UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Sheila A. Alles
Interim State Superintendent
Michigan Department of Education
608 W. Allegan Street
P.O. Box 30008
Lansing, MI 48909

November 28, 2018

Dear Superintendent Alles:

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

- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in high school (SAT): **Partially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**

The component that **partially meets requirements** does not meet a number of the requirements of the statute and regulations and/or MDE will need to provide substantial additional information to

demonstrate it meets the requirements. The Department expects that MDE may not be able to submit all of the required information within one year.

The specific list of items required for MDE to submit is enclosed with this letter. Because the State has only partially met the requirements for the SAT assessment, the Department is placing a condition on the State's Title I grant award. To satisfy this condition, MDE must submit satisfactory evidence to address the items identified in the enclosed list. MDE must provide to the Department a plan and timeline by which it will submit the additional documentation within 30 days of the receipt of this letter. If adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action. 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 OSDE's Federal fiscal year 2020 IDEA Part B grant award.

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 MDE peer review was conducted under the requirements of this statute. Beginning in the 2017-2018 school year, the assessment requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, will apply to State assessments. Given that this review began under the requirements of the ESEA as amended by the NCLB, it is important to indicate that while the MDE assessments meet many of the peer review guidance criteria under the NCLB, the State is still responsible to ensure that these assessments also comply with the requirements of the ESSA. Department staff have carefully reviewed MDE 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 MDE administration of the SAT needs to meet two additional requirements, one related to accessibility and one related to equal benefits afforded to all students. These requirements can be found under critical elements 4.2, 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 respectively.

The full peer review notes from the review are also 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 may 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. We have found it a pleasure working with your staff on this review. I wish you well in your continued efforts to improve student achievement in Michigan.

If you have any questions, please contact Tahira Rashid of my staff at: OSS.Michigan@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/
Frank T. Brogan
Assistant Secretary
for Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Andrew Middlestead, Director of Assessment

Critical Elements Where Additional Evidence is Needed to Meet the Requirements for Michigan's Assessment System

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments	For all assessments: • Evidence that students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services are required to be included in the statewide assessment system (e.g., guidance provided to local educational agencies that states this requirement).
2.1 – Test Design and Development	For the SAT: • A plan and a timeline to address the alignment issues identified in the existing alignment studies for the SAT, particularly in mathematics.
2.2 – Item Development	For the SAT: • 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. • Evidence of guidelines for item writers with respect to fairness in the development and review process.
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	For the SAT: • Evidence requested in critical element 2.1 will satisfy this critical element.
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes	For the SAT: • Validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for high school as represented in the State's academic content standards.
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	For the SAT: • 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.
4.2 – Fairness and accessibility	For the SAT: • 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. • 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.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	For the SAT: • Evidence of the State's process for ensuring that students with disabilities are included in the SAT with clear guidelines for educators and parents about accommodations and the receipt of college-reportable scores. • Evidence that children with disabilities are not denied the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.

5.2 – Procedures for Including ELs	For the SAT:
	• Evidence of communicating information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:
	  o Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s).
	  o Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.
	• Evidence that English learners are not denied the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.

5.3 – Accommodations	For the SAT: • 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. • As noted above in element 5.1, evidence that children with disabilities are not denied the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment (evidence submitted for element 5.1 will address this concern).

5.4– Monitoring Testing of Special Populations	For all assessments:
	• Evidence that it monitors test administration in 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:
	  o Consistent with the State's policies for accommodations.
	  o Appropriate for addressing a student's disability or language needs for each assessment administered.
	  o Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice.
	  o Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student's individualized education programs team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner.
	  o Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students	For the SAT: • Evidence that the State's academic achievement standards include: (1) at least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third for lower achievement; (2) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (3) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting	For the SAT: • Evidence of a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards.
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	For the SAT: • Evidence of how the academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State's academic content standards.

6.4 – Reporting	For the SAT:
	• 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:
	  o The production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that:
	  ▪ Report the student's achievement in terms of the State's grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors).
	  ▪ 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.

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.

Contents

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS 3
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

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

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER 41
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

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS 56
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

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 70
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 71
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 74
6.4 – Reporting..... 77

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.1 – Test Design and Development 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: • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State's grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; • Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State's academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.	**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 Technical Manual (October 2017)** The technical manual describes the test design and test development process for the SAT assessment: • 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. • Pages 27 - 52 provide a detailed description of test development procedures. • Additionally, see the evidence presented in response to section 3 and 4 regarding the technical quality of the SAT. **Evidence #2.1.2: College Board + Connecticut; SAT® Suite of Assessments: Alignment to** Connecticut Standards (October 2016) 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. • 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. **Evidence #2.1.3: College Board + Delaware; SAT® Suite of Assessments: Alignment to Delaware Standards (October 2016)** 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.	**Purposes and intended interpretations** **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?** 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. **Test Designs and Blueprints** 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." **Connection to Content Standards** 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. 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)

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	• 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. **Evidence #2.1.4: College Board + Maine; SAT® Suite of Assessments: Alignment to Maine Standards (October 2016)** 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. • 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. **Evidence #2.1.5: College Board + Michigan; SAT® Suite of Assessments: Alignment to Michigan Standards (2015)** The College Board conducted an alignment study to determine how the SAT and its related assessment aligned to the Michigan state standards. This document provides detailed information regarding the study findings. • 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. **Evidence #2.1.6: College Board + New Hampshire; SAT® Suite of Assessments: Alignment to New Hampshire Standards (October 2016)** 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	SAT indicated there was an independent alignment study conducted in 2016, but this study was not provided for review. 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. 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. Illinois – (2010) acknowledges which standards are not assessed, namely, speaking, listening, presentations, capitalization, spelling, construction mathematical representations. 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. Michigan: acknowledges which standards are not assessed, namely, speaking, listening, presentations, capitalization, spelling, construction mathematical representations. 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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	the study findings. • 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. **Evidence #2.1.7: College Board + Illinois; SAT® Suite of Assessments: Alignment to Illinois Standards (October 2016)** 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. • 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. **Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)** 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.	differently than stated in NH standards. **Item Descriptions for ELA and Mathematics** 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. 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. 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.
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • 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);		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.2 – Item Development 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.	**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)** • Pages 28 – 34 describe the processes used to ensure the fairness of the assessment. • Pages 27 - 52 provide a detailed description of test development procedures. • Pages 108 - 114 describe the evidentiary foundation for the decisions made about the content included in the SAT. • Pages 120 - 133 describe the College Board pilot study of the predictive validity of the SAT. • Pages 133 - 135 describe how the SAT assesses student readiness for college. **Evidence #2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board SAT Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire and Illinois** • Pages 7 - 8 in each of the alignment documents contain a section called The Alignment conducted their alignment study. **Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)** • Please refer to the sections identified as evidence in support of Critical Element 2.2.	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? Who are the "independent experts' active in the field" and what is the set of criteria they use to judge an item? 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? 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? 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. Evidence provided for cognitive complexity is minimal Lists 2.1.2 – 2.1.7 – state alignment documents. State alignment documents do not address cognitive processes alignment Lists 2.2.1 – this document discusses the predictive validity of the old test and proposed revisions to the SAT 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

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

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.

Section 2.2 Summary Statement

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

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

- Evidence of guidelines for item writers in fairness within the development and review process.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.3 – Test Administration The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State: • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State's general and alternate assessments receive training on the State's established procedures for the administration of its assessments; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.	**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)** • Pages 53 - 59 describe the standardized test administration procedures for standard administrations and for administration of the test with accommodations. **Evidence #2.3.1: The SAT School Day Supervisor Manual (Spring 2017)** 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. **Evidence #2.3.2: The SAT School Day Test Room Manual (Spring 2017)** 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. **Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)** This manual provides instructions for supervisors who will be responsible for registering students for testing accommodations and managing nonstandard test administrations. **Evidence #2.3.4: SAT School Day Test Center Supervisor Training (2016)** 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	Documentation in the administration manuals appears to be sufficient, except for accommodation administration. 2.1.1 establishes standardized procedures and 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3, & 2.3.4 communicate these procedures 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. 3.5 – Accommodations Webinar; however, this does not adequately address how to administer read aloud or scribe accommodations **2.3.3:** detailed instructions and procedures 2.3.5: training for testing with accommodations Does College Board collect information to ensure that school officials in every state have been trained and can administer the assessment under standardized conditions? Rosters may be maintained at the state level. Should SAT get a copy? 2.3.7 There is no agreement in this form that the individual has participated in any training. No evidence that training occurred. There was no verification of training participation.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	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. **Evidence #2.3.5: SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017)** 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. **Evidence #2.3.7: SAT Testing Staff Agreement** Prior to test day, all testing staff must sign this agreement to signify that they accept the conditions and requirements of SAT administration.	

Section 2.3 Summary Statement

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
Provide evidence to address policies and procedures for standardized test administration that

- 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;
- 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.

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

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

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
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration 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.	**For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:** The below information lists the resources the College Board provides to the states to support uniform standardized test administration procedures across districts and schools. **Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)** • 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. **Evidence #2.3.1: The SAT School Day Supervisor Manual (Spring 2017)** • 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. **Evidence #2.3.2: The SAT School Day Test Room Manual (Spring 2017)** • Pages 3 - 12 include information on how to monitor test administration and report testing irregularities. **Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)** • Pages 13 - 23 include information on how to	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. 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.

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
	monitor the test administration and report testing irregularities that may take place during a nonstandard test administration. **Evidence #2.3.4: SAT School Day Test Center Supervisor Training (2016)** 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. • 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.	

Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY

_x__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- 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.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.5 – Test Security 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: • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State's assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.	**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)** • Pages 58 - 59 describe the procedures the College Board has designed to maintain test security at all times. • Pages 66 - 68 describe the College Board's post-test analysis, which is conducted as a component of the company's test security procedures. **Evidence #2.3.1: The SAT School Day Supervisor Manual (Spring 2017)** This manual provides guidance for supervisors who are responsible for overseeing the administration on how to maintain test security: • 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. • 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. • Pages 14 - 26 provide instructions on how to receive and securely store materials until test day, and how to report on test administration irregularities. • Pages 39 - 40 include a sample irregularities report that supervisors use to begin investigation of test administration issues. **Evidence #2.3.2: The SAT School Day Test Room Manual (Spring 2017)** • Pages 1 - 12 provide instruction on standardized	**Prevention of assessment irregularities** 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. **Detection of irregularities** 2.3.1 pp. 39-40: form to report irregularities 2.1.1 pp. 66-68: statistical analysis for irregularities 2.3.4 pp. 23-30 Unclear how states participate in monitoring, auditing, and evaluating these procedures, **Investigations of irregularities** 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. 2.5.3 - 2.5.2: How and Why ETS Questions Scores (College Board Program) in cases not due to test irregularities Unclear how states participate in monitoring, auditing, and evaluating these procedures Should the state documentation also contain procedures for how local incidents are investigated and remediated? 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. 2.5.3 –no specifics for remediation are provided. Unclear how states participate in monitoring, auditing, and evaluating these procedures

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	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. **Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)** • 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. **Evidence #2.3.4: SAT School Day Test Center Supervisor Training (2016)** • 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. **Evidence #2.5.1: SAT School Day Registration and Questionnaire Guide (2017)** This brochure provides important information for students so that they may prepare for test day. • Pages 15 – 21 provide information on test security procedures, what will be allowed into testing rooms, and how to report suspicious behavior. • Pages 25 – 26 and 27 - 30 describe processes that may take place in order to conserve test integrity and maintain test security. **Evidence #2.5.2: Why and How ETS Questions Scores (College Board Programs) (2016)**	2.5.2 & 2.5.3 – ETS procedures for handling irregularities 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? SAT did not provide specifics on remediation- what does the state do and how does SAT inform the SEA? The state documentation will need to include procedures on how local incidents are investigated and remediated. 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).

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	This document describes the ways that ETS, our testing subcontractor, investigates cases that may affect the validity of test scores. **Evidence #2.5.3: Investigation and Remediation of SAT Irregularities (2018)** This document provides a high level overview of the procedures the College Board undertakes to investigate irregularities and remediate any recurring issues.	

Section 2.5 Summary Statement

_x__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
Evidence of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:

- 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.
- Detection of test irregularities but no specific data was provided to verify this process.
- Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State's assessments
- Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy 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: • To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.	**Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)** • Pages 58 - 59 describe the procedures the College Board has designed to maintain test **Evidence #2.3.1: The SAT School Day Supervisor Manual (Spring 2017)** This manual provides guidance for supervisors who are responsible for overseeing the administration on how to maintain test security: • 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. • Pages 14 - 26 provide instructions on how to receive and securely store materials until test day, and report on test administration irregularities. • Pages 39 - 40 include a sample irregularities report that supervisors use to begin investigation of test administration issues. **Evidence #2.3.2: The SAT School Day Test Room Manual (Spring 2017)** • 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. **Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)** • 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.	*College Board Information Security Policy* (2014) is a confidential document. It is in the process of being updated. *College Board Guidelines for the Release of Data (2009)* is in the process of being updated. 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? More information is needed to describe the process used if a data breach occurs and what steps are taken. Updated guides for the security policy and release of data would be useful and are needed. How does the SAT protect the integrity of its test materials in development, administration, and storage and use of results? No evidence was provided regarding the security measures used to protect the item bank or test bank. • Evidence related to test security before and during test administration is submitted • 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. 2.1.1, pp. 58-59 • 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?

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Evidence #2.3.4: SAT School Day Test Center Supervisor Training (2016) • Pages 23 - 30: The College Board trains test coordinators, and administrators) on how to report and address irregularities they may encounter on test day. **Evidence #2.5.1: SAT School Day Registration and Questionnaire Guide (2017)** This brochure provides to students information about how the College Board secures their data and personally identifiable information. • 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. **Evidence #2.6.1: Description of Test Management and Reporting System (2017)** This document provides an overview of the security of the College Board online test management and reporting system. **Evidence #2.6.2: Axway Secure Transport Data Sheet (2017)** 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. **Evidence #2.6.3: Description of Confidential College Board Information Security Policy (2017)**	SAT indicates and N of 15. Each state will also have individual reporting requirements. Note: some of the suggested documents relate to cheating, not securing student data. 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?

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	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. **Evidence #2.6.4: College Board Privacy Policy (January 15, 2016)** This policy is currently accessible at www.collegeboard.org/privacy-policy. 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. **Evidence #2.6.5: College Board Guidelines for the Release of Data (2009)** 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. **Evidence #2.6.6: ETS Legal Privacy and Security Notice** ETS manages the online test rostering system for the SAT. This document provides ETS' legal privacy and security notice.	

Section 2.6 Summary Statement

__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
Policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:

- To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data during test development, administration, and storage and use of results;
- College Board Information Security Policy and College Board Guidelines for the Release of Data should be submitted for review when updated.

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

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content 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: • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State's assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State's academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State's academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.	**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.** **Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)** • 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. • 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. **Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)** • Tables A-3.1 – A-3.15 in Appendix 3 (pages 11-35) provide test content specifications and content domains and descriptions. • Appendix 5 (pages 37 – 65) provides additional detail regarding how statistical indices were computed. • Appendix 6 (pages 66 – 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board. • Appendix 7 (pages 321 - 396) displays the results of analyses performed to evaluate the validity of the SAT. **Evidence #2.2.1: An SAT Validity Primer (January 2015)**	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? **Documentation of Independent Alignment** 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. 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? 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.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	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 *SAT Suite Technical Manual* describe how the new version of the SAT correlates with the previous version of the assessment. **Evidence #2.2.2: The Redesigned SAT® Pilot Predictive Validity Study: A First Look (2016)** 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. **Evidence #2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire and Illinois** • Pages 7 - 9 of each document describe how alignment between the standards and the assessment is determined. • 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. **Evidence #3.1.1: SAT Practice Test 8 (2017)** 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	The third party independent alignment review mentioned in the documentation as planned for 2016 was not provided.

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

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	
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • 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.		

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes 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.	**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)** • 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. • 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. **Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)** • Tables A-3.1 – A-3.15 in Appendix 3 (pages 11 – 35) provide test content specifications and content domains and descriptions. **Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)** 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. **Evidence #2.2.1: An SAT Validity Primer (January 2015)** This paper provides validity evidence on the	Lists 2.1.2 – 2.1.7 – state alignment documents. The DE doc does not address cognitive processes alignment Lists 2.2.1 – this document discusses the predictive validity of the old test and proposed revisions to the SAT 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 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. 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? 3.2.2, p. 4, cog lab study: **Conclusion** states, "The cognitive processes lab study conducted using TAPs provided important feedback to College Board content experts during the development of questions

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	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 *SAT Suite Technical Manual* describe how the new version of the SAT correlates with the previous version of the assessment. **Evidence #2.2.2: The Redesigned SAT® Pilot Predictive Validity Study: A First Look (2016)** 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. **Evidence #2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire and Illinois** • Pages 7 - 9 of each document describe how alignment between the standards and the assessment is determined. • 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. **Evidence #3.2.1: Summary of Validity Evidence for Cognitive Processes (2018)** This document provides an overview of how the	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. 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. 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. 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. More evidence needed to indicate that the items are really tapping into the cognitive processes as

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	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 **Evidence #3.2.2: CONFIDENTIAL Summary of Cognitive Laboratory Study for the Redesigned SAT Conducted on March 16, 2013 (2018)** 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.	indicated by the states' content standards. Cognitive processes study was conducted in 2013; updated study addressing more of the items should be conducted to address alignment with state standards
Section 3.2 Summary Statement		
__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • 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.		

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure 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.	**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)** • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. **Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)** • Appendix 5 (pages 37 – 65) provides additional detail regarding how statistical indices were computed. • Appendix 6 (pages 66 – 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board. • Appendix 7 (pages 321 – 396) displays the results of analyses performed to evaluate the validity of the	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. 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 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. 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. **2.1.1**: pp. 44, 45: description of DIF Analyses, with results in the appendix. **2.1.1.a**, pp. 50-63: results of DIF analyses indicate low or no DIF and does not include students with disabilities.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	SAT. **Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)** 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: • 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. • Pages 70 - 81 provide test specifications for the optional SAT Essay test. • 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. • Pages 198 – 206 provide an overview of SAT development process. **Evidence #3.3.1: Scaling for the SAT Suite of Assessments (2017)** • Pages 66 – 74 describe the characteristics of SAT sub-score scaling **Evidence #3.3.2: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report- Connecticut (April**	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. 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. 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?

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	2017) 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. • 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. **Evidence #3.3.3: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report- Delaware (April 2017)** 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. • 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. • 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. **Evidence #3.3.4: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report – Maine (April 2017)** This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 SAT school	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	day administration. The report includes a variety of test analysis based on the data gathered from the test administration. • 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. • 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. **Evidence #3.3.5: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report – Michigan (April 2017)** 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. • 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. 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. **Evidence #3.3.6: SAT Suite of Assessments**	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Administration Report – New Hampshire (April 2017) 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. • 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. **Evidence #3.3.7: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report – Illinois (April 2017)** 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. • 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.	

Section 3.3 Summary Statement

__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- 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.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State's assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.	**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)** • 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. **Evidence #2.2.1: An SAT Validity Primer (January 2015)** 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 *SAT Suite Technical Manual* describe how the new version of the SAT correlates with the previous version of the assessment. **Evidence #2.2.2: The Redesigned SAT® Pilot Predictive Validity Study: A First Look (2016)** 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. **Evidence #4.7.1: Excerpt from TAC**	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. **2.2.1**: 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. **2.2.2:** Predictive validity study on new SAT provides evidence that new SAT has similar predictive validity, as claimed. College Board should consider conducting studies comparing other assessment programs like NAEP, SBAC or PARCC. 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.

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

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

Section 3.4 Summary Statement

__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Provide adequate validity evidence that the State's assessment scores are related as expected with other variables, not necessarily associated with college success only.

