that results reported overall (ME-30, p. 14) are for all Maine students, not just those with college reportable SAT scores.</li> <li>• For the SAT essay portion, reliability, standard error of measurement, and consistency and accuracy of categorical classifications.</li> </ul>  |  |   |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine Evidence in Support of the SAT**

| <b>Critical Element</b>  | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>  | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>  |
|--|--|--|
| <p><b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</b></p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>  | <p>ME-07: ME_Educational_Assessment_Math_and_ELA_Measured_Progress_Proposal (p. 35, 42, 102, 104-107, 113-115, 119; pdf)</p> <p>ME-14: FINAL.BP54_IT.2017_Math-ELA.2016-17 (Rider A, Outcome 10, pp. 8-9; pdf)</p> <p>ME-30: Maine 2017 SAT Test Analysis Report (pp. 23-30; pdf)</p> <p>ME-31: MEA-SAT-SAA-MPO_Accommodations_2016-17 (pdf)</p> | <p><i>Note: State has not provided evidence of the design and development process of the SAT. This information was reviewed at SAT consortium review.</i></p> <p><b>Analysis</b></p> <p>DIF analyses were conducted (demonstrating low or no DIF) and results were broken down by gender and racial/ethnic groups. No evidence was provided that assessment is accessible for SWDs or ELs.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement (see also SAT notes)</b></p>   |  |  |
| <p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that assessment is accessible to SWDs and ELs, such as documentation: of approaches to item development, of procedures used for maximizing accessibility of items during the development process, and that experts in the assessment of SWDs and ELs were involved in item development and review.</li> </ul> |  |  |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine Evidence in Support of the SAT**

| <b>Critical Element</b>  | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>        | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>   |
|--|--|---|
| <p align="center"><b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b></p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>  | <p>ME-30: Maine 2017 SAT Test Analysis Report (pp. 2, 5, 7, 40; pdf)</p> | <p>Sufficient evidence of adequate precision across the full performance continuum for the non-essay portions of the SAT.</p> <p>Note: Confirm that results reported overall (ME-30, p. 14) are for all Maine students, not just those with college reportable SAT scores.</p> <p>For the essay portion, peers could not find evidence related to adequate precision across the full performance continuum.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement (see SAT notes)</b></p>  |  |   |
| <p><u>  </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, for the SAT essay, such as a description of the distribution of scores or conditional standard errors.</li> </ul> |  |   |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine Evidence in Support of the SAT

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)   | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence  |
|---|--|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;"><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>  | <p>ME-14: FINAL.BP54_IT.2017_Math-ELA.2016-17 (Rider A, Outcome 32 p. 21-22; Outcome 41 pp. 28-29; pdf)</p> <p>ME-15: Maine 2017 Essay Report (pp. 5-6; pdf)</p> <p>ME-32: 2017 SAT Essay Rubric (pdf)</p> | <p>Note: SAT consortium panel reviewed evidence for Math and ERW portions. State peers reviewed evidence for essay portion.</p> <p><b>Scoring procedures and protocols:</b><br/>ME-15: inter-rater reliability for essay scoring was low (ME-15, p. 19).</p> <p><b>Report results in terms of State’s academic achievement standards</b><br/>Peers found no evidence addressing this element with respect to the SAT essay.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response or plan to address low inter-rater reliability for the essay scoring</li> <li>• Documentation of procedures for reporting scores in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</li> </ul> |  |   |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine Evidence in Support of the SAT**

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)   | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence  |
|---|--|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;"><b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</b></p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p> | <p>ME-30: Maine 2017 SAT Test Analysis Report (p. 5; pdf)</p> <p>ME-15: Maine 2017 Essay Report (p. 6)</p> | <p>SAT consortium peers reviewed relevant material for the non-essay portions of the SAT and found no additional evidence was required.</p> <p>The only reference peers found to multiple forms for the SAT essay was in ME-15 (p. 6), which indicated that there were two forms, but the data were aggregated across forms and prompts. There was no discussion of how comparability of forms was established.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement (see SAT notes)</b></p>   |  |   |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of comparability across forms and prompts for the SAT essay.</li> </ul>   |  |   |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine Evidence in Support of the SAT**

