



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Roger Dorson  
Interim Commissioner of Education  
Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education  
P.O. Box 480  
Jefferson City, MO 65102-0480

September 25, 2018

Dear Interim Commissioner Dorson:

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 Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) to prepare for the review, which occurred in March 2018, and which was a follow up to a review that occurred in 2016.

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

External peer reviewers and Department staff carefully evaluated DESE's submission, which included several assessments. 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 assessments:

- Science general assessments in grades 5 and 8 (Missouri Assessment Program or MAP): **Partially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB and the ESSA.**
- Reading/language arts, mathematics, and science general assessments in high school (end-of-course in English II and Algebra I): **Partially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB and the ESSA.**
- Reading/language arts and mathematics alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) for grades 3-8 and high school (Missouri Assessment

400 MARYLAND AVE., SW, WASHINGTON, DC 20202  
[www.ed.gov](http://www.ed.gov)

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

Program-Alternate Assessment (MAP-A)): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB and the ESSA.**

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

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

Subsequent to the peer review, DESE indicated to the Department that it is no longer using the high school mathematics and reading/language arts assessments reviewed under this peer review. DESE administered new reading/language arts and mathematics assessments in spring 2018. In addition, DESE indicated that it is developing new science assessments for high school and grades 3-8, which it plans to administer for the first time in spring 2019. DESE must submit these new assessments for peer review after their first full operational administration. Given the changes DESE has made and continues to make to its assessment system, it is the Department's understanding that DESE does not intend to address further the peer reviewer comments in the attached chart that concern assessments DESE no longer plans to use. Therefore, DESE should include, as its plan and timeline that DESE will submit in response to this letter, a detailed description of the implementation for each of the reading/language arts, mathematics, and science general assessments.

Because the 2018 peer review resulted in a designation of partially met requirements, I am placing a condition on DESE's Title I grant award. This condition will remain in place until such time as DESE presents evidence that the reading/language arts, mathematics, and science general assessments meet all of the requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. The condition also stipulates that the Department may take further action if the condition is not resolved in a timely manner.

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. In particular, OSERS will monitor progress against critical elements 1.4, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4, and 6.3. Insufficient progress to address such matters may lead OSERS to place a condition on DESE's federal fiscal year 2019 IDEA Part B grant award.

In addition, the full peer review notes from the review are enclosed. These recommendations to the Department formed the basis of our determination. Please note that the peers' recommendations may differ from the Department's feedback; we encourage you to read the full peer notes for additional suggestions and recommendations for improving your assessment system beyond what is noted in the Department's feedback.

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. I wish you well in your continued efforts to improve student achievement in Missouri. If you have any questions, please contact my staff at: [OSS.Missouri@ed.gov](mailto:OSS.Missouri@ed.gov).

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank T. Brogan  
Assistant Secretary for  
Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Shaun Bates, Director of Assessment, Office of College and Career Readiness  
Lisa Sireno, Standards and Assessment Administrator, Office of College and Career Readiness  
Jocelyn Strand, Coordinator, School Improvement  
Chris Neale, Assistant Commissioner, Office of Quality Schools  
Stacey Preis, Deputy Commissioner, Division of Learning Services

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

Note: Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) adopted new academic content standards in 2016, so it will need to provide evidence of adoption and meaningful consultation of stakeholders in the development of those content standards in the next peer review for its new assessments aligned with those standards (meaningful consultation is a new requirement under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)).