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

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.1 – Reliability 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: • Test reliability of the State's assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State's assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student's achievement.	**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)** • 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. **Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)** • Appendix 6 (pages 66 - 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board. **Evidence #4.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report Table of Contents** 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.	There was very little analysis, interpretation of the data, lack of data for EL and SWD provided for this critical element. Tables were available for all demographic groups, but did not provide any information on students with disabilities, EL, or tests administered with accommodations. **Test reliability of the State's assessments estimated for its student population-** • There was no information provided for EL and SWD. **Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State's assessments** Average CSEMs are reasonable to slightly large: most are 6 to 8% of score range.

Section 4.1 Summary Statement

_x__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- 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.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility 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.	**Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)** • Pages 21 - 26 provide an overview of College Board test development processes related to fairness. • 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. • 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. • Pages 75 - 106 describe various psychometric analyses which are performed to identify any possible bias or inconsistent interpretations of assessment results across student groups. **Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)** • Appendix 6 (pages 66 - 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board. **Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)** This manual provides instructions for supervisors who will be responsible for registering students for testing accommodations and managing nonstandard test administrations. **Evidence #2.3.5: SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017)**	2.3.3 and 2.3.5 relate to fairness with respect to test administration, but not design, development, or analysis. 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. Design and Development 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? 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. 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? Analysis 2.1.1.a, pp. 50-63: results of DIF analyses indicate low or no DIF, however, no DIF evidence was provided for SWD, El and no interpretation provided.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	This PowerPoint deck is presented to SSD supervisors via online training sessions and reviews the policies and procedures related to nonstandard SAT administrations. **Evidence #4.2.1: Creating Better Tests for Everyone Through Universally Designed Assessments (2004)** College Board assessment writers are instructed to reference this paper regarding Universally Designed Assessment when creating assessment items for the SAT.	

Section 4.2 Summary Statement

__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- 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.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum 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.	**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)** • Pages 75 - 106 describe various psychometric analyses to study how the SAT assesses student performance across the full performance continuum. **Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)** • Appendix 6 (pages 66 - 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board. **Evidence #4.3.1: SAT Effectiveness at Representing Test Taker Achievement across the Performance Spectrum (2017)** This document provides data regarding the SAT's effectiveness at representing test taker achievement.	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." 2.1.1.a: pp. 216 – 221 & 4.3.1: CSEMs are almost identical across the score range, indicating similar precision across the spectrum (for low-, medium-, and high-achieving students).
Section 4.3 Summary Statement		
__X_ No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR 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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.4 – Scoring 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.	**Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)** • Pages 2 - 4 describe the scores derived from the assessment and the intended use of results. • Page 48 - 49 describes the inter-rater reliability statistics related to the essay portion of the assessment. • 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. • 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. • Pages 133 - 135 describe the processes that were used to develop and validate the SAT benchmarks for college and career readiness. **Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)** • Appendix 5 (pages 37 - 65) provides the essay scoring rubric and data to support the item analysis findings summarized in the technical manual. • Appendix 6 (pages 66 – 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board. **Evidence #3.3.1: Scaling for the SAT Suite of Assessments (2017)** This document describes the methodology and	The sample score report, Evidence 5.1.4, was the evidence used to get an overview of how scores and sub scores are reported. The subdivisions of the SAT do not map easily onto the Domains and Strands of the content standards. The state-specific alignment documents show how the standards fall into the different reported sections of the SAT 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? The low IRR brings into question the validity of the scores for the essay test. What are SAT plans to address this issue? States that use the essay test should review and consider improvements in this section.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	scale development process for the SAT Suite of Assessments. • Pages 8 - 11 provide a description of the scores derived from the SAT and an overview of how the scores were developed. • Pages 16 – 24 describe how the scaling study was designed. • Pages 25 – 40 describe the characteristics of SAT scaling. • Pages 66 – 74 describe the characteristics of SAT subscore scaling. **Evidence #3.3.3: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report – Delaware (April 2017)** 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. **Evidence #3.3.4: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report – Maine (April 2017)** 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. **Evidence #3.3.5: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report – Michigan (April 2017)** This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 SAT school	

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

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.	
Section 4.4 Summary Statement		
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • 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.		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 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.	**Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)** • Pages 39 - 49 describe how the test is constructed to ensure multiple forms of the assessment are comparable • Pages 82 - 90 describe equating procedures and results for the SAT. **Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)** • 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. **Evidence #3.3.2: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report- Connecticut (April 2017)** • Page 2 provides an executive summary which describes the number of forms used in the April 2017 administration of SAT SD in Connecticut. **Evidence #3.3.5: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report- Michigan (April 2017)** • Page 2 provides an executive summary which describes the number of forms used in the April 2017 administration of SAT SD in Michigan.	Documentation adequately provided for this critical element Peers noted it would have been helpful for an opportunity to review the forms or an independent audit of the multiple test forms.
Section 4.5 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State: • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.	**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.**	This critical element does not apply to this review.
Section 4.6 Summary Statement		
__x_ No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR 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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance 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).	**Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)** • 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. • 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. **Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)** • Tables A-3.1 – A-3.15 in Appendix 3 (pages 11 - 35) provide test content specifications and content domains and descriptions. • Appendix 5 (pages 37 - 65) provides additional detail regarding how statistical indices were computed. • Appendix 6 (pages 66 – 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board. • Appendix 7 (pages 321 – 396) displays the results of analyses performed to evaluate the validity of the SAT. **Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)** • Pages 198 – 206 provide an overview of SAT development process. **Evidence #2.2.1: An SAT Validity Primer**	4.7.1: "Initial findings from this large-scale study will be available in 2019." No evidence of independent studies of alignment No evidence of states' systems for monitoring and improving related to examples of evidence related to critical element 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. The College Board should plan to study the use of the SAT for state accountability vs. a predictive test for college admission. Evidence from the 2019 study and TAC recommendations may provide some information in meeting this element.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	(January 2015) 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 *SAT Suite Technical Manual* describe how the new version of the SAT correlates with the previous version of the assessment. **Evidence #2.2.2: The Redesigned SAT® Pilot Predictive Validity Study: A First Look (2016)** 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. **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)** • Pages 7 - 9 of each document describe how alignment between the standards and the assessment is determined. • 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. **Evidence #3.1.1: SAT Practice Test 8 (2017)** This practice test is a version of a form that was used for a 2016 SAT test administration. The	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	sample test includes the optional essay, answer key, answer sheet and instructions on how to score the test. **Evidence #4.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report Table of Contents** 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. **Evidence #4.7.1: Excerpt from TAC presentation regarding Validity Research (February 2017)** 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.	
Section 4.7 Summary Statement		
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • 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		

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

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 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: • Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student's education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards; • States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student's IEP Team based on each student's individual needs; • Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment; • Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities; • Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities; • Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic	**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 # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)** • Pages 49 – 52 describe the types of available allowable accommodations. **Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)** 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. **Evidence #2.3.5: SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017)** 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. **Evidence #5.1.1: Pages from the College Board Students with Disabilities website. (accessed September 1, 2017)** 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 -	**Participation Requirements for Students with Disabilities** There is an online request system for accommodations for students with disabilities listed on page 58 of the technical manual. • All evidence is specific to the SAT; evidence required by states is not provided in this document. 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. **Decisions by IEP team based on individual need** 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. Some accommodations are listed on page 59(2.1.1) but a complete list and instructions for administering the accommodations are not provided. 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. Clarity needs to be provided with respect to the

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA; • Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student's achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State's general assessments); • The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.	https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities **Evidence #5.1.2: College Board Typical Accommodations (accessed October 2, 2017)** This document provides information regarding typical testing accommodations available for SAT test administrations. This information is available through the College Board website - https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities/typical-accommodations. **Evidence #5.1.3: Support for Students with Temporary Physical/ Medical Conditions** This form is used to request testing support for students with temporary impairments (caused by injury, accident, etc) who cannot postpone their tests. **Evidence #5.1.4: Reports for Students who Test with State Allowed Accommodations** 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. **Evidence #5.1.5: Parent Consent Form Templates** 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.	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? **Guidelines for IEP Team Decision-making, including accommodations** The SAT did not provide any evidence on the IEP team decision-making process for selection of accommodations. **Accessibility Features and Selection of Appropriate Accommodations** Evidence appears to be adequate for this piece of the critical element. **Parent Notification** 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. 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? 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. The student score report indicates that the score is non reportable due to SAA accommodations

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		What do states share with parents about accommodations and possible implications on score reporting to colleges? States may provide this information but SAT did not provide information for the parent. 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.

Section 5.1 Summary Statement

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
Provide evidence of guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:

- Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student's education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards;
- States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student's IEP Team based on each student's individual needs;
- Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment;
- Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs 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: • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.	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. **Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)** • Pages 50 - 51 describe the types of accommodations available to English learners. **Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)** 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. **Evidence #5.2.1: College Board-Approved Word-to-Word Glossaries for the SAT® Suite of Assessments (2017)** 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	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? 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. **Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s)** States are advised to produce the evidence on accommodations. SAT supplies options for ELs, but LEAs decide which students receive these accommodations. 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. Accessibility tools and features are not addressed, but accommodations are listed on page 60. 1/1/2017 – state-funded daytime administrations – instructions in several native languages provided; glossaries available too. 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? 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? The evidence (2.3.5 webinar) suggests that extended

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	college reportable scores to students. **Evidence #5.2.2: College Board translated instructions for the SAT (2017)** 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.	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. What is the decision-making process, how is this communicated to the EL team, how is this reported back to the state? 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? Clarity between SAT and State guidance is needed for this element. Please provide the report regarding the effectiveness of the extended time accommodation for ELs. More evidence regarding the inclusion of ELs and accommodations is needed.