| Critical Element   | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)   | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence   |
|--|--|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;"><b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b></p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul> | <p>ME-07: ME_Educational_Assessment_Math_and_ELA_Measured_Progress_Proposal (p. 42; pdf)</p> <p>ME-14: FINAL.BP54_IT.2017_Math-ELA.2016-17 (Rider A, Outcome 2, p. 3-5; Outcome 11, p. 9; Outcome 25, p. 17-18; pdf)</p> <p>ME-19: SSD Webinar for MEDOE Jan 2017 (pp. 5-6, 29; pdf)</p> | <p><i>Note: from Maine: As per Accommodations, the SAT is available in Large print, MP3 audio, American Sign Language, and Braille.</i></p> <p>Peers found no evidence related to comparability across multiple versions of assessment, for either the SAT non-essay portions or SAT portions.</p> |

| <b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b>  |
|---|
| <p><u>  </u>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documentation of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results across multiple versions, such as a comparability study or how alternate versions were developed and reviewed.</li> </ul> |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine Evidence in Support of the SAT**

| <b>Critical Element</b>   | <b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>   | <b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b> |
|---|---|---|
| <p><b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b></p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p> | <p>ME-07: ME_Educational_Assessment_Math_and_ELA_Measured_Progress_Proposal (pp, 32-3; pdf)</p> <p>ME-14: FINAL.BP54_IT.2017_Math-ELA.2016-17 (Rider A, Outcome 1, pp. 1-2; pdf)</p> <p>ME-16: SAT Alignment Final Report_revised 01042017 (pp. v-ix; pdf)</p> <p>ME-33: Maine TAC Meeting Summary 021016 (pdf)</p> <p>ME-34: ME TAC Notes 10_3_16 (pdf)</p> <p>ME-35: Lessons Learned 2017-18 CollegeBoard-SAT (pdf)</p> | <p>Peers did not find evidence submitted relevant to this critical element.</p>       |
| <p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement (see SAT notes)</b></p>   |   |   |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documentation of a system for monitoring the technical quality of the SAT for Maine’s purposes.</li> </ul>   |   |   |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine Evidence in Support of the SAT

**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 Evidence in Support of the SAT

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)   | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence   |
|---|--|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;"><b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards;</li> <li>• States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs;</li> <li>• Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment;</li> <li>• Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities;</li> <li>• Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;</li> <li>• Includes instructions that students eligible to be</li> </ul> | <p>ME-07: ME_Educational_Assessment_Math_and_ELA_Measured_Progress_Proposal (pp. 104-107; pdf)</p> <p>ME-09: 2016-17 MEA Operational Procedures Manual (Section 2, pp. 4-8; pdf)</p> <p>ME-14: FINAL.BP54_IT.2017_Math-ELA.2016-17 (Rider A, Outcome 2, pp. 3-5; Outcome 10, p. 8-9; pdf)</p> <p>ME-19: SSD Webinar for MEDOE Jan 2017 (pdf)</p> <p>ME-31: MEA-SAT-SAA-MPO_Accommodations_2016-17 (pdf)</p> <p>ME-36: Participation Guidance_Rev_9-16 (pdf)</p> <p>ME-37: ME Evidence 5.1 &amp; 5.3: Maine DOE sends out assessment communications via District Assessment Coordinators emails, MEA listserv announcements, and DOE Newsroom/Priority Notices.</p> | <p><b>Differences between general and alternate assessments, including effects of policies on student’s education</b></p> <p>ME-36: sufficient and clear evidence on explanation between general and alternate assessments, as well as criteria for participation. Peers could not locate evidence of effects of policies on student’s education if alternate assessment is taken.</p> <p><b>Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs</b></p> <p>ME-31 provides sufficient evidence that assessment decisions are made by IEP team based on individual needs.</p> <p><b>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</b></p> <p>ME-19 &amp; ME-36: good guidance is provided for determining the appropriate assessment. Peers commend the State on providing criteria that should not be considered (as well as considered) in making the determination of assessment participation (ME-36, pp. 11, 12).</p> <p>Note: peers noted that there was limited information provided to parents about the possibility that some accommodations would lead to non reportable scores. The SAT consortium was provided with the consent form for state allowed accommodations in evidence 5.1.5, but peers felt additional information, such as a guide or brochure would be helpful for parents. As noted by the TAC, the non reportability of SAT scores resulting from</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 Evidence in Support of the SAT