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<b>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</b>	For all assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of inclusion of students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services in the State assessment system.</li> <li>• Evidence that the State is including all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</li> </ul>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b>	For the MAP English II test: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that shows that the Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) English II test, especially reading and writing, assesses the full breadth and depth of the State's academic content standards. OR</li> <li>• Evidence that the State has implemented a new reading/language arts assessment that does assess the full breadth and depth of the State's academic content standards (e.g., by submitting a new peer review submission for the reading/language arts high school test).</li> </ul>
<b>2.3 – Test Administration</b>	For all assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a written contingency plan that addresses procedures for possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b>	For R/LA and mathematics high school tests (MAP English II and Algebra I), and the MAP science tests in grades 5 and 8: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results from planned alignment studies that show improved alignment. OR</li> <li>• Evidence that the State has implemented new reading/language arts, mathematics, and science assessment that have adequate validity based on content and assess the full breadth and depth of the State's academic content standards (e.g., by submitting a new peer review submission for the reading/language arts and mathematics high school tests and grades 5 and 8 science).</li> </ul>
<b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b>	For reading/language arts and mathematics high school tests (MAP English II and Algebra I): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cognitive labs results or ratings from content experts that show that items measure intended cognitive processes.</li> <li>• Results from alignment studies that show that the tests assess intended cognitive processes. OR</li> <li>• Evidence that the State has implemented new reading/language arts and mathematics assessments that have adequate validity based on cognitive</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>processes (e.g., by submitting a new peer review submission for the reading/language arts and mathematics high school tests).</p>
<p><b>4.2 – Fairness and accessibility</b></p>	<p>For reading/language arts and mathematics high school tests (MAP English II and Algebra I), and the MAP science tests in grades 5 and 8:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State supports and enhances the accessibility of the assessments through appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities, and, to the extent practicable, by incorporating principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (section 1111(b)(2)(B)(xiii) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA).</li> </ul>
<p><b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b></p>	<p>For the MAP Science test in grade 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that DESE is sufficiently measurement achievement along the entire performance continuum (e.g., by addressing issues of consistency and accuracy of the test conditioned at the proficient level).</li> </ul>
<p><b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b></p>	<p>For all assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation that explains to parents and the public the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards.</li> </ul>
<p><b>5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners</b></p>	<p>For all assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that shows that procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system were communicated to parents (e.g., in the form of letter, booklet, template, website or other communication).</li> </ul>
<p><b>5.3 – Accommodations</b></p>	<p>For all assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that shows accommodations are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments; do not alter the construct being assessed; and allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who require and receive accommodations and students who do not require and do not receive accommodations.</li> <li>• A formal process for reviewing and allowing exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed (e.g., a description of process in standard document).</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b></p>	<p>For the (Missouri Assessment Program-Alternate Assessment :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. DESE should provide this evidence by December 15, 2020.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.4 - Reporting</b></p>	<p>For reading/language arts and mathematics high school tests (MAP English II and Algebra I), and the MAP science tests in grades 5 and 8:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Evidence that reports are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand.</li> </ul>

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Additional Evidence Needed</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence of a timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li></ul>

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## March 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes-Resubmission



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Missouri-Resubmission

Contents

1.4 Inclusion Policies ..... 3  
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 4  
2.3 – Test Administration ..... 5  
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 1

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 2  
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 2  
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 3

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER ..... 4  
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... 4  
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance..... 5

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS ..... 6  
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities ..... 6  
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 7  
5.3 – Accommodations..... 8  
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations ..... 9

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 10  
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 10  
6.4 – Reporting..... 11

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS ..... 1  
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 2

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 4  
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 5  
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure ..... 8  
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables ..... 10

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER ..... 11  
4.1 – Reliability..... 12  
4.4 – Scoring ..... 14  
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms ..... 15  
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment ..... 16

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Missouri-Resubmission**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p align="center"><b>1.4 Inclusion Policies</b></p> <p>For all components of the assessment system under this review, Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of inclusion of students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services in the State assessment system.</li> </ul>	<p>Missouri Accountability Guidelines for Schools</p>	<p>Evidence meets requirements.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>x_ No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Missouri-Resubmission**