Section 5.2 Summary Statement

__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
Evidence of communicating this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:

- Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);
- Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;
- Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.3 – Accommodations The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State: • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student's need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.	**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.** **Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)** • Pages 49 – 51 describe the types of available allowable accommodations, including a description of the supports available for English learners. **Evidence #2.3.5: SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017)** 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. **Evidence #5.1.1: Pages from the College Board Students with Disabilities website. (accessed September 1, 2017)** This document provides images of the College	SAT did not provide any information to ensure that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL) 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. 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. There was no data provided on the types and frequency of accommodation approval requests. 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? **Ensures Availability/Appropriateness/Selection for SWD and EL** States should supply evidence of how LEAs select accommodations for SWD and EL. There was no evidence provided to address whether the accommodations do not alter the construct being assessed, and allow meaningful interpretations of

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	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 - https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities **Evidence #5.1.2: College Board Typical Accommodations (accessed October 2, 2017)** This document provides information regarding typical testing accommodations available for SAT test administrations. This information is available through the College Board website - https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities/typical-accommodations. **Evidence #5.1.3: Support for Students with Temporary Physical/ Medical Conditions** This form is used to request testing support for students with temporary impairments (caused by injury, accident, etc.) who cannot postpone their tests. **Evidence #5.1.4: Reports for Students who Test with State Allowed Accommodations** **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** Board reports and resources are designed to meet accessibility standards including Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.	results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations. Is the read-aloud test format available for the Reading test? How is this not interfering with the tested construct? 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? **Process for exceptional accommodation request** Special cases addressed in 2.3.5 include changes to previously requested accommodations and transfer students. Slide 4, 2.3.5 indicates that SAT reviews requests for other accommodations. 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. 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 for students who need and receive accommodations

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Evidence #5.1.5: Parent Consent Forms Templates **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.**	and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.

Section 5.3 Summary Statement

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide

Evidence that the State ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:

- Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);
- Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student's need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;
- Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed but data was not provided and/or does this impact the score as reportable or non reportable.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations 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: • Consistent with the State's policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student's disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student's IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.	**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)** 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. **Evidence #2.3.5: SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017)** 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.	**State Policies Consistency** What are state allowed accommodations that may not be accepted by SAT? Does College Board collect any information from states to ensure students receive the appropriate accommodations on the assessment? 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? **Consistent with instruction and IEP team process** There is no evidence that SAT communicates about the accommodations use with IEP teams or the state. **Administered with fidelity to TA procedures** 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. 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. **Process used to monitor compliance by districts with data to verify** No State or SAT monitoring information is provided-either before, during, or post administration.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 5.4 Summary Statement		
__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: 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: • Consistent with the State's policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student's disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student's IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.		

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting 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.	**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.** **Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)** • Pages 120 - 133 describe how the benchmarks were determined and how they are related to college outcomes. **Evidence #2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board SAT Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire, and Illinois** 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. **Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)** Panelists were provided with this document as a reference that could be used during the standards setting process. **Evidence #6.2.1: Final Report on the 2016 SAT Multi-State Standard Setting.** This report summarizes the procedures used to obtain recommended cut scores from the standard setting panels, as well as the final cut	**Method and Process** Standard setting panels were rather small and lacked diversity, particularly in math. There was no EL representation on either standard setting panel. Process for setting achievement levels and descriptors appears to be sufficiently documented. • 6.2.1 references 4 states –does not include IL and MI. • Used Modified Angoff, p. 5 • 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 • P. 36 indicates that Math is aligned to CCSS; does not state the same for ERW • ALDs written by SME in 4 states – but no process described (p.4) 2.1.1 pp, 120-135: setting benchmarks 6.2.1, for CT, DE, ME, NH: standards setting procedures for the four states were documented. . 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)? IL and MI need to provide evidence of the standards setting process used. 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

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

<table>
<tr><th>Critical Element</th><th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th><th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>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.</td><td>addressed with 4 state participation in the standard setting?
<table>
<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></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Section 6.2 Summary Statement</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
• 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.</td></tr>
</table>

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 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. 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.	**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.** **Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)** • Pages 21 - 26 describe the processes used to ensure the fairness of the assessment. • Pages 27 - 52 provide a detailed description of test development procedures. • Pages 108 - 114 describe the evidentiary foundation for the decisions made about the content included in the SAT. • Pages 120 - 133 describe how the benchmarks were determined and how they are related to college outcomes. • Pages 133 - 135 describe how the SAT assesses student readiness for college. **Evidence #2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board SAT Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire, and Illinois** 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. **Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)** Panelists were provided with this document as a reference that could be used during the standards setting process. **Evidence #2.2.1: An SAT Validity Primer (January 2015)** This paper provides validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores and important college outcomes. The	**Challenging and aligned with the State's academic content standards** The description of process to develop ALDs is lacking in 6.2.1. The process is not described. Evidence that academic achievement standards are challenging was not provided. 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)? It is not clear how the ALDs represent the State's academic content standards, the evidence shows alignment with the SAT benchmarks. 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. 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.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	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. **Evidence #2.2.2: The Redesigned SAT® Pilot Predictive Validity Study: A First Look (2016)** 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. **Evidence #6.2.1: Final Report on the 2016 SAT Multi-State Standard Setting.** This report summarizes the procedures usedto obtain recommended cut scores from thestandard setting panels, as wellas the final cutscores 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.	

Section 6.3 Summary Statement

_x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- 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.

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

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

6.4 – Reporting
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:
• The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;
• The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;
• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that:
  • Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student's achievement;
  • Report the student's achievement in terms of the State's grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);
  • Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;
  • Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to
	The following documents are reference materials provided by the College Board to educators to support their use of the College Board reporting platform.
	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.
	Evidence #6.4.1: K–12 Educator Brief: The College and Career Readiness Benchmarks for the SAT® Suite of Assessments (April 2016)
	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.
	Evidence #6.4.2: K-12 Educator Brief: The SAT® Suite of Assessments: Using Scores and Reporting to Inform Instruction (2015)
	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.
	• Pages 23 - 41 display and explain the uses for sample reports available through the College Board reporting portal.
	
	Evidence #6.4.3: SAT Understanding Scores 2017 (2017)
	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.
	Evidence #6.4.4: Professional Development
		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.
		
		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.
		States should supply evidence of such reports as generated and published.
		
		For the individual student reports:
		• 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?
		• SAT information is provided, but not connected to requirements for States.
		• How are achievement standards (PLDs) reflected on SAT reports?
		• 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?
		• An individual score report was not provided for review to address the reporting requirements.
		
		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.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand; • The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.	**Module #6: Using Scores and Reporting to Inform Instruction (2015)** This PowerPoint presentation can be used to train educators on how to access, interpret and apply score report results to inform classroom instruction. **Evidence #6.4.5: Facilitator Guide to Professional Development Module #6: Using Scores and Reporting to Inform Instruction (2015)** 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. **Evidence #6.4.6: Educator Online Reporting Screen Shot Demo (February 2017)** This PowerPoint shows the different reports that available through the College Board online reporting system.	Educators also have a dashboard for requesting a variety of reports. There is no process and timeline for delivery to parents for individual reports. There is no information on availability of alternate formats of the reports available upon request.

Section 6.4 Summary Statement

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

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:

- The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that:
  - Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student's achievement;
  - Report the student's achievement in terms of the State's grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);
  - Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;
  - Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;
- The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.

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.

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 6
1.3 – Required Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 8
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 10
1.5 – Participation Data (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 12

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS 13
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 13
2.2 – Item Development..... 15
2.3 – Test Administration 17
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)21
2.5 – Test Security 24
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 28

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 32
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 33
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 35
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure 36
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables..... 37

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER 38
4.1 – Reliability..... 38
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 39
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... 40
4.4 – Scoring 41
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 42
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment 43
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance..... 44

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS 45
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 46
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 48
5.3 – Accommodations..... 50
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations..... 52

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 53
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students 54
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 56
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 58
6.4 – Reporting..... 61

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

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
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students 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.	**Evidence #1.1a: Michigan State Board of Education meeting minutes, June 15, 2010** Page 20 demonstrates the adoption of the current academic content standards for all public schools and students. **Evidence #1.1b: Michigan K-12 Standards: English Language Arts (2010)** Page 3 demonstrates that the academic content standards have been adopted for Michigan students and local districts. **Evidence #1.1c: Michigan K-12 Standards: Mathematics (2010)** Page 1 (unlabeled, PDF page 3) demonstrates that the academic content standards have been adopted for Michigan students and local districts.	
Section 1.1 Summary Statement		
__X__ No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Michigan

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards 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.	**Evidence #1.1b: Michigan K-12 Standards: English Language Arts (2010)** Pages 4-7 demonstrate that the academic content standards contain coherent and rigorous content and encourage the teaching of advanced skills. **Evidence #1.1c: Michigan K-12 Standards: Mathematics (2010)** Pages 3-8 (PDF pages 5-10) demonstrate that the academic content standards contain coherent and rigorous content and encourage the teaching of advanced skills. **Evidence #1.2a: Michigan State Board of Education meeting minutes, February 9, 2010** Page 12 demonstrates broad stakeholder involvement through field review and commentary on the proposed standards, along with state and national groups' involvement. **Evidence #1.2b: Michigan State Board of Education meeting minutes, May 11, 2010** Page 4 demonstrates broad stakeholder involvement through state participation in national reviews and through review of local feedback in Michigan. **Evidence #1.2c: "Overview of Specific Survey Comments," ELA version (March 2010)** Pages 1-6 demonstrate broad stakeholder involvement through public surveys on draft standards. (Summary available on page 1.) **Evidence #1.2d: "Overview of Specific Survey Comments," Mathematics version (March 2010)** Pages 1-11 demonstrate broad stakeholder involvement through public surveys on draft standards. (Summary available on page 1.)	Stakeholder comments (positive, negative, suggestions) were summarized. The survey methods, actual sample characteristics, and survey structure should have been provided. In future content standards adoption, it would be helpful to include more details about the survey method, sample, results, and actions taken to address respondent comments.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Evidence #1.1a: Michigan State Board of Education meeting minutes, June 15, 2010 Page 6 demonstrates broad stakeholder involvement through public comment.	
Section 1.2 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required		

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

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
1.3 – Required Assessments 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: • Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12).	**Evidence #1.3a: Guide to State Assessments 2016-2017 (September 2016)** Pages 1-2 list all assessments in Michigan's assessment system, including general and alternate assessments. For this peer review submission, "The SAT, with Essay," is listed on page 1. **Evidence #1.3b: The State School Aid Act of 1979 (Excerpt) MCL 388.1704b (October 1 2016)** Page 1, section 104b(1) demonstrates that the SAT ("a college entry test") is a required assessment for all public schools in Michigan.	evidence 1.3a demonstrates that the State includes all required assessments.
Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
_x_ No additional evidence is required .		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Michigan