| 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"> <li>Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments);</li> <li>The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.</li> </ul> |  | <p>some accommodations is a potential issue of fairness (ME-33, pp. 12, 13).</p> <p><b>Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities</b><br/>Sufficient evidence (ME-19 &amp; ME-31).</p> <p><b>Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities</b><br/>Sufficient evidence (ME-31).</p> <p><b>Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA</b><br/>Suggestion: ME-36 should reflect 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><b>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</b><br/>Peers did not see evidence.</p> <p><b>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</b></p> |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine Evidence in Support of the SAT

| Critical Element   | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | Peers did not see evidence.  |
| <b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b>   |  |  |
| <p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of effects of policies on student’s education if alternate assessment is taken,</li> <li>• Participation guidance, such as ME-36, should reflect that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA,</li> <li>• Evidence 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</li> <li>• Procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum,</li> <li>• State should consider issue of non reportability of SAT scores resulting from accommodations, as noted by their TAC, and how this is communicated to parents and other stakeholders.</li> </ul> |  |  |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine Evidence in Support of the SAT

| 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 Evidence in Support of the SAT

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)   | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence  |
|---|--|---|
| <p><b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> <li>○ Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;</li> <li>○ Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul> | <p>ME-07: ME_Educational_Assessment_Math_and_ELA_Measured_Progress_Proposal (pp, 104-107; pdf)</p> <p>ME-09: 2016-17 MEA Operational Procedures Manual (pdf)</p> <p>Sec.3:3.4 Recently Arrived English Learner (EL) Exemption (p. 9; pdf)</p> <p>ME-11: Maine DOE ESL/Bilingual Programs Serving Maine’s English Learners Resource Guide (jpg)</p> <p>ME-19: SSD Webinar for MEDOE Jan 2017</p> <p>ME-31: MEA-SAT-SAA-MPO Accommodations_2016-17 (pdf)</p> <p>ME-38: English SAT Test Directions ADA FINAL (pdf)</p> <p>ME-39 ME Evidence 5.2: Maine DOE sends out assessment communications via District Assessment Coordinators emails, MEA listserv announcements, and DOE Newsroom/Priority Notices. (pdf)</p> | <p><i>Note from ME: The College Board is in the process of planning and implementing a special data collection to understand the effectiveness of the extended time accommodation for ELL students. The extended time study compares the performance of three student groups (the general education population, SWD, and ELL) testing under two conditions (standard time and time and a half). This study will inform whether extended time is an accessibility issue (i.e., benefits all students) or a valid accommodation (i.e., appropriately benefits ELL and SWD populations). The results from this study will be available in 2018.</i></p> <p><b>Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s) and guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners</b></p> <p>Clearer guidance about which accommodations are appropriate for ELs from the list provided in ME-31 pp. 3-5. Of the State Approved Accommodations which are appropriate for ELs? It was unclear to peers if the word-to-word glossary is an SAA (ME-31, p. 2). Peers suggest that the State reviews recommended EL accommodations, such as those provided by CCSSO or the ED Toolkit.</p> <p><b>Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners</b></p> <p>ME-19 (p. 6) provides evidence of accessibility for all students.</p> <p>For ELs there is limited information on available accommodations; peers found: translated instructions and a word-to-word glossary (ME-31, p. 4). Peers wanted to know if other accommodations such as multiple testing sessions, testing in a separate room, are available to ELs.</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 Evidence in Support of the SAT

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

|                                      |
|--------------------------------------|
| <b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b> |
|--------------------------------------|

|   |
|---|
| <p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Upon completion, State should submit the College Board report on validity of the extended time accommodation,</li> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s),</li> <li>• Clearer guidance about which accommodations are available and appropriate for ELs.</li> </ul> |
|---|

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine Evidence in Support of the SAT

| 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 Evidence in Support of the SAT**