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b>                      For reading/language arts (R/LA) high school test (Missouri Assessment Program (MAP)) English II, DESE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the test assesses the full breadth and depth of the State’s academic content standards, including the speaking and listening aspect of the standards. [NOTE: Missouri has received a speaking and listening waiver; therefore, the U.S. Department of Education (the Department) does not expect Missouri to submit additional evidence regarding speaking and listening during the period of the waiver.]</li> </ul>	<p>Word Document Test Design and Development.</p> <p>Test Development and Equating Design and Procedure to Foster Comparability of Forms Scores for the New Missouri End-of-Course Assessment, Questar Assessment, Inc. (pp.1-17).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New standards were adopted on 4/19/2016. From 2017-2018 school year, new assessment aligned to adopted standards in ELA, Math, and Science was administered (for Science, it was field test). The State is currently working with their vendors and Technical Advisory Committee to create a long range plan to assess the breadth and depth of the standards.</li> <li>Evidence provided was not sufficient to show that the EOC English II test denoted in this Critical Element assesses the full breadth and depth of the State’s academic content standards.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate evidence that shows that the EOC English II test, especially reading and writing, assesses the full breadth and depth of the State’s academic content standards</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Missouri-Resubmission**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p> <p>For all components of the assessment system under this review, DESE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of DESE’s contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>	<p>The Word Document did not provide any evidence that state had contingency plans in place to address possible technology problems during testing.</p>	<p>The State did not have a formal contingency plan to address technology challenges during test administration.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A contingency plan that addresses possible technology challenges during test administration</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM Integrated Model Consortium Submission**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</b></p> <p>For all components of the assessment system under this review, DESE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of procedures that describe the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for a student group.</li> </ul>	<p>Element 2.6 MSIP_5_2017_Comprehensive_Guide.pdf (p.17)</p>	<p>The State provided the minimum number of students required for reporting, but for accountability purposes only: a minimum of 30 students in a given content area each year over a three-year period was required to generate scores for accountability based on the average of three annually-calculated MPIs. If this is not possible, the Status measure is calculated by “pooling” three years of data and summing the number of accountable students and the numbers of students in each achievement level across the three year period and the “pooled” count is used in the calculation for determining status and is referred to as the cumulative measure. However, the minimum number of students required for reporting subgroup performance was not provided (e.g., will the results for 15 Hispanic grade four students be reported for X school)</p>
<p><b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documentation on the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for a student subgroup at a school/district level.</li> </ul>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM Integrated Model Consortium Re-Submission**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b></p> <p>For R/LA and mathematics high school tests (MAP English II and Algebra I), and the MAP science tests in grades 5 and 8, DESE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that it has improved alignment for the tests, based upon findings from the end of course alignment study and the MAP science alignment study.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	<p>Test Development and Equating Design and Procedure to Foster Comparability of Forms Scores for the New Missouri End-of-Course Assessment, Questar Assessment, Inc. (pp.1-17).</p>	<p>Evidence was not found about improved alignment for the tests. Plans were developed and described but not actually executed.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results from planed alignment studies that shows improved alignment for the R/LA and Math high school tests (MAP English II and Algebra I), and the MAP science tests in grades 5 and 8.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM Integrated Model Consortium Re-Submission**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b>                      For R/LA and mathematics high school tests (MAP English II and Algebra I), DESE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the tests assess the intended cognitive processes as represented in the State’s content standards for R/LA and mathematics.</li> </ul>	<p>Test Development and Equating Design and Procedure to Foster Comparability of Forms Scores for the New Missouri End-of-Course Assessment, Questar Assessment, Inc. Appendix B: Proposed Algebra I Blueprint (pp.25-26). Appendix D: Proposed English I and II Blueprint (p.29).</p>	<p>Peers could not find evidence that shows that the tests in question (English II and Algebra I) assess the intended cognitive processes as presented in the State’s content standards for R/LA and Math.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed (for the test under review)/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cognitive labs results or ratings from content experts that show that items measure intended cognitive processes or</li> <li>Results from alignment studies that shows that the tests assess intended cognitive processes</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM Integrated Model Consortium Re-Submission**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b></p> <p>For the MAP science test in grade 5, DESE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that DESE has addressed issues of consistency and accuracy of the test conditioned at the proficient level.</li> </ul>	<p>Element 4.3 MAP Grade-Level 2017 Technical Report.pdf (p.158)</p>	<p>MO DESE admitted that lower than expected classification consistency was found at the Proficient level for Science Grade 5. DESE stated that relatively few test items effectively measured students classified as Proficient on Grade 5 Science tests, likely contributing to the lower classification consistency at this achievement level. The TAC recommended that more items effectively measuring students in the middle and upper part of the ability scale be included in the new Science forms in the future. DESE needs to provide evidence that these new items are added to the test.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DESE needs to provide evidence that more items effectively measuring students in the middle and upper part of the ability scale was added to the Science test in Grade 5 in order to improve consistency and accuracy of the test conditioned at the proficient level, and these statistics are actually improved.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM Integrated Model Consortium Re-Submission**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b></p> <p>For R/LA and mathematics high school tests (MAP English II and Algebra I), and the MAP science tests in grades 5 and 8, DESE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that describes the issues reviewed by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), such as TAC meeting minutes and summaries, and that also describes what actions were taken to monitor and improve the quality of Missouri’s assessment system.</li> </ul>	<p>DESE Assessment Technical Advisory Committee Annual Report for 2016 ER.docx (pp.14, 15, 19, 25, 29, 31).</p> <p>Element 4.3 MAP Grade-Level 2017 Technical Report.pdf (pp.1-185).</p> <p>Missouri TAC report March 2017.docx</p> <p>Missouri TAC report 6.7.2017.docx (p.3).</p> <p>Missouri TAC report 7.28.2017.docx (pp.1-2).</p> <p>Missouri TAC report 8.21.2017 FINAL.docx (pp.1-7).</p> <p>Missouri TAC report 12.11.2017 draft.docx</p>	<p>TAC meeting minutes were provided which show TAC’s discussion on how to improve the quality of Missouri’s assessment system. TAC provided clear recommendations and DESE developed plans to improve assessment system in terms of test administrations, scoring, test reliability and validity, and reporting of results. However, not adequate evidence was provided which described actions taken to monitor and improve the quality of Missouri’s assessment system.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence which described actions taken by MO based on TAC’s recommendation in order to monitor and improve the quality of Missouri’s assessment system.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM Integrated Model Consortium Re-Submission**