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

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

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
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments 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. • For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system; • For English learners (EL): o 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; o 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.	**Evidence #1.4a: "The State School Aid Act of 1979 (excerpt)" (2016)** Pages 1-2 demonstrate that all 11th graders in public schools are required to take the Michigan Merit Exam, including the SAT with Essay ("college entrance test"). **Evidence #1.4b: 2017 M-STEP Test Administration Manual (2016)** Page 20-24 demonstrate that all public school students are required to take the statewide assessments. This explicitly includes students with disabilities, students in different locations, and students in unique circumstances. Page 24 demonstrates that this explicitly applies to grade 11 students, including taking the SAT with Essay. **Evidence #1.4c: "Who Must/Can Take the MME?" (2016)** Page 1 demonstrates that all 11th graders are required to take the Michigan Merit Exam, including the SAT with Essay, or the alternate assessment (MI-Access). This explicitly includes new students, foreign exchange students, and students with Individualized Education Programs. **Evidence #1.4d: High School Grade Assignment for Accountability Calculations: Frequently Asked Questions (September 2014)** Page 1 demonstrates that all 11th graders are required to take the high school assessments, along with some 12th graders if they missed 11th grade testing.	evidence 1.4a 1.4b, and 1.4c. establish that all public school students are to be included in the required State high school assessments. This includes specific references to students with disabilities and English learners (ELs). The evidence does not, however, specifically state that all students with disabilities in the State, <u>including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services</u>, must be included in the assessment system. The evidence presented shows that students enrolled in private schools may optionally participate in State tests.
Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Michigan

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
_x__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • evidence that students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services are included in the Statewide assessment system.		

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

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
1.5 – Participation Data 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.	Evidence #1.5a: "Statewide tested rates by subgroup 2016-2017.xls" (2017) Page 1 shows participation rates for all students, disaggregated by subgroup, for grade 11.	evidence demonstrates participation of all students and subgroups of students for high school tests.
Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
_x__ No additional evidence is required for high school tests.		

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

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.1 – Test Design and Development 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: • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State's grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; • Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State's academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.	Please refer to the College Board's submission for evidence, notably **College Board + Michigan; SAT® Suite of Assessments: Alignment to Michigan Standards (2015)** and **SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017)**. Michigan did not publish an additional independent alignment study, but other states with common standards did. For additional alignment evidence, please refer to **Evidence 2.1a Delaware System of Student Assessment and Maine Comprehensive Assessment System: SAT Alignment to the Common Core State Standards (2016)**. Pages 43-45 (PDF pages 53-55) summarize the evidence on alignment, covered in more detail in pages 14-40 (PDF pages 24-50).	Peer reviewers note that the College Board's stated purpose of the SAT is not specifically referenced in state documents or its use for school accountability. Alignment study involves Delaware and Maine. To what extent are Michigan's content standards identical to the standards of Delaware and Maine? It is not clear whether the detail in the blueprints is sufficient to measure the full range of the State's grade-level academic content standards and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results. The proportion of CCSS grade-level standards rated as not having a link (linked to any SAT items) were about 20% in math; 36% in reading, and 23% in language arts. What has Michigan done to remediate alignment issues raised by the Delaware-Maine study? We only know how many Michigan/CCSS standards match the SAT content specifications (Reading Test-Text Complexity). The "match" does not appear to include cognitive complexity, balance, etc. (pages 71-169). Are the Michigan Standard Course of Study for English Language Arts and mathematics the same as CCSS? SAT items were written to SAT content specifications rather than directly to the CCSS.

Section 2.1 Summary Statement

__X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Reconcile the state's intended purpose of the assessment (i.e. accountability) and the College Board's intended purpose of the assessment (i.e. college readiness).
- Same as consortium review: Evidence of processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State's academic content

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills).		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.2 – Item Development 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.	Please refer to the College Board's submission for evidence, notably **SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017)**.	There is a lack of specific information about item writers, their qualifications, and their training. SAT items are not developed or selected to assess student achievement based on the State's academic content standards. Do the SAT items sufficiently assess the State's content standards or should augment the SAT with State developed items?

Section 2.2 Summary Statement

__X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
As stated in the consortium review:

- 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
- Evidence of guidelines for item writers in fairness within the development and review process.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Michigan

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.3 – Test Administration The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State: • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State's general and alternate assessments receive training on the State's established procedures for the administration of its assessments; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.	**Evidence #2.3a: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual - Michigan (Spring 2017)** This manual provides instructions for supervisors who will be responsible for registering students for testing accommodations and managing nonstandard test administrations. **Evidence #2.3b: The SAT School Day Room Manual - Michigan (Spring 2017)** 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. **Evidence #2.3c: "What to Know About College Board Accommodations for Spring SAT in Michigan" (2017)** Pages 1-2 demonstrate accommodations for the SAT along with the meaning and implications of each. **Evidence #2.3d: "M-STEP, MI-Access, SAT, ACT WorkKeys and WIDA Student Supports and Accommodations Table" (February 13, 2017)** Pages 19-20 demonstrate instructions on requesting SAT-specific accommodations. **Evidence #2.3e: "Michigan DOE Implementation – Consolidated Business Requirements: Test Personnel Training" (November 10, 2016)** Pages 4-7 of this business requirements document demonstrate procedures for communicating testing procedures to all individuals responsible for assessment administration.	Examples are provided of communications and training, rather than copies of every document. Evidence 2.3e is a summary document for communications and training. **2.3h:2017 MME Day Analytics** – track attendance for participation in training so sign in is not required. However, the analytics on count page views and do not verify that viewers are teachers participating in the training (i.e. there is no log of exactly who is viewing the materials).

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Evidence #2.3f: "Michigan Strategic Communications Timeline" (2017) Pages 1-2 demonstrate what communications were sent to Michigan schools about SAT preparation and administration, when, and in what format. This includes the schedule of 17 training sessions under the column "Training." Examples of training and communications follow. **Evidence #2.3g: "Michigan SAT, PSAT 10 and PSAT 8/9: Spring 2017 Administration: MME Day" (December 6, 2016)** This PowerPoint deck demonstrates Michigan-specific SAT training for test administrators. It comes from the December 6, 2016 training webinar. Training content is comprehensive, including test administration, roles, preparation, and accommodations. **Evidence #2.3h: "2017 MME Day Analytics" (December 6, 2016)** This screenshot demonstrates attendance tracking for Michigan-specific SAT training. It comes from the December 6, 2016 training. Web analytics let the Michigan Department of Education authoritatively track district attendance without relying on individual sign-in. **Evidence #2.3i: "Administrative Tips for the Michigan SAT, PSAT, and PSAT 8/9" (March 14, 2017)** This PowerPoint deck demonstrates Michigan-specific SAT training for test administrators. It comes from the March 14, 2017 training WebEx. Training content includes test administration and security.	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Evidence #2.3j: "MDE Spotlight on Student Assessment and Accountability" (October 13, 2016) Pages 5-6 demonstrate Michigan-specific SAT communication. The "MDE Spotlight" is a weekly publication throughout the academic year, and each includes an SAT corner. This example discusses accommodated and off-site testing. Evidence #2.3e, "Michigan Strategic Communications Timeline," documents 35 Spotlight SAT Corners, plus additional communications. Please refer to the College Board's submission for additional evidence, notably **SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017)** and **The SAT School Day Supervisor Manual (Spring 2017)**	

Section 2.3 Summary Statement

_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

From the consortium review:

- 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;
- 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.

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

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

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

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
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration 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.	Evidence #2.4a: Assessment Integrity Guide (April 2016) The Assessment Integrity Guide is Michigan's state test security handbook. Pages 28-31 demonstrate how Michigan monitors standardized test administration. Evidence #2.4b: "M-STEP & MI-Access Monitoring – Overview" (2017) Pages 1-2 demonstrate how Michigan monitors standardized test administration. In this context, "M-STEP" in the title should be understood as referring to all the general assessments, as the same procedures include all components of Michigan Merit Exam testing, such as the SAT with Essay. Evidence #2.4c: "Requirements Document – Assessment Observation" (Spring 2017) This business requirements document demonstrates contractual requirements for training and deployment of testing site monitors. Evidence #2.4d: SAT Test Day Observations (2017) This checklist demonstrates what monitors observe during SAT monitoring visits. The checklist is customized for different assessments. Evidence #2.4e: "2017 Summary of Monitoring" (2017) This spreadsheet demonstrates all monitoring results from random and targeted monitoring for spring 2017, including all standard and alternate assessments.	evidence 2.4a provides strong overview about the importance of testing integrity, and outlines the State's approach and guidelines for assessment monitoring. evidence 2.4b provides overview for the independent test monitors employed by the State. evidence 2.4c provides comprehensive guide to observation protocols used in assessment administration monitoring. evidence 2.4d presents evidence of monitoring 2017 test administration—49 visits overall. evidence 2.4e presents evidence of SAT test monitoring/observation protocols.