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)   | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence   |
|---|--|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;"><b>5.3 – Accommodations</b></p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities (SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504;</li> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);</li> <li>Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> <li>Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul> | <p><b>ME-07: ME_Educational_Assessment_Math_and_ELA_Measured_Progress_Proposal (pp, 104-107)</b></p> <p><b>ME-11: Maine DOE ESL/Bilingual Programs Serving Maine’s English Learners Resource Guide</b></p> <p><b>ME-14: FINAL.BP54_IT.2017_Math-ELA.2016-17 (Rider A, Outcome 2, p. 3-5; Outcome 10, pp. 8-9)</b></p> <p><b>ME-19: SSD Webinar for MEDOE Jan 2017</b></p> <p><b>ME-31: MEA-SAT-SAA-MPO_Accommodations_2016-17 (pdf)</b></p> <p><b>ME-37: ME Evidence 5.1 &amp; 5.3: Maine DOE sends out assessment communications via District Assessment Coordinators emails, MEA listserv announcements, and DOE Newsroom/Priority Notices.</b></p> <p><b>ME-40: SAT-SSD-TempCondition (pdf)</b></p> | <p><i>Note from ME: The College Board is in the process of planning and implementing a special data collection to understand the effectiveness of the extended time accommodation for ELL students. The extended time study compares the performance of three student groups (the general education population, SWD, and ELL) testing under two conditions (standard time and time and a half). This study will inform whether extended time is an accessibility issue (i.e., benefits all students) or a valid accommodation (i.e., appropriately benefits ELL and SWD populations). The results from this study will be available in 2018.</i></p> <p><b>Appropriate accommodations available for SWDs</b><br/>Sufficient evidence (ME-19) that accommodations are available, although some State Allowed Accommodations (SAAs) make scores non reportable for college admission purposes.</p> <p><b>Appropriate accommodations available for ELs</b><br/>Peers could not determine which accommodations are available to ELs, in addition to the word-to-word dictionary and translated instructions, which are available to all students.</p> <p><b>Comparability of scores of students who do and do not receive accommodations.</b><br/>State did not provide evidence of validity of scores for students who received accommodations. Peers suggest that the State could provide evidence from research on validity of scores from students who received accommodations.</p> <p><b>Exceptional requests for accommodations</b><br/>ME-40 documents procedure to request exceptional accommodations; however, the third bullet states; “Temporary support on the SAT is available only to seniors.” If so, what does this mean for 11<sup>th</sup> graders</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 Evidence in Support of the SAT

| Critical Element   | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | who need temporary support?  |
| <b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b>   |  |  |
| <p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As in section 5.2, provide the planned College Board report on extended time accommodation for ELs,</li> <li>• Clearer explanation and guidance of what accommodations are available to ELs,</li> <li>• Evidence on research of validity of scores from students who received accommodations (see note),</li> <li>• Clarification on exceptional accommodations request for 11<sup>th</sup>-graders taking the SAT (ME-40).</li> </ul> |  |  |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine Evidence in Support of the SAT

| Critical Element   | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)  | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence  |
|--|---|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;"><b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b></p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul> | <p>ME-07: ME_Educational_Assessment_Math_and_ELA_Measured_Progress_Proposal (pp. 104-107; pdf)</p> <p>ME-11: Maine DOE ESL/Bilingual Programs Serving Maine’s English Learners Resource Guide (jpg)</p> <p>ME-14: FINAL.BP54_IT.2017_Math-ELA.2016-17 (Rider A, Outcome 2, pp. 3-5; Outcome 10, pp. 8-9; pdf)</p> <p>ME-19: SSD Webinar for MEDOE Jan 2017 (pdf)</p> <p>ME-31: MEA-SAT-SAA-MPO_Accommodations_2016-17 (pdf)</p> <p>ME-36: Participation Guidance_9-16 (pdf)</p> <p>ME-40: SAT-SSD-TempCondition (pdf)</p> <p>ME-41: CCSO-SCASS-ASES (pdf)</p> | <p>Peers reviewed all eight pieces of evidence cited for this critical element, but could not find references to monitoring or other information relevant to this critical element. The evidence referred to how and what accommodations are provided.</p> <p>Note: monitoring may consist of desk monitoring and/or site visits to a small number of randomly selected schools. The monitoring should be on-going.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><u>  </u>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that State monitors test administration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>○ Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>○ Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>○ Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner;</li> <li>○ Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>   |   |   |

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine Evidence in Support of the SAT**

**SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING**

| Critical Element   | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)   | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence  |
|--|--|---|
| <p><b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</b></p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities;</li> <li>• The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply;</li> <li>• The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</li> </ul> | <p>ME-33: Maine TAC Meeting Summary 021016 (pp. 2, 10, 12-14, 19; pdf)</p> <p>ME-34: ME TAC Notes 10_3_16 (pp. 2, 4; pdf)</p> <p>ME-42: MEA_SAT_2016_ALDs+Cut Scores (pdf)</p> <p>ME-43: Multi-State ALDs for SAT (pdf)</p> <p>ME-44: 2.1.3 College Board + Delaware, Alignment to Delaware Standards (pp. 2-3, 81-84; pdf)</p> <p>ME-45: ME Evidence 6.1: Maine DOE sends out assessment communications via District Assessment Coordinators emails, MEA listserv announcements, and DOE Newsroom/Priority Notices.</p> | <p><i>Note from Maine: After careful review and discussion with TAC, Maine adopted the Essay standards determined by a second standard setting process in Delaware.</i></p> <p><b>The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades</b></p> <p>Peers found evidence that Maine has achievement standards, but did not see documentation of formal adoption.</p> <p><b>The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public school students</b></p> <p>Peers found evidence that Maine has achievement standards, but did not see evidence that they are applied to all public school students.</p> <p><b>The State’s academic achievement standards include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, two for high and one for lower; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels</b></p> <p>Sufficient evidence provided (ME-42).</p> |
| <p><b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of formal adoption of achievement standards, such as legislative statutes or other formal process.</li> <li>• Documentation that achievement standards are applied to all public school students.</li> </ul>   |  |   |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine Evidence in Support of the SAT

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

| Critical Element   | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)  | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence   |
|--|---|--|
| <p align="center"><b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b></p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p> | <p>ME-33: Maine TAC Meeting Summary 021016 (pp. 2, 10, 12-14, 19; pdf)<br/>                     ME-34: ME TAC Notes 10_3_16 (pp. 2, 4; pdf)<br/>                     ME-43: Multi-State ALDs for SAT (pdf)<br/>                     ME-46: 6.2.1 SAT Multi-State Standard Setting Report 2016 with Essay (pdf)<br/>                     ME-47: Multi-State Standard Setting SAT (pdf)</p> | <p><i>Note from ME: After careful review and discussion with TAC, Maine adopted the Essay standards determined by a second standard setting process in Delaware.</i></p> <p>SAT consortium peers reviewed the SAT (without essay) standard setting.</p> <p>The State peers reviewed the essay cut score verification.</p> <p>ME-46, Appendix J: Essay Cut Score Verification with 4 panelists from Delaware and 2 panelists from Maine took place over half a day. This process was a verification of the College Board proposed cut score of 12, not a standard setting. No evidence that the process referred to the achievement standards.</p> <p>ME-47 (refers to SAT without essay multi-state standard setting): peers noted that information about panelists’ subject expertise, including experience with SWDs and ELs, should be included.</p> <p>State panel peers noticed the following TAC comment about essay scores: “The state needs to be clear about its use of the essay score, especially whether it intends to combine the results of the essay score with the EBRW (Evidence-based Reading/Writing) results to produce a ‘total ELA’ score, and if the essay results will be included in school accountability, and if so how” (ME-34, p. 2). Peers wanted clarification of how/whether the essay scores are being used for federal accountability reporting.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b></p>  |   |  |
| <p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>   |   |  |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine Evidence in Support of the SAT

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify whether essay score is used as part of annual summative determination for Reading / Language Arts,</li> <li>• If score will be used:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence of how the essay score and ERW from SAT will be combined, and</li> <li>○ Clear and transparent procedure should be used to ensure new score is valid and reliable, such as a standard setting with new combined score.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |  |  |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine Evidence in Support of the SAT