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b></p> <p>For all components of the assessment system under this review, the DESE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence clearly explaining 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 AA-AAAS.</li> <li>• Evidence that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments).</li> </ul>	<p>Missouri Alternate Assessment Decision Making Flow Chart.</p> <p>Form D – 3 (p.5)</p> <p>Form E – District Wide Assessments</p> <p>Alternate Assessment Participation Determination</p> <p>Form F : Classroom Accommodations and Modification</p>	<p>Submitted documents do not address the requirements. They do not clearly explain the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards. They do not show that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities were informed 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).</p>
<p><b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation that explains 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 AA-AAAS.</li> <li>• Evidence that shows parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments).</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM Integrated Model Consortium Re-Submission**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</b>                      For all components of the assessment system under this review, the DESE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that procedures to ensure the inclusion of all ELs in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system are clearly communicated to parents.</li> </ul>	<p>MSIP 5 2016 Comprehensive Guide (p.15).</p>	<p>Submitted documents show that procedures to ensure the inclusion of all ELs in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system were communicated to test coordinators. However, it is not evident that this information was clearly communicated to parents as required by this element.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that shows that procedures to ensure the inclusion of all ELs in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system were communicated to parents (in the form of letter, booklet, template, website or other communication)</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM Integrated Model Consortium Re-Submission**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>5.3 – Accommodations</b></p> <p>For all components of the assessment system under this review, the DESE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has determined that the accommodations it provides:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments;</li> <li>○ Do not alter the construct being assessed; and</li> <li>○ Allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Evidence that the State has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>	<p align="center"><b>The evidence submitted describes the tools and accommodations available in the testing software/ platforms.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitted documents describe tools and accommodations available in the testing environment. However, they do not provide evidence that MO DESE has determined that the accommodations are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, do not alter the construct being assessed; and allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations, as required by this element.</li> <li>• The state does not have a formal process for individually reviewing and allowing exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. However, DESE seems to have processes in place but they were not written in formal documents.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that shows accommodations are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, do not alter the construct being assessed; and allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</li> <li>• A formal process for reviewing and allowing exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed (e.g., a description of process in standard document)</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM Integrated Model Consortium Re-Submission**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b></p> <p>For all components of the assessment system under this review, the DESE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State monitor test administrations in its districts and schools to ensure that accommodations are administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> <li>• Evidence that ELs receive accommodations that are consistent with accommodations recommended for each student.</li> </ul>	<p>Element 5.4 Form D.pdf                      Element 5.4 QA Review Form.pdf                      Element 5.4 Spring 2017 Quality Assurance Form - MAP Grade-Level and End-of-Course.pdf                      Element 5.4 Training PPT.pptx</p>	<p>Submitted documents show that the state has developed procedures to monitor accommodations as implemented during test administration. However, no evidence was found that shows that the monitoring actually took place (e.g., schedule of on-site visits, summary of results from QA documents).</p>
<p><b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that shows state actually implemented procedures to monitor accommodation during test administration such as data, reports...</li> <li>• A schedule of on-site visits.</li> <li>• A summary of the results from the Quality Assurance documents from the most recent year of test administration in the state</li> </ul> <p align="center">○</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM Integrated Model Consortium Re-Submission**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b>                      For R/LA and mathematics high school tests (MAP English II and Algebra I), and the MAP science tests in grades 5 and 8, DESE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that demonstrates the State used a technically sound method and process for setting its academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable (e.g., a complete standards-setting report that describes the process).</li> </ul>	<p>Element 6.2 Cut Point Validation.pdf                      Element 6.2 MAP Grade-Level 2016 Technical Report – Science.pdf (pp.74-77)                      Element 6.2 Technical Report EOC 15-16.pdf (pp.34-36)                      Element 6.2 Technical Report EOC.pdf (pp.30-33)                      Element 6.2 Technical report GLA.pdf (pp.147-151)</p>	<p>Submitted evidence met requirements of this element.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM Integrated Model Consortium Re-Submission**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p> <p>For R/LA and mathematics high school tests (MAP English II and Algebra I), and the MAP science tests in grades 5 and 8, DESE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Evidence that reports are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand.</li> <li>• Evidence of a timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>	<p>Missouri Assessment Program Content Strand Summary (pp.1-2).</p> <p>Missouri Assessment Program 2017 Item Analysis Summary (pp.1-23).</p> <p>Item Analysis Summary Tabular Report (pp.1-23).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitted documents show that state provided content strand reports, item analysis report, district performance report.</li> <li>• Submitted documents do not show student performance reports, reports in alternate format, reports in a native language that parents can understand. It is not clear if and how student performance was reported to parents.</li> <li>• Timeline for delivering individual student reports was not provided.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A document that shows that State reports assessment results to parents, teachers, principals (with report samples).</li> <li>• Reports in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand.</li> <li>• Timeline and process for delivering individual student reports was not provided (e.g., in Test Administration Manual)</li> </ul>		

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

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## February 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes (resubmission based on June 2016 peer review)



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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM Integrated Model  
Consortium Re-Submission**

**Contents**

<b>SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>4.1 – Reliability.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>4.4 – Scoring .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment .....</b>	<b>16</b>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM Integrated Model Consortium Submission

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM Integrated Model Consortium Re-Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></p> <p>For the DLM IM AA-AAAS: See evidence requested under elements 3.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>interchangeability across linkage levels used by the tests, including analysis of model fit.</li> <li>Evidence that provides detailed descriptions of the routing pathways within and across essential elements (content domains).</li> </ul> <p>and 4.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence regarding reliability estimation, which will be satisfied by response to element 3.3.</li> <li>Evidence regarding consistency and accuracy of classifications, which will be satisfied by response to element 3.3.</li> </ul>	<p>IM_01Technical Manual_Update_IM 2016-2017 (pages 38, 39, &amp; 44). Analysis of model fit (pages 44, 54 and 58).</p> <p>File 6- Chapter IV of the <i>2014–2015 Technical Manual – Integrated Model</i> (pages 118-120) and File IM_01Technical Manual_Update_IN 201-2017 page 28</p> <p>IM_01Technical Manual_Update_IM 2016-2017, (pages 74-90).</p> <p>IM_01Technical Manual_Update_IM 2016-</p>	<p>See comments in section 3.1.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM Integrated Model Consortium Re-Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of model fit analysis, which will be satisfied by response to element 3.1.</li> </ul>	2017 (pages 86-90).  IM_01Technical Manual_Update_IM 2016-2017, Analysis of model fit (pages 44, 54 and 58)	
<b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM Integrated Model Consortium Re-Submission

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY**

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

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM Integrated Model Consortium Re-Submission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b>                      For R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and HS (DLM-IM):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of analysis that supports the assumptions of testlet interchangeability across linkage levels used by the tests, including analysis of model fit.</li> <li>• Evidence that provides detailed descriptions of the routing pathways within and across essential elements (content domains).</li> </ul>	<p>Content Standards</p> <p>1) IM 02 Technical Manual IM 2014-15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Chapter III: Item and Test Development                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Essential Element Concept Maps for Testlet Development (pp. 61-65)</li> </ul> </li> <li>b) Chapter IV: Test Administration                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Linkage Level Selection and Adaptive Delivery (pp. 114-120)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>2) IM 01 Technical Manual Update IM 2016-17</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Chapter III: Item and Test Development                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Operational Assessment Items for 2016-2017 (pp. 11-16)</li> <li>ii) Field Test Results (pp. 19-26)</li> </ul> </li> <li>b) Chapter IV: Test Administration                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Adaptive Delivery (pp. 28-29)</li> </ul> </li> <li>c) Chapter V: Modeling                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Model Fit (pp. 44-58, 59)</li> </ul> </li> <li>d) Chapter IX: Validity Studies</li> </ul>	<p>The claim that items are fungible (i.e. exchangeable) is based on item development design. The logic in the evidence section provided by DLM is that items within EEs and Linkage Levels (designed to be exchangeable) demonstrate similar p-values and have standardized differences with weighted mean p-value of all other items measuring same linkage level of EE that is within 2 standard deviations. Data provided on operational items and field test items (pp.11-16 and 19-26).</p> <p>Peers were concerned that DLM flagged and reviewed items during field testing to determine equivalency, however, when items fell outside of the specified parameters, items were put back into the pool without revision (page 25-26, 2016-2017 Technical Manual). Peers recommend that reviewed or flagged items be revised and retested to support the fungibility assumption. This could have implications for 4.1.</p> <p>Methodology used to determine model fit is described on pages 44 and 54, however, it is unclear why the selected model was chosen as the ‘best fit’, given that the lack of strong evidence to support this choice (“Preliminary model fit results indicated</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM Integrated Model Consortium Re-Submission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p style="text-align: center;">i) Internal Structure Across Linkage Levels (p. 119)</p> <p>3) IM 03 TAC Materials (pp. 1-2)</p> <p>IM_01Technical Manual_Update_IM 2016-2017 (pages 38, 39, &amp; 44).</p>	<p>mixed support for the use of the current fungible scoring model”, page 58). Peer agreed with the TAC members (IM 03_TAC_Materials) conclusion that “larger sample sizes and refinements to methodology are unlikely to change the fundamental conclusion that the non-fungible model provides superior fit”.</p> <p>The TAC members thought that the model did have an impact of item classification and recommend calculating using Bayesian estimation methods or switching to a non-fungible model (IM 03_TAC_Materials). Peers support this recommendation, as well as continuing to study model fit over time as described in the last paragraph on page 59 of the 2016-2017 Technical Manual.</p> <p>The impact of model selection on mastery decisions for students may be differential at the state level than consortium wide, due to different Ns for states. While ongoing research is being conducted to improve the model fit, peers were concerned about how model fit impacts mastery decisions and how they are incorporated into guidance for interpreting scores and any resulting impact of the use of those scores (including the use of multiple measures to support actions based on mastery decisions).</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM Integrated Model Consortium Re-Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		Peers recommend a revision of the Technical Manual to include an explanation of the two-down scoring rule and how it is applied, which is not sufficiently explained on page 43 of the IM Technical Manual (2016-2017).
<b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b>		
_X_ No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM Integrated Model Consortium Re-Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b></p> <p>For R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and HS (DLM-IM):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of consistency and accuracy of classifications resulting from the tests.</li> <li>Evidence of item-level data (e.g., factor loadings or item-total correlations), or comparable node-level data that support the internal structure of the tests.</li> </ul> <p>Evidence that reliability estimates are based upon known item and testlet parameters.</p>	<p>Scoring and Reporting Structures’ Consistency with Sub-Domain Structures</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) IM 01 Technical Manual Update IM 2016-17               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Chapter III: Item and Test Development                   <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Operational Assessment Items for 2016-2017 (pp. 11-16)</li> <li>ii) Field Test Results (pp. 19-26)</li> </ol> </li> <li>b) Chapter V: Modeling                   <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Overview of the Psychometric Model (pp. 38-39)</li> <li>ii) Calibrated Parameters (pp. 39-42)</li> </ol> </li> <li>c) Chapter VIII: Reliability                   <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Reliability Sampling Procedure (pp. 75-76)</li> <li>ii) Linkage Level Reliability Evidence (pp. 85-88)</li> <li>iii) Conditional Reliability Evidence by Linkage Level (p. 89)</li> </ol> </li> <li>d) Chapter IX: Validity Studies                   <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Internal Structure Across Linkage Levels (p. 119).</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>The 2016-2017 correlation values, agreement and Kappa statistics, as compared to the evidence for reliability reported for Linkage Levels in 2014-15, are more in line with acceptable levels.</p> <p>Internal Structure Across Linkage Levels: (see comments in section 3.1 regarding flagged items).</p> <p><b>Internal Structure:</b> Peers were concerned that there are issues with the non-masters having a greater than 50% change of responding correctly (File 1, p. 40-41), which could result in misclassification. This may resolve with further study of the scoring model, however, peers recommend that in addition to examining and revising flagged items, the consortium should continue to monitor this phenomenon.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM Integrated Model Consortium Re-Submission

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM Integrated Model Consortium Re-Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b></p> <p>For R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and HS (DLM-IM):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</li> </ul>	<p>Score Relationship to Other Variables</p> <p>1) IM 01 Technical Manual Update IM 2016-17</p> <p>    a) Chapter IX: Validity Studies</p> <p>        i) Evidence Based on Relation to Other Variables (pp. 119-125)</p> <p>    b) Chapter XI: Conclusion and Discussion</p> <p>        i) Future Research</p> <p>IM01, (pp. 143-144).</p>	<p>The current study is an initial step. Although, as noted there are issues with the First Contact survey being used to determine the testlet linkage level. The proposed research in IM01, pp. 143-144 asking teachers to rate student mastery will be beneficial.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM Integrated Model Consortium Re-Submission

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM Integrated Model Consortium Re-Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.1 – Reliability</b></p> <p>For R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and HS (DLM-IM):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence regarding reliability estimation, which will be satisfied by response to element 3.3.</li> <li>• Evidence regarding consistency and accuracy of classifications, which will be satisfied by response to element 3.3.</li> <li>• Evidence of model fit analysis, which will be satisfied by response to element 3.1.</li> </ul>	<p><b>DA: Scoring and Reporting Structures’ Consistency with Sub-Domain Structures</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) IM 01 Technical Manual Update IM 2016-17               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Chapter III: Item and Test Development                   <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Operational Assessment Items for 2016-2017 (pp. 11-16)</li> <li>ii) Field Test Results (pp. 19-26)</li> </ol> </li> <li>b) Chapter V: Modeling                   <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Overview of the Psychometric Model (pp. 38-39)</li> <li>ii) Calibrated Parameters (pp. 39-42)</li> </ol> </li> <li>c) Chapter VIII: Reliability                   <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Reliability Sampling Procedure (pp. 75-76)</li> <li>ii) Linkage Level Reliability Evidence (pp. 86-88)</li> <li>iii) Conditional Reliability Evidence by Linkage Level (p. 89)</li> </ol> </li> <li>d) Chapter IX: Validity Studies                   <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Internal Structure Across Linkage Levels (p. 119)</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>IM_01Technical Manual_Update_IM 2016-2017, (pages 74-90).</p>	<p>See comments in section 3.1.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM Integrated Model Consortium Re-Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Consistency and Accuracy of classifications (pages 86-90).  Analysis of model fit (pages 44, 54, 58, and 59).	
<b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM Integrated Model Consortium Re-Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></p> <p>For R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and HS (DLM-IM):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of scoring reliability statistics for writing items based upon test administrator ratings.</li> <li>• Evidence of a detailed description of the calibration used in scoring software (e.g., field test versus operational calibration).</li> <li>• Evidence that distinguishes between option level scoring and item level scoring.</li> </ul>	<p>Standardized Scoring Procedures</p> <p>1) IM 01 Technical Manual Update IM 2016-17</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Chapter III: Item and Test Development               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) English Language Arts Writing Testlets (pp. 6-8)</li> </ul> </li> <li>b) Chapter V: Modeling               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Overview of the Psychometric Model (pp. 38-39)</li> </ul> </li> <li>c) Chapter IX: Validity Studies               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Interrater Agreement of Writing Product Scoring (pp. 104-111)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The description of the writing task was adequate as was the scoring process.</p> <p>Examples provided in TM appropriately demonstrate the low inference nature of the items as depicted in the examples. The peers acknowledged the innovative approach to the assessment of writing for this population.</p> <p>Observer data indicate 80% of test administrator entered responses agreed with student response under observation. However, for the operational writing assessments, peers recommend that there be consistent checks on data quality, to ensure that the teachers are accurately recording the response.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM Integrated Model Consortium Re-Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</b>                      For R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and HS (DLM-IM):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of analysis that supports the assumptions of testlet interchangeability, which will be satisfied by response to element 3.1</li> </ul>	<p>IM_01Technical Manual_Update_IM 2016-2017 (page 57).</p>	<p>See comments in section 3.1.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM Integrated Model Consortium Re-Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b>                      For R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and HS (DLM-IM):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of analysis that supports the assumptions of testlet interchangeability, which will be satisfied by response to element 3.1</li> </ul>	<p>IM_01Technical Manual_Update_IM 2016-2017, (pages 38, 39, &amp; 44).                      Analysis of model fit (pages 44, 54, 57-59).</p>	<p>See comments in section 3.1.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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