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

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
Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
__x_ No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Michigan

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.5 – Test Security 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: • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State's assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.	**Evidence #2.4a: Assessment Integrity Guide (April 2016)** The *Assessment Integrity Guide* is Michigan's state test security handbook. • Pages 10-27 demonstrate policies and procedures for prevention of assessment irregularities. • Pages 28-37 demonstrate policies and procedures for detection and investigation of assessment irregularities. • Pages 37-39 demonstrate policies and procedures for remediation of assessment irregularities. **Evidence #2.5a: Test Security Audit Report: Michigan Department of Education (April 20, 2016)** This report contains the summary results of an independent audit of Michigan's test security policies, procedures, and practices. Pages 4-7 demonstrate exemplary practices in place in Michigan. The Michigan Department of Education has implemented or is actively pursuing all high priority recommendations of the audit. **Evidence #2.5b: "Incident Reporting Procedures" (2016)** Pages 1-4 demonstrate local training materials on reporting assessment irregularities. Pages 5-21 demonstrate investigation and remediation guidance for local schools, along with which decisions are at local discretion and which must be reported for a state response. **Evidence #2.5c: "Michigan DOE Implementation – Consolidated Business Requirements: Testing Irregularity/ (SUI)**	The Assessment Integrity Guide is impressive and sufficiently describes procedures for Michigan-developed assessments. However, it does not mention the SAT. How do the policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities apply to SAT security? Prioritized recommendations under 15 Caveon security standards resulted from the audit. They should prove useful, but did not address SAT. Although business requirements for incident reporting with the SAT exist (evidence 2.5b), there is no evidence that the requirements were met. For example, there is no example incident report or listing of the number of incidents. In addition, there is nothing about the way incidents were investigated or resolved. It is suggested that SAT security procedures be reviewed and added (as warranted) to the State's security plan. It is not clear which security procedures apply to 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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Reporting" (October 12, 2016) Pages 4-5 of this business requirements document demonstrate procedures on investigation and remediation in terms of reporting testing irregularities reported to College Board. **Evidence #2.5d: OSA Assessment Security Compliance Form (2016)** This form is what all participants in assessment sign in acknowledgement of their security responsibilities. **Evidence #2.5e: "Assessment Security" (2016)** This flyer demonstrates an online training course in assessment security that the Michigan Department of Education developed in partnership with Michigan Virtual University. It provides training for local schools and state personnel. The 2016 version was considered a "pilot" version, currently being updated to its final version. Online training through Michigan Virtual University comes with its own attendance tracking. Please refer to the College Board's submission for additional evidence, notably **SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017)** and **The SAT School Day Supervisor Manual (Spring 2017).**	

Section 2.5 Summary Statement

_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

From the consortium review:

- 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.
- Detection of test irregularities but no specific data was provided to verify this process.
- Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State's assessments
- Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Michigan

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy 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: • To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.	**Evidence #2.4a: Assessment Integrity Guide (April 2016)** The *Assessment Integrity Guide* is Michigan's state test security handbook. • Pages 16-18 demonstrate policies and procedures to protect the integrity and confidentiality of test materials. • Page 27 demonstrates policies for confidentiality and the use of student-level assessment data at local schools. **Evidence #2.6a: "Michigan DOE Implementation – Consolidated Business Requirements: Outbound Materials - Packaging and Distribution" (October 23, 2016)** Pages 4-6 of this business requirements document demonstrate procedures to protect the integrity of test materials through the shipping of secure materials under standard and unusual circumstances. **Evidence #2.6b: "Michigan DOE Implementation – Consolidated Business Requirements: Testing Material Returns" (October 22, 2016)** Pages 5-6 of this business requirements document demonstrate procedures to protect the integrity of test materials through the return of secure materials and tracking of missing materials. **Evidence #2.6c: "Michigan DOE Implementation – Consolidated Business Requirements: Answer Sheet Verification" (February 2, 2017)** Pages 4-10 of this business requirements document demonstrate procedures to protect the integrity, security, and privacy of test data. This includes the	**Evidence #2.6d:** How does the information technology policy apply to student level data? Clearly, Michigan has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable Information. It is not clear the degree they currently protect SAT. What security protocols exist for storing and transmitting student SAT data (e.g. database encryption, redundant systems, data backup procedures, technical adequacy of reporting portal)? The minimum N is provided and appropriate.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	scanning of student answers, data verification, tracking missing data, data encryption, and data exchange. **Evidence #2.6d: "Policy 1340.00 Information Technology Information Security" (April 12, 2017)** This policy document is the overview of information security at the State of Michigan. It provides context and definitions that may be helpful for understanding the next three pieces of evidence. **Evidence #2.6e: "Policy 1340.00.170.01 System and Communications Protection Standard" (July 18, 2016)** Pages 1-11 demonstrate security controls for MDE data systems and communication between systems. **Evidence #2.6f: "Policy 1340.00.060.02 Database Security Standard" (February 22, 2017)** Pages 1-16 demonstrate security controls for MDE data systems, including databases holding student-level assessment data. **Evidence #2.6g: "Policy 1345.00.09 Firewall and SOM-NET Perimeter Security Standard" (February 6, 2017)** Pages 1-7 demonstrate security controls for transmitting data from and between MDE data systems, along with protection for data at rest. **Evidence #2.6h: "Secure Site screenshot – student data file" (accessed December 27, 2017)** This screenshot demonstrates the Secure Site system used to securely access student-level data files for the State, districts, and schools.	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Evidence #2.6i: "Secure Site screenshot – login and access" (accessed December 27, 2017) Secure Site is Michigan's school-facing assessment data portal. This website screenshot demonstrates security of student-level information (including personally identifiable information) and guidelines to schools and districts. The "FERPA" link is to the US Department of Education's FERPA web page, and users must acknowledge FERPA responsibilities before logging into Michigan Department of Education systems. The login also demonstrates access controls on the Secure Site system. Access requires an existing Michigan Education Information System account, authorization from a district administrator, and acceptance of security conditions. **Evidence #2.6j: "MI School Data Web Privacy Statement" (accessed January 25, 2018)** MISchoolData.org is Michigan's public-facing assessment data portal. PDF pages 2-3 of this website demonstrate security of student-level assessment data and personally identifiable information in reporting. Page 3 demonstrates explicit guidelines for districts and schools what must and must not be done with this data. **Evidence #2.6k: "Michigan and the SAT" (accessed January 25, 2018)** This website demonstrates Michigan's use of College Board's Reports Center for SAT score reporting. PDF pages 1-3 demonstrate report access control to protect student-level assessment data and guidelines for individuals and schools. Please refer to College Board's submission for additional evidence on this reporting portal.	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Evidence #2.6l: "Michigan's Consolidated State Plan Under the Every Student Succeeds Act" (accessed April 3, 2017) Pages 13-14 (PDF pages 14-15) demonstrate the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups (*n*=30, *n*=10 for English Learner Progress). Please refer to the College Board's submission for additional evidence, notably **SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017)** and **The SAT School Day Supervisor Manual (Spring 2017)**	

Section 2.6 Summary Statement

_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Provide evidence of the way SAT-related data will be incorporated into Michigan policies for data security. Reconcile Michigan and SAT data security policies.
- Specific policies about securing student-level assessment data and protecting student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools of the way the department protects student privacy and confidentiality.
- As stated in the consortium review: College Board Information Security Policy and College Board Guidelines for the Release of Data should be submitted for review when updated.

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

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content 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: • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State's assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State's academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State's academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.	Please refer to the College Board's submission for evidence, notably **SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017)** and **An SAT Validity Primer (January 2015)**.	SAT Technical Manual p 132 "they also tend to measure *somewhat different aspects of academic performance* and therefore complement each other in their use in college admission and the overall prediction of FYGPA." This statement seems to contradict the idea the SAT can be used to measure achievement in high school. Nothing about alignment to Michigan's academic content standards. External alignment review was for Delaware and Maine. State did not make the case that Michigan is similar to Delaware or Maine. Do all three states strictly use the CCSS? All validity evidence is predictive validity for college success – 75% chance of a grade of "C" better. It is not very relevant for an accountability test. The College Board has focused much of its validity research efforts on examining the relationship between the SAT and measures of college success. No reference to CCSS or academic content standards. Validity concerns the evidence to support score interpretation for the *proposed use of a test*. The purpose of the SAT is not school accountability. Therefore, new evidence is needed to support the use of the test for this purpose. Do the SAT items sufficiently assess the State's content standards or should the State augment the SAT with State developed items? Not convinced that there exists adequate alignment between the SAT and the State's academic content

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

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

Section 3.1 Summary Statement

_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Documentation of adequate alignment between the Michigan 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 Michigan's academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity. For example, conduct an independent alignment study, and a timeline for addressing the study's findings.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes 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.	Please refer to the College Board's submission for evidence, notably **SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017)** and **An SAT Validity Primer (January 2015)**. Evidence provided to consortium panel but not the Michigan panel: **Evidence #3.2.1: Summary of Validity Evidence for Cognitive Processes (2018), Evidence #3.2.2: CONFIDENTIAL Summary of Cognitive Laboratory Study for the Redesigned SAT Conducted on March 16, 2013 (2018).** Not reviewed by the state panel.	No evidence based on cognitive processes. The State does not appear to have documented adequate validity evidence that the SAT tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State's academic content standards. The issue is evidence about cognitive processes "as represented in the *Michigan's academic content standards*."

Section 3.2 Summary Statement

_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Document 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. For example, conduct cognitive laboratories with students from Michigan.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure 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.	Please refer to the College Board's submission for evidence, notably **SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017)** and **SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report – Michigan (April 2017)**.	No dimensionality study (e.g. factor analysis) for Michigan. The SAT scoring and reporting structures do not appear to be consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State's academic content standards. Moreover, the factor structure from the HumRRO alignment study for Delaware and Maine does not seem to comport with the intended structure of the test (i.e. overall, section, and subscores). All analyses excluded SWD and EL as a subgroup. See Table 3. Frequency and Percentage of Test Takers in Item Analysis Sample by Grade Level, First Language, and Gender; and Table 4. Frequency and Percentage of Racial/Ethnic Subgroups in Item Analysis. **Exhibit 1.1b and 1.1c:** The State's ELA and Math content standards structures do not appear to match the SAT reporting structures. Additionally, the State's ELA content standards include Speaking and Listening; the SAT does not.

Section 3.3 Summary Statement

_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
From the consortium review:

- 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.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State's assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.	Please refer to the College Board's submission for evidence, notably **SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017)**.	From the consortium review: College Board should consider conducting studies comparing other assessment programs like NAEP, SBAC or PARCC.
Section 3.4 Summary Statement		
_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: From the consortium review: • Provide adequate validity evidence that the State's assessment scores are related as expected with other variables, not necessarily associated with college success only.		

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

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.1 – Reliability 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: • Test reliability of the State's assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State's assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student's achievement.	Please refer to the College Board's submission for evidence, notably **SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017)** and **SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)**. **SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report – Michigan (April 2017)**.	Average CSEM and reliability coefficients (pages 14-29) for SAT overall, cross-test, subscores, section scores, total, and essay scores are presented by ethnicity and gender. The coefficients are sufficient and as expected. No other State subgroup data were located. No reliability estimates for students receiving test accommodations, students with disabilities, or English learners. Consistency and accuracy of categorical classification decisions by subgroup were also not located. Technical Documents refer to two achievement levels (College and Career ready, or not). Standard setting refers to three. What is decision consistency for the three levels?