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)  | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence   |
|---|---|--|
| <p><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p> | <p>ME-42: MEA_SAT_2016_ALDs+Cut Scores (pdf)<br/>ME-48: 6.4.1 K12 Educator Brief – CCR Benchmarks (pdf)</p> | <p><i>Note from ME: A group of five states collectively decided to use the research-based College and Career Readiness Benchmark for SAT as the cutscore between Level 2 and 3 to indicate proficiency.</i></p> <p>Note: SAT consortium peers reviewed 6.3 with respect to the SAT (without essay).</p> <p>The essay cut score verification (ME-46, Appendix J) established a single cut score “on the SAT essay to differentiate students with a minimal level of competency in productive writing from those without.” This categorization does not align with the State’s four achievement levels.</p> <p>Peers did not find evidence that the achievement level descriptors were written to reflect the full range of the State content standards.</p> <p>Note: these comments would only apply if this essay score is being used as part of the annual summative determination.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the SAT essay, evidence that the achievement level descriptors were written to reflect the full range of the State content standards,</li> <li>• If the essay score is used as part of annual summative determination for Reading / Language Arts, evidence of a clear and transparent process to ensure that 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.</li> </ul>   |   |  |

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Maine Evidence in Support of the SAT

| 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 Evidence in Support of the SAT

| Critical Element   | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)   | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence  |
|--|--|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;"><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;</li> <li>• The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;</li> <li>• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;</li> <li>○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;</li> <li>○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <p>ME-07: ME_Educational_Assessment_Math_and_ELA_Measured_Progress_Proposal (pp. 40-41, 245, Appendix Q; pdf) *</p> <p>ME-14: FINAL_BP54_FF_2017_Math_ELA_2016-17 (Rider A, Outcome 38, pp. 24-25; pdf)</p> <p>ME-25: MAARS User Management Guide v1.1_20161219 (pdf)</p> <p>ME-49: CT 05A-20160616-4236 FocalPoint K12 Executed (pdf)</p> <p>ME-50: ME Evidence Reporting Confidential Samples (pdf)</p> <p>ME-51: ME Evidence Reporting Public Samples (pdf)</p> <p>ME-52: 2015-16 &amp; 2016-17 Reporting Public Samples (pdf)</p> <p>ME-53: Reporting_Parent_Letter_Samples (pdf)</p> <p>ME-54: Reporting_Parent_Letter_Sample_Translations (pdf)</p> <p>ME-55: 2016 &amp; 2017 Fall Assessments Workshops Reporting (pdf)</p> <p>ME-56: Accessing College Board Reports (pdf)</p> <p>ME-57: ME Evidence 6.4 Maine Educational Assessments listserv (pdf) Maine DOE sends out assessment communications via District Assessment Coordinators emails, MEA listserv announcements, and DOE Newsroom/Priority Notices.</p> <p>*In ME-07, the appendices are numbered, so there is no Appendix Q and the appendices have cover pages, but no material.</p> | <p><b>Public reporting</b></p> <p>ME-51, ME-52: not reported at each proficiency level, only “at or above State expectations” vs “well below or below.” Results by subgroups of SWDs and ELs were provided, but not by racial/ethnic group. State should confirm if this is available from the pull-down menu.</p> <p><b>Assessment results, itemized score analyses, to districts, schools, etc.</b></p> <p>ME-25, ME-50: confidential reports had four performance levels and results by groups, including SWDs and ELs. Peers did not find documentation of an interpretive guide to accompany the assessment results.</p> <p><b>Individual student reports</b></p> <p>ME-50, pp. 10-11, individual student report provides valid and reliable information of student achievement, achievement in terms of State’s grade-level academic achievement standards. Peers did not find evidence of student reports in alternate formats.</p> <p>Peers did not find evidence of information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students. The parent letter (ME 53 &amp; ME-54) provided some information, but did not meet the full scope of an interpretive guide. Peers were concerned that some parents/guardians may not have Internet access to follow links provided.</p> <p><b>Process and timeline for delivering scores</b></p> <p>Peers reviewed ME-57, which informed district staff of when scores would be available, but this does not constitute a process and timeline for score distribution to parents, teachers, and principals, nor</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 Evidence in Support of the SAT

| Critical Element  | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|--|--|
| <p style="padding-left: 40px;">the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>   |  | <p>does this guarantee that such delivery is timely.</p>                       |
| <p><b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b></p>   |  |  |
| <p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmation of public availability of subgroup reporting,</li> <li>• Public reporting by four performance levels,</li> <li>• Interpretive guides to accompany score reports,</li> <li>• Process and timeline for delivering student reports to parents, teachers, and principals.</li> </ul> |  |  |

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