Section 4.1 Summary Statement

_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
From the consortium review:

- 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.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility 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.	Please refer to the College Board's submission for evidence, notably **SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017)** and **Creating Better Tests for Everyone Through Universally Designed Assessments (2004)**.	Fairness addressed through pretesting review, DIF analysis, test accommodations, differential validity (to be conducted). Universal design is described but no evidence about the way it is incorporated into or implemented during SAT administration. 4.2.1**Creating Better Tests for Everyone Through Universally Designed Assessments (2004)** Item writers are instructed to access this paper to inform item development, what is evidence that they do? Are items rejected during item review process that may indicate these practices are not implemented? What type of verification or training is provided? Will you update this document from 2004? **Exhibit 4.2.1 Universally Designed Assessments:** There was no reference to the SAT in the document. What evidence suggests that the Michigan SAT was constructed using universal design? Overall fairness and accessibility are not adequately documented (e.g., how universal design was applied to SAT). Evidence should address fairness and accessibility with respect to students with disabilities and English learners.

Section 4.2 Summary Statement

_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
From the consortium review:

- 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.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum 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.	Please refer to the College Board's submission for evidence, notably **SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017)** and **SAT Effectiveness at Representing Test Taker Achievement across the Performance Spectrum (2017)**.	Is the histogram of student scores shown in **SAT Effectiveness at Representing Test Taker Achievement across the Performance Spectrum (2017)** based on Michigan students or is it a national group? It should be specific to Michigan students. Are students with disabilities and English learners included in group used to produce the histogram in **SAT Effectiveness at Representing Test Taker Achievement across the Performance Spectrum (2017)**? The State could also provide additional support for this critical element such as: distributions of cognitive complexity and item difficulty indices that demonstrate the SAT items adequately cover the full performance continuum; test information functions and ability estimates for students at different performance levels across the full performance continuum; and CSEMs at various points along the score range.

Section 4.3 Summary Statement

_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Score distribution summary (e.g. a histogram) for Michigan students taking the SAT including those with disabilities and English learners.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.4 – Scoring 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.	Please refer to the College Board's submission for evidence, notably **SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017)** and **SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report – Michigan (April 2017)**.	Test scaling procedures for producing scale scores are appropriate for the SAT results. However, SAT results do not appear to be reported in terms of the State's academic achievement standards. It appears that Michigan is using only two achievement levels (Ready/Not ready) instead of the required three.

Section 4.4 Summary Statement

_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- 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.*

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 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.	Please refer to the College Board's submission for evidence, notably **SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017)**.	
Section 4.5 Summary Statement		
_X_ No additional evidence is required		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State: • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. •	The SAT was administered on paper, not as a technology-based or computer-adaptive assessment. This peer review submission covers the general assessment in mathematics and English language arts. Alternate assessment will be evidenced in the peer review submission for the alternate assessment.	Only administered by paper-and-pencil
Section 4.6 Summary Statement		
_X_ No additional evidence is required		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance 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).	Please refer to the College Board's submission for evidence, notably **SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017)**.	College Board has additional validity studies planned. Ongoing work includes item, DIF, and equating analysis. No evidence of states' systems for *monitoring and improving* related to examples of evidence related to critical element provided. It is not clear that the State has a system for *monitoring and maintaining, and improving* as needed, the quality of SAT as administered in Michigan. Michigan may consider developing a plan and timeline for improving their use of the SAT in the assessment system. The TAC could assist in developing this plan.

Section 4.7 Summary Statement

_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Evidence that Michigan 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.

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

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 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: • Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student's education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards; • States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student's IEP Team based on each student's individual needs; • Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment; • Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities; • Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities; • Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic	**Evidence #1.4b: 2017 M-STEP Test Administration Manual (2016)** Pages 20-24 demonstrate that all public school students are required to take the statewide assessments. Pages 20-21 demonstrate that this explicitly includes students with disabilities. Page 24 demonstrates that this explicitly applies to grade 11 students. **Evidence #2.3a: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual - Michigan (Spring 2017)** Pages iv-v, 1, and 24-28 (PDF pages 4-5, 9, and 32-36) demonstrate procedures for requesting and providing accommodations. **Evidence #5.1a: 2017 MI-Access Test Administration Manual (2016)** Pages 7-9 demonstrate procedures for whether students should take the general or alternate assessment, including the different levels of alternate assessment. This references the general and alternate academic standards and explicitly notes the role of the IEP team. **Evidence #5.1b: "Should My Student Take the Alternate Assessment?" (2016)** Page 1 demonstrates the decision criteria for taking the general or alternate assessment, including the different levels of alternate assessment. This references the general and alternate academic standards and explicitly notes the role of the IEP team and that parents must be informed of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments. **Evidence #2.3d: "M-STEP, MI-Access, SAT, ACT WorkKeys and WIDA Student Supports and**	**Evidence #5.1a: 2017 MI-Access Test Administration Manual (2016) states** that parents must be informed of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments, but it is not on an IEP form or in a parent letter but an internal document for educators so no verification provided for parents. **Evidence #1.4b: 2017 (page 24)** contained no procedures for including students with disabilities for MME (SAT). Limited information cited regarding the role of the IEP team in SAT assessment. Insufficient discussion regarding decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student's IEP Team based on each student's individual needs. Michigan documents should be updated to include the SAT as one of the assessments in the accommodations and accessibility manual for IEP team guidance.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA; • Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student's achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State's general assessments); • The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.	**Accommodations Table" (February 13, 2017)** Pages 19-20 demonstrate instructions on requesting SAT-specific accommodations. Please refer to the College Board's submission for additional evidence, notably **SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017)**, **SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017)**, and website references for accommodations and students with disabilities	

Section 5.1 Summary Statement

_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Provide evidence which states that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities on the SAT must be made by a student's IEP Team based on each student's individual needs.
- Provide 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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs 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: • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.	**Evidence #1.4b: 2017 M-STEP Test Administration Manual (2016)** Pages 20-24 demonstrate that all public school students are required to take the statewide assessments. Page 21 demonstrates that this explicitly includes English learners. Page 24 demonstrates that this explicitly applies to grade 11 students. **Evidence #2.3a: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual - Michigan (Spring 2017)** Pages iv-v, 1, and 24-28 (PDF pages 4-5, 9, and 32-36) demonstrate procedures for requesting and providing accommodations. **Evidence #2.3d: "M-STEP, MI-Access, SAT, ACT WorkKeys and WIDA Student Supports and Accommodations Table" (February 13, 2017)** Pages 19-20 demonstrate instructions on requesting SAT-specific accommodations. Please refer to the College Board's submission for additional evidence, notably **SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017)**, **College Board-Approved Word-to-Word Glossaries for the SAT® Suite of Assessments (2017)**, and **College Board translated instructions for the SAT (2017)**.	A procedure/process to request accommodations is in place but no guidance is provided for how to select an appropriate EL accommodation. Moreover, the SAT only allows for two accommodations for English learners that result in college-reportable scores. Various test administration manuals reference ELs. The components of this critical element are not fully developed. Other than the manuals, there appears to be no communication of EL inclusion procedures to districts, schools, teachers, and parents.

Section 5.2 Summary Statement

_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Describe procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);
- Provide information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; and
- Provide guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Michigan

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.3 – Accommodations The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State: • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student's need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.	**Evidence #2.3a: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual - Michigan (Spring 2017)** Pages iv-v, 1, and 24-28 (PDF pages 4-5, 9, and 32-36) demonstrate procedures for requesting and providing accommodations. **Evidence #2.3d: "M-STEP, MI-Access, SAT, ACT WorkKeys and WIDA Student Supports and Accommodations Table" (February 13, 2017)** Pages 19-20 demonstrate instructions on requesting SAT-specific accommodations. **Evidence #5.3a: "Michigan DOE Implementation – Consolidated Business Requirements: Testing Accommodations & Supports – Standard and State Allowed" (January 15, 2017)** This business requirements document demonstrates standard and state-specific accommodations. Pages 9-13 demonstrate accommodations and their implications in detail. Please refer to the College Board's submission for additional evidence, notably **SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017)**, **SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017)**, and website references for accommodations and students with disabilities.	SAT documentation and administration manual lists considerably fewer accommodations than those listed in the Michigan DOE Consolidate Business Requirements for accommodations. How is the College Board communicating to teachers about the expanded set of accommodations allowed in Michigan? Are teachers aware they exist? Michigan Business requirements mandate that College Board provide training to teachers, but what evidence shows that the training took place and that summarizes teacher participation rates. Documentation regarding training (participants, evaluation, etc.) should be submitted. SSD and State Allowed Accommodations are treated differently by the College Board. Some accommodations may result in non-college reportable scores. There is a limited number of accommodations for English learners taking the SAT. College Board provides an online system for having individual accommodation requests reviewed. However, teachers may not be aware of the possible accommodations that may be requested. Also, are teachers aware that this process is available to them? There is no evidence that the accommodation request system is being used by teacher and no evidence about the types of accommodations requested by teachers. Michigan did not provide evidence 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

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

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

Section 5.3 Summary Statement

_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Provide evidence 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.
- See the consortium review.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations 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: • Consistent with the State's policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student's disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student's IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.	**Evidence #2.4b: "M-STEP & MI-Access Monitoring – Overview" (2017)** Pages 1-2 demonstrate how Michigan monitors standardized test administration. In this context, "M-STEP" in the title should be understood as referring to all the general assessments, as the same procedures include all components of Michigan Merit Exam testing, such as the SAT with Essay. **Evidence #2.4c: "Requirements Document – Assessment Observation" (Spring 2017)** This document demonstrates contractual requirements for training and deployment of testing site monitors. **Evidence #2.4d: SAT Test Day Observations (2017)** This checklist demonstrates what monitors observe during SAT monitoring visits. The checklist is customized for different assessments. **Evidence #2.4e: "2017 Summary of Monitoring" (2017)** This spreadsheet demonstrates all monitoring results from random and targeted monitoring for spring 2017, including all standard and alternate assessments.	There was no evidence provided that the state monitors test administration in its schools to ensure that students receive appropriate accommodations. The submitted monitoring protocols primarily address critical logistical matters, but do not appear to address the uses of accommodations. The monitoring of test administration procedure should be expanded to include the appropriate use of accommodations. Evidence 2.4b should be updated to specifically address monitoring for the SAT. Also, 2.4b mainly concerns test security. It does not require monitors to check for appropriate accommodations. A monitoring process is needed to verify that students receive accommodations commensurate with IEP Team, 504 Plan, or English learner recommendations.

Section 5.4 Summary Statement

_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
Evidence that monitoring ensures assessment accommodations are:

- Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;
- Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student's IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; and
- Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.

Also see consortium review.

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

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically: • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; • The State's academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.	**Evidence #6.1a: "SAT 2016 Cut Scores" (August 10, 2016)** This memo demonstrates that the state formally adopted academic achievement standards ("cut scores") for 11th grade English language arts and mathematics, with the SAT as the general assessment. **Evidence #6.1b: Notes from the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) of the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) Division of Accountability Services (DAS) (May 12 and 13, 2016)** Page 6 demonstrates Michigan's plan to adopt SAT cut scores as state-level academic achievement standards, in consultation with the Technical Advisory Committee, with options for extending standards in future years. Michigan uses College Board's recommended academic achievement standards for the SAT as a general assessment in grade 11. Please refer to the College Board's submission for additional evidence on achievement levels and descriptions, notably **SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017)** and **Final Report on the 2016 SAT Multi-State Standard Setting.**	Technical Documents refer to two achievement levels (College and Career ready, or not). Standard setting refers to three. Score reports only reference two levels. **Evidence #6.1a:** Memo to a Deputy Superintendent recommending the adoption of the College Board's benchmark score as the proficiency for both SAT ELA and Math scores. Memo does not constitute the State's formal adoption of challenging academic achievement standards. Should be approved by the SBOE or at least a memo announcing formal approval from the Chief State School Officer to districts. **Evidence #6.1b (page 6):** The dichotomy of the ready or not ready (one cut-score/two levels) as discussed by the TAC does not meet this Critical Element. It is unclear whether Michigan is adopting the two-level achievement standards (College Ready or Not Ready) or the four-level achievement standards derived in the standard setting. Clarification is need about which achievement levels are being adopted. **Evidence #6.2.1 (page 3):** In June 2016, College Board conducted panel-based standard setting meetings for the new SAT. The purpose of the standard setting meeting was to produce cut scores on the SAT Math section and the SAT Evidence-Based Reading and Writing section (ERW) for classifying students into 4 performance levels to be used by Maine, New Hampshire, Connecticut, and Delaware. What about Michigan? Are they using these cut-scores?

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 6.1 Summary Statement		
_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • Evidence that 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.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting 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.	Please refer to the College Board's submission for evidence, notably **SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017)** and **Final Report on the 2016 SAT Multi-State Standard Setting**.	Standard setting for three cut-scores (level 2, 3, and 4) involved Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, New Hampshire. No evidence that Michigan will be using the cut-scores from this standard setting. The modified Angoff method is sound. However, of the 16 panelists for mathematics, all but one was white. Likewise, of the 16 panelists for ERW all but 2 were white. There seems to be a lack of diversity among standard setting panelists. Note that the College and Career benchmarks are based on empirical analysis and not the modified Angoff procedure reported here. Peers suggest that Michigan conduct a review and verification that the cut-scores from the Angoff standard setting are applicable to Michigan students.

Section 6.2 Summary Statement

_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

From the consortium review:

- 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.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Michigan

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 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. 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.	Please refer to the College Board's submission for evidence, notably **SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017)**, **College Board + Michigan; SAT® Suite of Assessments: Alignment to Michigan Standards (2015)**, and **Final Report on the 2016 SAT Multi-State Standard Setting.**	**Exhibit 2.1.5 College Board + Michigan; SAT Suite of Assessments: Alignment to Michigan Standards (2015):** Speaking and listening are not addressed on the SAT and are thus not aligned. Seven of the nine Reading Standards for Literature 11–12 and all of the Reading Standards for Informational Text 11–12 are addressed in whole or in part on the redesigned SAT. Seven of the ten Writing Standards 11–12 are addressed in whole or in part. All of the Language "progressive" standards applicable to grades 11–12 are aligned to, as are all of the Language Standards 11–12, in whole or in part. The alignment between the redesigned SAT content specifications and the Michigan Standards for High School Mathematics is strong in the Number and Quantity, Algebra, Functions, Modeling, Geometry, and Statistics and Probability conceptual categories. The SAT's domain sampling approach covers standards from 20 of the 22 domains within these conceptual categories. The two domains not covered, Vector and Matrix Quantities (from Number and Quantity) and Using Probability to Make Decisions (from Statistics and Probability), were intentionally excluded as they are composed entirely of (+) standards. The (+) standards throughout the Michigan Standards for High School Mathematics are intended as preparation for advanced courses and are not essential for all students to learn to be college and career ready. We only know how many Michigan standards match the SAT content specifications (Reading Test-Text

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		Complexity). The "match" does not appear to include cognitive complexity, balance, etc. (pages 71-169). The Achievement Level Descriptions (ALDs) should align with the Michigan academic content standards. How were Michigan's content standards incorporated into the ALDs that were part of the SAT standard setting? Considering the components that lack alignment, it seems the ALDs might also not align well with Michigan's content standards.

Section 6.3 Summary Statement

_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Evidence that Michigan'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.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Michigan

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.

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

6.4 – Reporting
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:
• The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;
• The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;
• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that:
  • Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student's achievement;
  • Report the student's achievement in terms of the State's grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);
  • Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;
  • Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to
	Evidence #6.4a: "MI School Data 2016-17 College Readiness Snapshot" (accessed January 25, 2018)
	MISchoolData.org is Michigan's public-facing assessment data portal. This website screenshot demonstrates that Michigan reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement.
	
	Evidence #6.4b: "MI School Data 2016-17 College Readiness subgroups" (accessed January 25, 2018)
	This website screenshot demonstrates that Michigan reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement for all students and each student group.
	
	Evidence #6.4c: "MI School Data 2016-17 College Readiness Snapshot (Statewide: Mathematics / Race/Ethnicity / Gender)" (accessed January 25, 2018)
	This website screenshot demonstrates that Michigan reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement for all students and each student group.
	
	Evidence #6.4d: "MI School Data 2016-17 Students Not Tested" (accessed January 25, 2018)
	MISchoolData.org is Michigan's public-facing assessment data portal. This website screenshot demonstrates that Michigan reports to the public the percentage of students not tested.
	
	Evidence #6.4e: "Students Not Tested" (May 2017)
	This spreadsheet is the data available at the MISchoolData.org "Students Not Tested" site. It demonstrates in detail the data available for students tested and not, broken down by school
		Score report guide appears to be for M-step only.
		
		(6.4i) Supports that the State follows a process and timeline for the implementation of its assessment system, but it does not delineate delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. No evidence of a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.
		
		No evidence of availability of reports in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request.
		
		Report on the number of students not tested does not list this information for some important student groups such as students with disabilities.
		
		Score report only lists two achievement levels for the SAT: Met Benchmark or Did Not Meet Benchmark. Michigan should be reporting at least three levels.
		
		Test scaling procedures indicate the SAT has itemized scores. However, peers could not find the way this information is included in the score report or that Michigan reports itemized results for the SAT or that itemized scores are aligned to state academic content standards.
		
		No evidence supported that the State reports SAT results in terms of its academic achievement standards including performance-level descriptors.
		
		No evidence supported that SAT reports are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand; • The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.	and subject area. This example uses 2016 data. The public-facing version of the 2017 edition is being updated. **Evidence #2.6k: "Michigan and the SAT" (accessed January 25, 2018)** This website demonstrates Michigan's use of College Board's Reports Center for SAT score reporting. This includes individual student reporting and guidance on interpretation of reports. Please refer to College Board's submission for additional evidence on this reporting portal. **Evidence #6.4f: Spring 2017 Michigan M-STEP Guide to Reports (November 7, 2017)** The Michigan Merit Exam (MME) is the collection of 11th grade assessments, including the SAT with Essay, ACT WorkKeys, and M-STEP for social studies and science. The entire testing program is frequently called "M-STEP," including the MME, as is the case in the title of this document. Pages 12, 15, 17-19, 22-23, 26, and 28 demonstrate the assorted reports available to students, parents, and schools. Surrounding pages demonstrate guidance on the validity and interpretation of reports. Page 4 is a convenient summary of all the reports. **Evidence #6.4g: "How to Read Your Child's Score Report for Parents of Students in Grade 11" (2017)** Pages 1-2 demonstrate the production and guidance to parents on reading score reports, specific to grade 11. A video guide is also available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hvenxL17_So **Evidence #6.4h: 2017 M-STEP Reports for**	language that parents can understand.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	District and School Test Coordinators (2017) Pages 1-36 demonstrate information to help teachers and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students. The information largely repeats the Guide to Reports. This document is an example of training materials used to conduct webinars with schools, walking them through reports and demonstrating the use of the online reporting portal. **Evidence #6.4i: "MDE SAT-PSAT Implementation 2016-17" (June 29, 2017)** Pages 3-4 of this project plan demonstrate that 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. Page 3 demonstrates the data return and review processes that precede reporting, and page 4 demonstrates reporting itself. Please refer to the College Board's submission for additional evidence, notably **SAT Understanding Scores 2017 (2017)** and **Student Online Reporting Screen Shot Demo**.	

Section 6.4 Summary Statement

_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Evidence that Michigan reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and *each student group* after each test administration;
- Evidence that the State reports assessment results, including *itemized score analyses*, to districts and schools *so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results* and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;
- The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that:
  - Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student's achievement;
  - Report the student's achievement in terms of the *State's grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors)*;
  - Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• Are *available in alternate formats* (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand; • The State follows a *process and timeline* for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration		