



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Elsie Arntzen  
Superintendent of Public Instruction  
Montana Office of Public Instruction  
P.O. Box 202501  
Helena, MT 59620

January 16, 2019

Dear Superintendent Arntzen:

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

In regard to the assessments that OPI submitted for the February 2018 peer review, peer reviewers and the Department staff carefully reviewed the information. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and the Department's analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (Smarter Balanced): **Substantially meets requirements.**
- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in high school (ACT): **Partially meets requirements.**

400 MARYLAND AVE., SW, WASHINGTON, DC 20202  
<http://www.ed.gov/>

- Reading/language arts and mathematics alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (National Center and State Collaborative/Multi-State Alternate Assessment (NCSC/MSAA)) in grades 3-8 and high school: **Substantially meets requirements.**

The components that substantially meet requirements meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. The Department expects that OPI should be able to provide this additional information within one year.

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

Please note that the assessment requirements for ESEA, as amended by the NCLB, were in effect through the end of the 2016-2017 school year. The OPI 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. Department staff carefully reviewed the 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 OPI administration of the MSAA assessments need to meet one additional requirement related to alternate academic achievement standards. This requirement is listed under critical element 6.3. Under the orderly transition authority in section 4(b) of the ESSA, I am granting OPI until December 15, 2020, to submit evidence of an alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards that meets this ESSA requirement. I have also determined that OPI administration of the ACT needs to meet two additional requirements related to equal benefits for students receiving accommodations.

The specific list of items required for OPI to submit is enclosed with this letter. Because the State has only partially met the requirements for the high school general assessment, the Department is placing a condition on the State's Title I grant award related to that component of the assessment system. To satisfy this condition, OPI must submit satisfactory evidence to address the items identified in the enclosed list. OPI 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 OPI'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. If you have any questions, please contact Diedra Hilliard of my staff at: [OSS.Montana@ed.gov](mailto:OSS.Montana@ed.gov).

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank T. Brogan  
Assistant Secretary for  
Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Ashley McGrath, Assessment Director

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

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<b>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</b>	For Montana’s assessment system: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of policies that students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, are included in the assessment system.</li> </ul>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development (ACT)</b>	For the ACT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A plan and a timeline to address the alignment issues identified in the existing alignment studies in order to ensure that the assessment measures the full range of the State’s academic content standards.</li> <li>• Strong evidence to establish that OPI’s academic content standards are equivalent to the State cited in the alignment studies.</li> </ul>
<b>2.2 – Item Development (ACT)</b>	For the ACT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 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. (Evidence for 2.1 will address this critical element.)</li> </ul>
<b>2.3 – Test Administration (MSAA)</b>	For the Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA)): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that State established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the MSAA assessments that include evidence of a policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration in writing (including the assessment delivery devices, accessibility tools and features available for students, and item formats) prior to testing.</li> </ul>
<b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (all)</b>	For the State’s assessment system: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that Montana Office of Public Instruction (OPI) adequately monitors the administration of the assessments to ensure that test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across Montana school districts and schools.</li> </ul>
<b>2.5 – Test Security (all)</b>	For the State’s assessment system: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the detection of test irregularities, remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments, and investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> <li>• Evidence of clear consequences for confirmed violations of test security.</li> </ul>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content (ACT)</b>	For the ACT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State’s assessments measure the depth and breadth of Montana’s academic content standards (evidence for 2.1 will address this critical element).</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes (ACT)</b>	For the ACT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the test assesses the cognitive processes found in the depth and breadth of the State’s content standards (evidence critical element 2.1 may also address this critical element).</li> </ul>
<b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure (MSAA)</b>	For the MSAA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State’s item response theory (IRT) assumptions of test unidimensionality are met.</li> </ul>
<b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure (ACT)</b>	For the ACT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards (evidence for 2.1 will address this critical element).</li> </ul>
<b>4.1 – Reliability (MSAA)</b>	For the MSAA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the reading/language arts tests (with operational constructed response writing items) demonstrate appropriate reliability.</li> </ul>
<b>4.1 – Reliability (ACT)</b>	For ACT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of reliability based on Montana’s student population (e.g., reliability estimates for the State overall and major reporting subgroups; standard error of measurement for the State overall and major reporting sub-groups; and estimates of classification accuracy and decision consistency for the State overall and major reporting sub-groups—including evidence for consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on assessment results).</li> </ul>
<b>4.2 – Fairness and accessibility (ACT)</b>	For ACT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure the assessment is accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the State (e.g., analysis of sub-group performance for Montana students on the tests).</li> </ul>
<b>4.4 – Scoring (MSAA)</b>	For the MSAA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols designed to produce reliable results and facilitate valid score interpretations for constructed-response items in reading/language arts and mathematics and also operational writing items. Specifically:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Adequate procedures and criteria for ensuring and documenting inter-rater reliability; and</li> <li>○ Clear scoring rubrics, comprehensive instructions for raters, adequate training of raters, and evaluation of inter-rater reliability.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance (all)</b>	For Montana’s assessment system: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of an ongoing process for monitoring, maintaining, and improving as needed, the technical quality of its assessment system.</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities (all)</b>	For Montana’s assessment system: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards.</li> </ul>
<b>5.1 Procedures for Including All Students with Disabilities (ACT)</b>	For the ACT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the State’s process for ensuring that students with disabilities are included in the ACT with clear guidelines for accommodations and the receipt of college-reportable scores.</li> </ul>
<b>5.2 – Procedures for Including ELs (Smarter Balanced)</b>	For Smarter Balanced: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>
<b>5.2 – Procedures for Including ELs (MSAA)</b>	For the MSAA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>
<b>5.2 – Procedures for Including ELs (ACT)</b>	For the ACT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> <li>• Evidence of the State’s process for ensuring that ELs are included in the ACT with clear guidelines for allowable supports and the receipt of college-reportable scores.</li> </ul>
<b>5.3 – Accommodations (ACT)</b>	For the ACT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that clarifies that students who receive allowable accommodations will receive equal benefits (e.g., college reportable scores). Evidence submitted for section 5.1 may also address this critical element.</li> </ul>
<b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations (all)</b>	For the Montana assessment system: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations.</li> <li>○ Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered.</li> <li>○ Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>○ Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>another process for an English learner.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</b></p>	<p>For Smarter Balanced and MSAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level for the general and alternate assessments at each grade level.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards (additional requirement under section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA)</b></p>	<p>For the MSAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act. OPI should provide this evidence by December 15, 2020.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.4 – Reporting (MSAA)</b></p>	<p>For the MSAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence of a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.4 – Reporting (ACT)</b></p>	<p>For the ACT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence that OPI reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested, for all students and each student group, after each test administration.</li> <li>● Evidence that OPI follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## February 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana

Contents

**SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS . 4**  
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students .... 4  
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards ..... 5  
1.3 – Required Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 7  
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 10  
1.5 – Participation Data (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 15

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS ..... 19**  
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 20  
2.2 – Item Development..... 24  
2.3 – Test Administration ..... 27  
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)29  
2.5 – Test Security ..... 32  
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 35

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 37**  
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 38  
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 40  
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure ..... 41  
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables ..... 43

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER ..... 46**  
4.1 – Reliability..... 46  
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 48  
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... 50  
4.4 – Scoring ..... 52  
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms ..... 54  
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment ..... 55  
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance..... 56

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS ..... 57**  
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities ..... 57  
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 62  
5.3 – Accommodations..... 65  
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations ..... 70

**SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 72**  
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students ..... 73  
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 75  
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards ..... 76  
6.4 – Reporting..... 78

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</b></p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MT Evidence (SBAC) 1 - MCCS Review and Adoption Overview and List of Participants – Page 1</li> <li>• MT Evidence (SBAC) 2 - MT CS Revision Handbook, Page 11: Adoption, Revision, Repeal History</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Montana adopted academic content standards in Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics.</li> <li>• NOTE: Montana did not submit Science assessments for this peer review.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</b></p> <p>The State’s academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science specify what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school to succeed in college and the workforce; contain content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>MT Evidence (SBAC) 3 -</b> English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technological Subjects – Grade-Band K-12</li> <li>• <b>MT Evidence (SBAC) 4 -</b> Mathematical Practice and Content November 2011</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Montana has met this critical element by adopting the common core standards in 2011, which 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.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 1.2 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 Montana

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p align="center"><b>1.3 – Required Assessments</b></p> <p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments (based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate academic achievement standards-AAAS) in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12);</li> <li>• Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12).</li> </ul>	<p>MSAA for AA-AAAS (ELA and Math) and CRT Science ALT) for Science</p> <p>MT Evidence 5 - MT OPI Required Assessments</p>	<p>MSAA for AA-AAAS (ELA and Math) and CRT Science ALT) for Science</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OPI submitted evidence that the State’s assessment system includes annual alternate assessments for ELA and Math (MSAA) and for Science (CRT Science Alternative Assessment) for the required grade spans and levels.</li> <li>• Please note that OPI did not submit their alternate Science assessment (CRT Science ALT) for this peer assessment review.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC)</b></p> <p>MT Evidence (SBAC) 5 - MT OPI Required Assessments</p> <p>MT Evidence (SBAC) 9 - ESEA Waiver June 2016 (speaking and listening)</p>	<p><b>Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OPI submitted evidence that the State’s assessment system includes annual general assessments for ELA and Reading and Math (SBAC) for the required grade spans and levels (3-8). OPI has a separate assessment for the required assessment in High School (ACT).</li> <li>• OPI also provided the ESEA waiver for the Listening and Speaking portions of the SBAC, June, 2016.</li> </ul> <p>Please note that OPI did not submit a Science assessment for grades 3-5, 6-9 for this peer assessment review.</p>
	<p><b>ACT</b></p> <p>MT Evidence (ACT) 5 - MT OPI Required Assessments</p>	<p><b>ACT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OPI submitted evidence that the State’s assessment system includes annual general assessments for ELA and Reading and Math assessment in High School (ACT), administered in grade 11. OPI has separate assessments (SBAC) for the required elementary and middle grade</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 Montana**

<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>
		spans and levels (3-8). Please note that OPI did not submit a high school Science assessment for this peer assessment review.
<b>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>		
<u>X</u> No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana**

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p align="center"><b>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</b></p> <p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system;</li> <li>• For English learners (EL):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment;</li> <li>○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>MSAA for AA-AAAS (ELA and Math) and CRT Science ALT) for Science</p> <p>MT Evidence 7- Guidelines, Including All Students MT Evidence 16- Eligibility Guidelines Mont CAS Alt</p>	<p>MSAA for AA-AAAS (ELA and Math) and CRT Science ALT) for Science</p> <p>OPI submitted a one-page document (evidence 7) entitled <i>Guidelines for Including All Students in MontCAS Assessments</i> and a screen shot of the webpage where testing irregularities can be reported (evidence 16).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The evidence submitted did not include examples of OPI’s regulations, policies, procedures, test coordinator manuals, test administrator manuals or accommodations manuals that OPI may have disseminated to districts, schools and teachers, clearly stating that the State’s assessment system does not exclude any student group or subset of a student group.</li> <li>• The evidence submitted did not include any document or accommodations manual that would provide instructions for the alternate assessments for Individualized Education Program (IEP) teams’ members, parents or administrators.</li> <li>• The evidence submitted did not include any documents or assessment accommodations manuals that show that OPI provides a native language (e.g., Spanish, Native American languages) version of its assessments, or the existence of accommodations to students who take the alternate assessment whose language is not English.</li> <li>• The evidence submitted did not include information on OPI’s policies stating that SWD also include students publicly placed in private schools that are being provided special education services.</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 Montana**

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
	<p><b>Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC)</b>            MT Evidence (SBAC) 6 - Eligibility Guidelines MontCASAlt</p> <p>MT Evidence (SBAC) 7 - Guidelines-Including All Students</p>	<p><b>Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC)</b>            OPI submitted a one-page document (evidence 6) entitled <i>Guidelines for Including All Students in MontCAS Assessments</i> and a screen shot of the webpage where testing irregularities can be reported (evidence 7).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The evidence submitted did not include samples of OPI’s regulations, policies, procedures, test coordinator manuals, test administrator manuals or accommodations manuals that OPI may have disseminated to districts, schools and teachers, clearly stating that the State’s general assessment system (SBAC) does not exclude any student group or subset of a student group.</li> <li>• The evidence submitted did not include detailed documents or accommodations manual that would provide instructions related to the general assessment (SBAC) for Individualized Education Program (IEP) teams’ members, parents or administrators.</li> <li>• The evidence submitted did not include any documents or assessment accommodations manuals that show that OPI provides a native language (e.g., Spanish, Native American languages) version of its general assessments, or the inclusion of students whose language is not English.</li> <li>• The evidence submitted did not include information on OPI’s policies stating that the administration of SBAC may also include students publicly placed in private schools and that are being provided education services in those schools.</li> </ul>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
	<p><b>ACT</b>            MT Evidence (ACT) 6 - Eligibility Guidelines MontCASAlt</p> <p>MT Evidence (ACT) 7 - Guidelines Including All Students</p>	<p><b>ACT</b>            OPI submitted a one-page document (evidence 6) entitled <i>Guidelines for Including All Students in MontCAS Assessments</i> and a screen shot of the webpage where testing irregularities can be reported (evidence 7).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The evidence submitted did not include samples of OPI’s regulations, policies, procedures, test coordinator manuals, test administrator manuals or accommodations manuals that OPI may have disseminated to districts, schools and teachers, clearly stating that the State’s high school assessment (ACT) does not exclude any student group or subset of a student group.</li> <li>• The evidence submitted did not include detailed documents or accommodations manual that would provide instructions related to Montana’s high assessment (ACT) for Individualized Education Program (IEP) teams’ members, parents or administrators.</li> <li>• The evidence submitted did not include any documents or assessment accommodations manuals that show that OPI provides a native language (e.g., Spanish, Native American languages) version of its high school assessment (ACT), or for the inclusion of students whose language is not English.</li> <li>• The evidence submitted did not include information on OPI’s policies stating that the administration of their high school assessment (ACT) may also include students publicly placed in private schools and that are being provided education services in those schools.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana**

<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><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OPI’s regulations, policies, procedures, test coordinator manuals, test administrator manuals or accommodations manuals disseminated to districts, schools and teachers, with clear assurances that the State’s general and alternate assessment systems do not exclude any student group or subset of a student group.</li> <li>• Documentation or accommodations manuals that would provide instructions to IEP teams’ members, or for parents or administrators for the administration of OPI’s alternate assessments.</li> <li>• Communications or documentation directed at IEP members (such as teachers, parents and administrators) explaining what are the accommodations that exist for special education students taking the general assessments in grades 3-8 (SBAC) and in high school (11<sup>th</sup> grade, ACT).</li> <li>• Documentation that show that the OPI provides a native language (e.g., Spanish, Native American languages) version of its general, alternate and high school ELA and Math assessments; and if it does not, what accommodations are provided to students who take these assessments whose first language is not English.</li> <li>• Documentation of OPI’s policies stating that SWD also include students publicly placed in private schools that are being provided special education services.</li> <li>• Documentation of OPI’s policies stating that the administration of their general, alternate and high school ELA and Math assessments (MSAA, SBAC and ACT) may also include students publicly placed in private schools and being provided educational services in those schools</li> </ul>	

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana**

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p align="center"><b>1.5 – Participation Data</b></p> <p>The State’s participation data show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system. In addition, if the State administers end-of-course assessments for high school students, the State has procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates on each required assessment and provides the corresponding data.</p>	<p>MSAA for AA-AAAS (ELA and Math) and CRT Science ALT) for Science</p> <p>MT Evidence 8 - Participation Data For ESSA Peer Review</p>	<p>MSAA for AA-AAAS (ELA and Math) and CRT Science ALT) for Science</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the MSAA (ELA and Math), OPI provided participation data that shows all students and subgroups by assessment type for all the required grades and grade spans.</li> <li>• NOTE: Participation rate in the alternate assessment in ELA and Math for all students and subgroups was lower than 95%.</li> <li>• OPI did not provide documentation that the State has in place procedures to ensure that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rate on the MSAA. Since OPI did not provide this documentation, and the State is not meeting the 95% participation rate requirement, it is unclear if the State is testing and counting in the calculation of participation rate all the students that must be tested with their alternate assessment, especially in high school.</li> <li>• OPI did not provide any participation data for the CRT Science ALT assessment because this assessment was not submitted to this assessment peer review.</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
	<p><b>Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC)</b></p> <p>MT Evidence (SBAC) 8 - Participation Data For ESSA Peer Review</p>	<p><b>Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For SBAC (ELA and Math) OPI provided participation data that shows all students and subgroups by assessment type for all the required grades and grade spans.</li> <li>• NOTE: Overall participation rate in the SBAC Math assessment for high school was lower than 95% for all students and for almost every subgroup, especially for 11<sup>th</sup> grade EL (69.6%) special education students (85.6%) and economically disadvantaged students (88.5%).</li> <li>• OPI did not provide documentation that the State has in place procedures to ensure that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rate on the SBAC assessment. OPI did not provide any participation data for the general Science assessment because this assessment was not submitted to this assessment peer review.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>ACT</b></p> <p>MT Evidence (ACT) 8 - Participation Data For ESSA Peer Review</p>	<p><b>ACT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For ACT (11<sup>th</sup> grade ELA and Math) OPI provided participation data that shows all students and subgroups by assessment type for all the required grades and grade spans.</li> <li>• NOTE: Overall participation rate in ACT assessment for high school was lower than 95% for all students and for almost every subgroup, especially for 11<sup>th</sup> grade ELs and economically disadvantaged students.</li> <li>• OPI did not provide documentation that the State has in place procedures to ensure that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rate on the ACT assessment.</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 Montana**

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
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OPI did not provide any participation data for the high school Science assessment because this assessment was not submitted to this assessment peer review.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation that OPI has in place procedures to ensure that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rate of their alternate assessment (MSAA), their general assessment (SBAC for grades 3-8 ELA and Math) and their high school assessment (ACT).</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 Montana

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

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results;</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills);</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.</li> </ul>	<p><b>MSAA for AA-AAAS (ELA and Math) and CRT Science ALT) for Science</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence provided by the MSAA consortium</li> </ul> <p><b>Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence provided by the SBAC consortium</li> </ul> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <p><b>Alignment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #[1]: How ACT Assessments Align with State College and Career Readiness Standards (pp. 2-3 discuss alignment to the Common Core State Standards). <b>Evidence 1, How ACT Assessments Align w State CCRS</b></li> <li>• Evidence #[2]: Alignment of Common Core and ACT’s College and Career Readiness System <b>Evidence 2, The Alignment of Common Core and ACT’s CCR System</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Percentage alignment across CCSS ELA and mathematics strands to ACT (p. 5).</li> <li>○ All standards in the CCSS highlighted to show areas of alignment with ACT (Appendix A).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Statement of purpose and intended interpretations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #[3]: ACT_Technical_Manual 2017 <b>Evidence 3, ACT_Technical_Manual 2017</b></li> <li>• Evidence #[4]: ACT Technical Manual for the statement of purpose <b>Evidence 4, ACT_Technical_Manual 2014</b> (see pp. 1-2), and information about the College Readiness Benchmarks (pp. 24- 25).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The standards which are the basis for the ACT test do not address the full range of the State’s academic content standards for either R/LA or Mathematics (Evidence 2, p.5., ACT Grades 11-12 column).</li> <li>• Statements of purpose and intended interpretations and uses of results of the ACT are in ACT Evidence 3, pages 1.1 through 1.6.</li> <li>• Test blueprints provided for ACT Reading (ACT Evidence 6), ACT English and Writing (ACT Evidence 7), and ACT Mathematics (ACT Evidence 8 and ACT Evidence 4) can support the development of assessments that are technically sound, but they do not measure the full range of the State’s grade-level (high school) academic content standards for either content area.</li> <li>• The evidence cited (ACT Evidence 3, ACT Evidence 4, and ACT Evidence 10) shows that ACT has processes to ensure that each assessment reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content and requires higher-order thinking skills. However, it does not show that those processes ensure that the ACT is tailored to the State’s academic content standards. Rather, those processes ensure that the assessments are tailored to ACT’s College Readiness Standards.</li> <li>• Montana does not administer computer-adaptive testing for high school.</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 Montana**

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 #[5]: Using Your ACT Results, which is written for students to understand score interpretations and reporting. <b>Evidence 5, Using-Your- ACT-Results</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Test blueprints:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #[6]: ACT Reading Test Blueprint <b>Evidence 6, ACT Reading Test Blueprint</b></li> <li>• Evidence #[7]: ACT English and Writing Test Blueprint <b>Evidence 7, ACT English and Writing Test Blueprints</b></li> <li>• Evidence #[8]: ACT Mathematics Test Blueprint <b>Evidence 8, Mathematics Test Blueprint</b></li> <li>• Evidence #[9]: ACT Science Test Blueprint <b>Evidence 9, Science Test Blueprint</b></li> <li>• Evidence #[3]: ACT_Technical_Manual 2017 <b>Evidence 3, ACT_Technical_Manual 2017</b></li> <li>• Evidence #[4]: ACT Technical Manual includes <b>Evidence 4, ACT_Technical_Manual 2014</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Content specifications (see pp. 9-11).</li> <li>o Scoring procedures (p. 16).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Processes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #[3]: ACT_Technical_Manual 2017 <b>Evidence 3, ACT_Technical_Manual 2017</b></li> <li>• Evidence #[4]: ACT Technical Manual <b>Evidence 4, ACT_Technical_Manual 2014</b> Test development process (pp. 7-15). College and Career Readiness Standards (pp. 17-37)</li> <li>• Evidence #[10]: National Curriculum Survey (2012). Figure 1 illustrates different processes and sources of evidence used to inform ACT test blueprints <b>Evidence 10, National Curriculum Survey</b> (p. 2, Figure 1).</li> </ul>	

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>• Provide evidence that their chosen assessment for high school covers the full range of the state’s academic content standards for high school.</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 Montana**

<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>
-------------------------	---	---

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>2.2 – Item Development</b></p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p><b>MSAA for AA-AAAS (ELA and Math) and CRT Science ALT) for Science</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence provided by the MSAA consortium</li> </ul> <p><b>Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence provided by the SBAC consortium</li> </ul> <p><b>ACT</b>  <b>General item development and selection procedures:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence #[3]: ACT_Technical_Manual 2017 <b>Evidence 3, ACT_Technical_Manual 2017</b></li> <li>Evidence #[4]: ACT Technical Manual <b>Evidence 4, ACT_Technical_Manual 2014</b></li> <li>Information about item development (pp. 7-16).</li> </ul> <p><b>Selection:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence #[26]: Forms Construction Guide <b>Evidence 26, Forms Construction Guide</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Statistical reviews (Sections 2.1, 2.2, p. 2-1).</li> <li>Item reviews (Sections 3.2, 3.2.4a, 3.2.4b, pp. 2-2 to 2-3).</li> <li>Form specifications (Section 4.0, p. 2-6).</li> <li>Item/Passage mix on a form (Sections 5.1, 5.1.1, 5.1.2, pp. 2-8 to 2-9).</li> <li>Reviews and review elements (sections 9.0, 9.1.1, 9.1.2, 9.1.3, 9.1.4, 9.3.2, 9.3.3, 9.4, 9.4.1, pp. 2- 15 to 2-17).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Subject-specific item development and selection procedures:</b>  <i>ACT Stimulus and Item Development Guides.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence #[11]: English Multiple-Choice</li> <li>Item Writer Guide <b>Evidence 11, English Multiple Choice Item Writer Guide</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The processes outlined and detailed in the evidence documents referenced in the ACT index demonstrate reasonable and technically sound procedures for item development, but not for assessing student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards. (The ACT assessment does not cover the full range of the academic content standards adopted by Montana. See Comments in Critical Element 2.1)</li> </ul>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana

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>○ General ACT processes for developing high-quality, passage- based ELA items (pp. 2-8).</li> <li>○ Overview of item task models (pp. 9-14).</li> <li>○ Examples of individual item specifications (see “ORG” item category: Organization, Unity, and Cohesion, pp. 32-46).</li> <li>● Evidence #[12]: Reading Item Writer Guide <b>Evidence 12, Reading Item Writer Guide</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ General ACT processes for developing high-quality, passage- based ELA items (pp. 4-10).</li> <li>○ Overview of item task models (pp. 11-14).</li> <li>○ Examples of individual item specifications (see “IDT” item category: Central Ideas, Themes, and Summaries, pp. 21-27).</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Evidence #[13]: ACT English Essay Writer Guide <b>Evidence 13, ACT English Essay Writers Guide</b></li> <li>● Evidence #[14]: ACT Reading Passage Selection Guide <b>Evidence 14, ACT Reading Passage Selection Guide</b></li> <li>● Evidence #[15]: ACT Mathematics Item Writer’s Guide <b>Evidence 15, ACT Mathematics Item Writer's Guide</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ General ACT processes for developing high-quality items (pp. 6-15).</li> <li>○ Calculator policy (p. 15).</li> <li>○ Overview of item classification categories (pp. 16-18).</li> <li>○ Examples of item sets (pp.19-23).</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Evidence #[16]: ACT Science Item Writer’s Guide <b>Evidence 16, ACT Science Item Writer's Guide</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ General ACT processes for developing high-quality items (pp. 5-7).</li> <li>○ Overview of item classification categories</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>(pp. 9-15).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Examples of sample passages and items (pp. 16-27).</li> <li>• Evidence #[17]: Your Guide to the ACT Assessment. Includes cognitive specifications for mathematics (Table 3, p. 7). <b>Evidence 17, Your Guide to the ACT Assessment</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Example of assignments provided to item writers re. item specifications:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #[18]: Item Writer Assignment. Example assignment given to mathematics item writer (see p. 1). <b>Evidence 18, ACT Mathematics Test item writer assignment</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Demographic characteristics of item writers:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #[19]: 2011 Annual Item Writer Report for Explore, Plan, and the ACT <b>Evidence 19, 2011 EPAS Item Writer information p 3-4</b></li> <li>• Target demographic distribution of item writers (see pp. 5-6).</li> <li>• Actual demographic distribution of item writers from 2004-2011 (see pp. 12-15).</li> </ul>	
<b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide evidence that their chosen assessment for high school covers the full range of the State’s academic content standards for high school.</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 Montana

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments;</li> <li>If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>	<p><b>MSSA for AA-AAAS (ELA and Math) and CRT Science ALT) for Science</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence provided by the MSSA consortium</li> <li>MT Evidence 9 - 2015 Assessment and Data Conference Agenda</li> <li><u>AA-AAAS</u>: MT Evidence 10 - NCSC Alternate Assessment Test Administration Training</li> </ul>	<p><b>MSSA for AA-AAAS (ELA and Math) and CRT Science ALT) for Science</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents provided do not show that the State has established and communicated to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence provided by the SBAC consortium</li> <li>MT Evidence 9 - 2015 Assessment and Data Conference Agenda</li> </ul>	<p><b>Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents provided do not show that the State has established and communicated to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>ACT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence 20, The ACT Test Administration Manual</li> </ul>	<p><b>ACT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence provided shows that this critical element has been met for the high school assessment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide evidence that the State has established and communicated to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodation, such as: 1) State-level Test coordinator manuals, 2) State-level Test administrator manuals, 3) State-level Test accommodation manuals, 4) State-level Instructions for the use of accommodations used by the State. (See Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, Critical Element 2.3, pp. 28-29)</li> <li>Provide evidence that the State has policies and procedures for technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana**

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p align="center"><b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p>MSAA for AA-AAAS (ELA and Math) and CRT Science ALT) for Science</p> <p>Montana did not submit evidence that OPI adequately monitors the administration of the MSAA to ensure standardized test administration procedures with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p>MSAA for AA-AAAS (ELA and Math) and CRT Science ALT) for Science</p> <p>No evidence was submitted for this critical element.</p> <p>Additional comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OPI states that Test Administrators complete training and pass a final quiz to be certified to administer the MSAA.</li> <li>• OPI's Special Education division states plans to use an observation and monitoring protocol that was developed by MSAA.</li> <li>• Please note that OPI did not submit their alternate Science assessment (CRT Science ALT) to this assessment peer review.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC)</b></p> <p><b>Evidence submitted by SBAC (separately) and</b></p> <p>MT Evidence (SBAC) 11 - 2016-17 Montana-Smarter-Test-Administration-Manual FINAL</p> <p>MT Evidence (SBAC) 12 - 2016-17 Montana SBAC Tech Report</p>	<p><b>Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although the <i>Montana SBAC Test Administration Manual</i> addresses certain aspects of test administration that involve monitoring, it does not seem to provide as unclear if OPI offers a comprehensive, unified description of OPI's approach to monitoring test administration (e.g., what aspects of monitoring are conducted by SEA staff v. SBAC consortia staff, or by LEAs (with support from OPI), or another approach). The documentation provided by OPI does not address what are OPI's procedures for monitoring test administration across the State, including, for example, strategies for selection of districts and schools for monitoring, cycle for reaching a variety of schools and LEAs across Montana, schedule for monitoring, OPI monitors' roles, and other such</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 Montana**

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
	<p><b>ACT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #[20]: ACT Test</li> <li>• Administration Manual: State and District Testing Evidence 20, <i>The ACT Test Administration Manual</i></li> <li>• Information on test room starting time, general announcement to examinees, distribution of test materials, sequence of tests, timing of tests, checking calculators during Test 2, calculators, checking for prohibited behavior, breaks, examinees who leave a test and return, guessing (pp. 28-32).</li> <li>• Verbal instructions for standard time testing (pp. 39-54).</li> </ul> <p>Authorized Observers (pg. 3) – district is provided opportunity for site visits on the day of testing.</p>	<p>details.</p> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although the <i>ACT Administration Manual</i> addresses certain aspects of test administration that involve test administration monitoring by the school or LEA at the test site (see bullet points on second column), it is unclear if there is a comprehensive, unified process of how the <u>State</u> monitors the ACT test administration (e.g., what aspects of monitoring are conducted by SEA staff, or another approach).</li> <li>• The documentation provided by OPI does not provide information on what are OPI’s procedures for monitoring the ACT test administration across the State, including, for example, strategies for selection of districts and schools for monitoring, cycle for reaching a variety of schools and LEAs across Montana, schedule for monitoring, OPI monitors’ roles, and other such details.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation (such as: test monitoring protocols, test monitoring guides, test monitoring training sessions, lists of test monitoring opportunities throughout the State and attendees, test monitoring logs, etc.) that OPI monitors the administration of the SBAC, the MSAA and the ACT assessments in all required grades and grade spans to ensure that test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across Montana school districts and schools.</li> <li>• Documentation that OPI has a comprehensive, unified approach to the State’s responsibility of monitoring the general test administration (3-8 ELA Reading and Math; SBAC and high school ACT, 11<sup>th</sup> grade) and the alternate test administration to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. Examples of documentation: Description of the strategies OPI will utilize for the selection of districts and schools for monitoring; monitoring cycle schedules designed to reach a variety of schools and LEAs across Montana; description of OPI monitors’ roles, etc.</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 Montana

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 Montana**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>2.5 – Test Security</b></p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> <li>Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> </ul>	<p><b>MSAA for AA-AAAS (ELA and Math) and CRT Science ALT) for Science</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence provided by the MSAA consortium</li> <li>MT Evidence 11 - 2014.2015 NCSC Alternate Confidential TIR Form</li> <li>MT Evidence 12 - 2014.2015 NCSC Test Security Agreement</li> <li>MT Evidence 13 - 2014.2015.NCSC Test Security Agreement</li> <li>MT Evidence 14 - 2016.MSAA Test Security Agreement</li> <li>MT Evidence 15 - 2016.MSAATest Security Agreement</li> <li>MT Evidence 16 - MontCASTestIrregularityApplication</li> </ul>	<p><b>MSAA for AA-AAAS (ELA and Math) and CRT Science ALT) for Science</b></p> <p><b>Prevention</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Peers could not find evidence that there were clear consequences for confirmed violations of test security, i.e. State law, State regulations or State Board-approved policies.</li> </ul> <p><b>Detection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Peers could not find policies and procedures for the detection of test irregularities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Remediation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Peers could not find policies or procedures for remediation following test security incidents.</li> </ul> <p><b>Investigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Peers could not find policies or procedures for investigation for alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence provided by the SBAC consortium</li> <li>MT Evidence (SBAC) 11 - 2016-17_Montana-Smarter-Test-Administration-Manual_FINAL, pp. 16-18.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC)</b></p> <p><b>Prevention</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Peers could not find evidence that there were clear consequences for confirmed violations of test security, i.e. State law, State regulations or State Board-approved policies.</li> </ul> <p><b>Detection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Peers could not find policies and procedures for the detection of test irregularities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Remediation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence was located in MT Evidence (SBAC) 11, pp. 16-17.</li> </ul> <p><b>Investigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Peers could not find policies or procedures for investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana**

<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>
	<b>ACT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence 20, The ACT Test Administration Manual</li> <li>• Evidence 21, Procedures for Investigating Testing Irregularities</li> </ul>	<b>ACT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence for prevention, detection, remediation and investigation have been provided by ACT.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide evidence that there were clear consequences for confirmed violations of test security, i.e. State law, State regulations or State Board-approved (for the general assessments).</li> <li>• Provide policies and procedures for the detection of test irregularities (for the 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 Montana**

<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>
-------------------------	---	---

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</b></p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results;</li> <li>To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> <li>To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.</li> </ul>	<p><b>MSAA for AA-AAAS (ELA and Math) and CRT Science ALT) for Science</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MT Evidence 21 - 7.2.01.C Resource C – OPI Data Tiers for Release of Data</li> <li>MT Evidence 22 - 7.2.01.D Resource D – OPI Cell Suppression Flow Chart</li> <li>MT Evidence 23 - OPI. 7.2.01 Student Records Confidentiality Policies</li> </ul>	<p><b>MSAA for AA-AAAS (ELA and Math) and CRT Science ALT) for Science</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Peers did not see evidence of policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials for the alternate assessments.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence provided by the SBAC consortium</li> <li>MT Evidence (SBAC) 20 - 7.2.01.C Resource C – OPI Data Tiers for Release of Data</li> <li>MT Evidence (SBAC) 21 - 7.2.01.D Resource D – OPI Cell Suppression Flow Chart</li> <li>MT Evidence (SBAC) 22 - OPI. 7.2.01 Student Records Confidentiality Policies</li> </ul>	<p><b>Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Peers did not see evidence of policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials for the general assessments.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>ACT Testing Materials:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence #[20]: ACT Test Administration Manual: State and District Testing <b>Evidence 20, The ACT Test Administration Manual</b> o Information about securing test</li> <li>materials before, during, and after testing and secure distribution of test materials (pp. 13-15).</li> </ul> <p><b>Test-related data and personally identifiable information</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence #[23]: ACT Privacy Policy <b>Evidence 23, ACT Privacy Policy</b></li> <li>Evidence #[24]: ACT Information Security Program Summary. <b>Evidence 24, Information Security Summary for external use - legal reviewed</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>ACT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence provided shows that this critical element has been met for the high school assessment.</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 Montana**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide evidence that OPI has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials for both the alternate and the 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 Montana

**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 Montana**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> <li>• If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence provided by SBAC and MSAА Consortia.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACT Validity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #[3]: ACT_Technical_Manual 2017 <b>Evidence 3, ACT_Technical_Manual 2017</b></li> <li>• Evidence #[4]: ACT Technical Manual. <b>Evidence 4, ACT_Technical_Manual 2014</b></li> </ul> <p>The technical manual for the ACT assessment includes a chapter on Validity Evidence, which provides descriptions of studies providing validity evidence for the use and interpretation of ACT Assessment test scores (Chapter 5, pp. 64-137).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #[30]: ACT Writing Test Technical Report. <b>Evidence 30, ACT Writing Test Technical Report</b></li> <li>• Includes results of various studies that demonstrate overall validity of the optional Direct Writing (ACT-W) Test.</li> <li>• Relationship between ACT-W scores and writing-intensive college courses (pp. 13-17).</li> <li>• Evidence #[34]: Content Review Panel Instructions (Reading) <b>Evidence 34, Reading content review panel instructions 2016</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Alignment:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #[2]: Alignment of Common Core and ACT’s College and Career Readiness System <b>Evidence 2, The Alignment of Common Core and ACT's CCR System</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Percentage alignment across CCSS ELA and mathematics strands to ACT (p. 5).</li> <li>○ All standards in the CCSS highlighted to show areas of alignment with ACT</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence provided by SBAC and MSAА Consortia.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although OPI provided evidence of the overall validity and validity based on content of the ACT assessment, it did not satisfy the critical element requirement because there is no evidence that the ACT measures the full range of the Montana 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 Montana**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	(Appendix A).	
<b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide evidence that OPI's chosen assessment for high school covers the full range of the state's academic content standards for high school.</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 Montana**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence provided by SBAC and MSAA Consortia.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACT Expert Judgment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #[3]: ACT_Technical_Manual 2017 <b>Evidence 3, ACT_Technical_Manual 2017</b></li> <li>• Evidence #[4]: ACT Technical Manual. <b>Evidence 4, ACT_Technical_Manual</b></li> <li>• 2014o Information about item reviews (pp. 8 and 13-15).</li> <li>• Evidence #[26]: Forms Construction Guide <b>Evidence 26, Forms Construction Guide</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Guidelines and qualifications for review panels (pp. 2.15-2.19 and Appendix A).</li> <li>○ Review of field test items (Section 3.2, pp. 2.2-2.5).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence provided by SBAC and MSAA Consortia.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although OPI provided evidence of validity based on cognitive processes of the ACT assessment, it did not satisfy the critical element requirement because there is no evidence that the ACT measures the full range of the Montana academic content standards.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide evidence that OPI’s chosen assessment for high school covers the full range of the state’s academic content standards for high school.</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 Montana**

<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>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence provided by SBAC and MSAA Consortia.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACT</b>  <b>Subscore structures:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence #[27]: “Correlations among subscores on the ACT” provides evidence of the internal structure among ACT subscores. <b>Evidence 27, Correlations among subscores on the ACT</b></li> <li>Evidence #[28]: “Differential Item Functioning” includes operational item DIF analyses for the ACT comparing African American/White and Female/Male. Table 1 shows that a few items show moderate DIF, but none of the subject tests contained items with large DIF. <b>Evidence 28, Differential Item Functioning</b></li> </ul> <p><b>English and Writing Subscores:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence #[30]: ACT Writing Test Technical Report (2009). <b>Evidence 30, ACT Writing Test Technical Report</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes results of analyses that demonstrate overall validity of the optional Direct Writing (ACT-W) Test.</li> <li>Relationship between ACT-W scores and writing-intensive college courses (Tables 9-12, pp. 13-17).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence provided by SBAC and MSAA Consortia.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although OPI provided evidence of the validity based on internal structure for the ACT assessment, it did not satisfy the critical element requirement because it is not consistent with the sub-domain structures of Montana’s academic content standards.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide evidence that OPI’s chosen assessment for high school covers the full range of the state’s academic content standards for high school.</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 Montana**

<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>
-------------------------	---	---

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence provided by SBAC and MSAA Consortia.</li> </ul> <p><b>High School Coursework:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #[2]: ACT Technical Manual (pp. 67-69). <b>Evidence 2, The Alignment of Common Core and ACT’s CCR System</b></li> <li>• Evidence #[29]: McNeish, D. M., Radunzel, J., &amp; Sanchez, E. (2015). <b>Evidence 29, A multidimensional perspective of college readiness</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A multidimensional perspective of college readiness: Relating student and school characteristics to performance on the ACT. ACT Research Report 2015-6 (Iowa City, IA: ACT).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Evidence #[31]: Allen, J. (2015). Influence of achievement in core high school courses on ACT scores. ACT Technical Brief (Iowa City, IA: ACT). <b>Evidence 31, Influence of Achievement in Core High School Courses...</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Needing Academic Assistance:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #[3]: ACT_Technical_Manual 2017 <b>Evidence 3, ACT_Technical_Manual 2017</b></li> <li>• Evidence #[4]: ACT Technical Manual (pp. 67-69). <b>Evidence 4, ACT_Technical_Manual 2014</b></li> </ul> <p><b>College Coursework:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #[3]: ACT_Technical_Manual 2017 <b>Evidence 3, ACT_Technical_Manual 2017</b></li> <li>• Evidence #[4]: ACT Technical Manual (pp. 97-100); <b>Evidence 4, ACT_Technical_Manual 2014</b></li> <li>• Evidence #[32]: Mattern, K., Radunzel, J., &amp; Westrick, P. (2015). Development of STEM readiness benchmarks to assist educational and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence provided by SBAC and MSAA Consortia.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence submitted by OPI for ACT shows that ACT scores are related as expected with other variables.</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 Montana**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>career decision making. ACT Research Report 2015-3 (Iowa City, IA: ACT). <b>Evidence 32, Development of STEM Readiness Benchmarks.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #[33]: Allen, J. (2013). Updating the ACT College Readiness Benchmarks. ACT Research Report 2013-6 (Iowa City, IA: ACT). <b>Evidence 33, Updating the ACT College Readiness Benchmarks</b></li> </ul> <p><b>College Performance:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #[36]: Mattern, K., &amp; Radunzel, J. (2015). Who goes to graduate school? Tracking 2003 ACT- tested high school graduates for more than a decade. ACT Research Report 2015-2 (Iowa City, IA: ACT). <b>Evidence 36, Who Goes to Graduate School</b></li> <li>• Evidence #[37]: Sanchez, E. (2013). Differential effects of using ACT college readiness assessment scores and high school GPA to predict first-year college GPA among racial/ethnic, gender, and income groups. ACT Research Report 2013-4 (Iowa City, IA, ACT). <b>Evidence 37, Differential Effects of Using ACT College Readiness Assessment Scores and HS GPA...</b></li> <li>• Evidence #[39]: Westrick, P. A., Le, H., Robbins, S. B., Radunzel, J. M. R., &amp; Schmidt, F. L. (2015). College Performance and Retention: A Meta- Analysis of the Predictive Validities of ACT® Scores, High School Grades, and SES. Educational Assessment, 20, 23-45. <b>Evidence 39, College Performance and Retention</b></li> </ul> <p><b>External Measures:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #[40]: Dickinson, E. R. &amp; Adelson, J. L. (2016). Choosing among multiple achievement measures: Applying multitrait-</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 Montana**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>multimethod confirmatory factor analysis to state assessment, ACT, and student GPA data, Journal of Advanced Academics, 27(1), 4-22.</p> <p><b>Evidence 40, Choosing Among Multiple Achievement Measures</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #[41]: Mattern, K.D. &amp; Lacina, C. (2015). Different assessments, different results: A cautionary note when interpreting state test results. (Iowa City, IA: ACT). Evidence 41, <b>Different Assessments, Different Results</b></li> <li>• Evidence #[42]: Dorans, N.J., Sconing, J., Crouse, J. (2010). Selection decisions for the ACT and SAT scores used to produce the ACT-SAT Concordances. Draft of paper presented at National Council on Measurement in Education. <b>Evidence 42, Selection Decisions for the ACT and SAT Scores Used...</b></li> <li>• Evidence #[43]: ACT (2008). The relative predictive validity of ACT scores and high school grades in making college admissions decisions. (Iowa City, IA: ACT) (see Appendix for prediction weights). <b>Evidence 43, The Relative Predictive Validity of ACT Scores and HS Grades in Making College Decisions</b></li> </ul>	
<b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<u> X </u> No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4.1 – Reliability</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence provided by SBAC and MSAA Consortia.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACT</b>  <b>Overall reliability, including standard error of measurement:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #[3]: ACT_Technical_Manual 2017 <b>Evidence 3, ACT_Technical_Manual 2017</b></li> <li>• Evidence #[4]: ACT Technical Manual (2014). <b>Evidence 4, ACT_Technical_Manual 2014</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The technical manual for the ACT assessment includes a chapter on reliability evidence, (Chapter 4, pp. 51-64). Reliability evidence includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reliability and measurement precision information (pp. 51-62).</li> <li>• Internal consistency reliabilities (p. 61, Table 4.13).</li> <li>• Standard errors of measurement and the conditional standard errors of measurement (pp. 51-61).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Inter-rater. reliability:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #[30]: ACT Writing Test Technical Report <b>Evidence 30, ACT Writing Test Technical Report</b></li> <li>• Inter-rater reliability and measurement precision information (pp. 1-2).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence provided by SBAC and MSAA Consortia.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although OPI provided evidence for the reliability of the ACT assessment, the reliability estimates were not based on Montana’s student population.</li> <li>• OPI did not provide evidence for consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on assessment results.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 4.1 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>• Provide evidence for the reliability of OPI’s chosen high school assessment based on Montana’s student population.</li> <li>• Provide evidence for consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on assessment results.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana**

<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>
-------------------------	---	---

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</b></p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence provided by SBAC and MSAA Consortia.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACT</b>  <b>Code of Fair Testing Practices:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #[3]: ACT_Technical_Manual 2017  Evidence 3, ACT_Technical_Manual 2017</li> <li>• Evidence #[4]: ACT Technical Manual (p. 3).  Evidence 4, ACT_Technical_Manual 2014</li> </ul> <p><b>Item writers:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #[11]: English Multiple- Choice Item Writer Guide (p. 6). Evidence 11, English Multiple Choice Item Writer Guide</li> <li>• Evidence #[12]: Reading Item Writer Guide (p. 7).  Evidence 12, Reading Item Writer Guide</li> <li>• Evidence #[13]: ACT English Essay Writer Guide (p. 6-8). Evidence 13, ACT English Essay Writers Guide</li> <li>• Evidence #[14]: ACT Reading Passage Selection Guide (p. 6). Evidence 14, ACT Reading Passage Selection Guide</li> <li>• Evidence #[18]: ACT Mathematics Item Writer’s Guide (pp. 6-7). Evidence 18, ACT Mathematics Test item writer assignment</li> <li>• Evidence #[16]: ACT Science Item Writer’s Guide (p. 5-6). Evidence 16, ACT Science Item Writer's Guide</li> </ul> <p><b>Fairness reviews:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #[26]: Forms Construction Guide. Includes guidelines and qualifications for review panels (pp. 2- 15-2-19 and Appendix A).  Evidence 26, Forms Construction Guide</li> <li>• Evidence #[3]: ACT_Technical_Manual 2017  Evidence 3, ACT_Technical_Manual 2017</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence provided by SBAC and MSAA Consortia.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although OPI provided evidence from ACT for national Differential Item Functioning (DIF) analyses, they did not provide similar evidence for all Montana student groups.</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 Montana**

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 #[4]: ACT Technical Manual <b>Evidence 4, ACT_Technical_Manual</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 2014o Content and fairness review of test forms (p. 14).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Evidence #[35]: Consultants Guide for the Fairness Review of the ACT Assessment <b>Evidence 35, Consultants Fairness Review Guide</b></li> </ul> <p><b>DIF analyses:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #[28]: “Differential Item Functioning” includes operational item DIF analyses for the ACT comparing African American/White and Female/Male. <b>Evidence 28, Differential Item Functioning</b></li> </ul>	
<b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide evidence for fairness and accessibility (Example: DIF Analyses) for all Montana student groups</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 Montana**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b></p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence provided by SBAC and MSAA Consortia.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence #[3]: ACT_Technical_Manual 2017 Evidence 3, ACT_Technical_Manual 2017</li> <li>Evidence #[4]: ACT Technical Manual: The technical manual includes evidence of precision across the score scale. Evidence 4, ACT_Technical_Manual 2014</li> <li>Examples of item difficulty distribution (p. 14, Table 2.5).</li> <li>Conditional standard error of measurement plots and values (pp. 54-55).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence provided by SBAC and MSAA Consortia.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OPI did not provide evidence of adequately precise estimates across the full performance continuum for Montana’s students.</li> </ul>
<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>Provide evidence that estimates of student performance are adequately precise across the full performance continuum for OPI’s chosen high school assessment.</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 Montana**

<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>
-------------------------	---	---

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p><b>MSAA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence provided by MSAA</li> <li>• MT Evidence 24 - Section 4.4 MSAA Subcommittees</li> </ul>	<p><b>MSAA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence provided by MSAA</li> <li>• Evidence submitted by OPI does not provide scoring procedures and protocols.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>SBAC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence provided by SBAC</li> <li>• MT Evidence (SBAC) 12. pp. 9-18</li> </ul>	<p><b>SBAC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence provided by SBAC</li> </ul>
	<p><b>ACT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #[3]: ACT_Technical_Manual 2017 <b>Evidence 3, ACT_Technical_Manual 2017</b></li> <li>• Evidence #[4]: ACT Technical Manual: The technical manual includes a chapter on the technical characteristics of the ACT tests (Chapter 4, pp. 38-63) <b>Evidence 4, ACT_Technical_Manual 2014</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Description of the scaling construction and procedures (pp. 38-50).</li> <li>○ Measurement error and precision (pp. 51-62).</li> <li>○ ACT scoring procedures for each subject test, subscale scores, and the Composite score (p. 16).</li> <li>○ Scaling of the combined English/Writing score (p. 45).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Evidence #[30] ACT Writing Test Technical Report (2009): The Writing test technical report includes information on the inter-rater reliability, the standard error of measurement, and other reliability analyses (pp. 12-13) <b>Evidence 30, ACT Writing Test Technical Report</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>ACT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OPI provided evidence of standardized scoring procedures and protocols, but not in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana**

<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><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide evidence that there are standardized scoring procedures and protocols for their chosen alternate assessment.</li> <li>• Provide evidence of scoring procedures and protocols that are expressed in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards for OPI’s chosen high school assessment.</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 Montana**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</b></p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p><b>MSAA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence provided by MSAA</li> </ul>	<p><b>MSAA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence provided by MSAA</li> </ul>
	<p><b>SBAC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence provided by SBAC</li> </ul>	<p><b>SBAC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence provided by SBAC</li> </ul>
	<p><b>ACT</b></p> <p><b>Construction of multiple forms:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence #[26]: Forms Construction Guide <b>Evidence 26, Forms Construction Guide</b></li> <li>Guidelines and qualifications for review panels (pp. 2.15-2.19 and Appendix A).</li> <li>Review of field test items (Section 3.2, pp. 2.2-2.5).</li> <li>Selection of items for forms (Section 4, p. 2.6-2.7).</li> <li>Guidance about item quality (Section 5, pp. 2.7-2.12).</li> <li>Subject-specific specifications (e.g., for English, Appendix B, section 5-7).</li> </ul> <p><b>Psychometric analyses:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence #[3]: ACT_Technical_Manual 2017 <b>Evidence 3, ACT_Technical_Manual 2017</b></li> <li>Evidence #[4]: ACT Technical Manual: The ACT technical manual includes the equating process (pp. 50-51). <b>Evidence 4, ACT_Technical_Manual 2014</b></li> <li>Evidence #[45] Equating Stability: Example of the type of research ACT conducts to evaluate equating function accuracy. <b>Evidence 45, Equating stability</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>ACT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OPI provided evidence from ACT for comparability of alternate forms of the assessments. However, the evidence did not show that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If OPI administers multiple forms for their chosen high school assessment, then OPI must provide evidence of comparability, ensuring that all forms adequately represent 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 Montana**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b></p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence provided by MSAA &amp; SBAC</li> </ul> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <p><b>Comparability:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence #[46]: ACT Working Paper 2015-05 “Spring 2014 ACT Test Mode Comparability Study: <b>Evidence 46, ACT Test Mode Comparability Study</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Item-level, IRT parameter estimate comparisons between the online and paper versions (pp. 24-26).</li> <li>DIF analyses between online and paper versions (pp. 30-31).</li> <li>Table 13 presents scale score moments, standard error of measurement, and reliability of online and paper forms after equating to provide evidence that the equated forms are comparable across modes (p. 32, Table 13).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence provided by MSAA &amp; SBAC</li> </ul> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OPI did not provide evidence of comparability across multiple versions of the assessment for Montana students.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 4.6 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>If OPI administers multiple versions of its chosen high school assessment, then OPI must provide evidence of comparability of the interpretation of the assessment results.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b></p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p><b>MSAA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence provided by MSAA</li> <li>MT Evidence (SBAC) 2 - MT CS Revision Handbook</li> </ul>	<p><b>MSAA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OPI provided evidence that there is a system for monitoring and improving the quality of its assessment system, including their general and alternate assessments.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>SBAC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence provided by SBAC</li> <li>MT Evidence (SBAC) 2 - MT CS Revision Handbook</li> </ul>	<p><b>SBAC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OPI provided evidence that there is a system for monitoring and improving the quality of its assessment system, including their general and alternate assessments.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>ACT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence provided by ACT</li> <li>MT Evidence (SBAC) 2 - MT CS Revision Handbook</li> </ul>	<p><b>ACT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OPI provided evidence that there is a system for monitoring and improving the quality of its assessment system, including their general and alternate assessments.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana**

<p><b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards;</li> <li>• States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs;</li> <li>• Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment;</li> <li>• Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities;</li> <li>• Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;</li> <li>• Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the</li> </ul>	<p><b>MSAA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence provided by MSAA</li> <li>• MT Evidence 25 - 16FebOPIQuickFactsAltAssessments</li> <li>• MT Evidence 26 - 2017 MSAA Test Administration Manual (TAM) 3.3.17</li> <li>• MT Evidence 27 - Special Education in Montana</li> <li>• MT Evidence 28 - 17AprilJUMP</li> <li>• MT Evidence 29 - Section 5.1.2 NCSC Curriculum and Instruction resource websites</li> <li>• MT Evidence 30 - 17MissoulaConfProgram</li> <li>• MT Evidence 31 - NCSC AA-AAS Procedures for Students Who Are Blind Deaf DeafBlind 2015</li> <li>• MT Evidence 7 - Guidelines_IncludingAllStudents</li> <li>• MT Evidence 32 – MSAAQuickFacts</li> <li>• MT Evidence 33 - NCSC IEP Team Guidance for Alternate Assessment Participation Decisions 5-12-14</li> <li>• MT Evidence 34 - NCSCBrief5</li> </ul>	<p><b>MSAA, SBAC &amp; ACT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence provided by MSAA, SBAC, &amp; ACT</li> <li>• OPI did not provide clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards.</li> <li>• Although OPI states that decisions whether to test the students on the alternate assessment must be documented in the IEP (Guidelines for Including All Students in MontCAS Assessments), OPI did not provide evidence of how these decisions must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs.</li> <li>• OPI did not 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.</li> <li>• Peers found evidence on accessibility tools.</li> <li>• OPI did not provide evidence of guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities.</li> <li>• OPI did not include evidence of instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA.</li> <li>• OPI did not provide documentation that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on</li> </ul>
	<p><b>SBAC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence provided by SBAC</li> <li>• MT Evidence (SBAC) 7 - Guidelines_IncludingAllStudents</li> <li>• MT Evidence (SBAC) 11 - 2016-17_Montana-Smarter-Test-Administration-Manual_FINAL</li> <li>• MT Evidence (SBAC) 23 - 16FebOPIQuickFactsAltAssessments</li> <li>• MT Evidence (SBAC) 24 - 16Mar2SmarterNextSteps</li> <li>• MT Evidence (SBAC) 25 - 17AprilJUMP</li> <li>• MT Evidence (SBAC) 26 - 17MissoulaConfProgram</li> <li>• MT Evidence (SBAC) 27 - 17SBRolesPermissionsAccomm</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 Montana

<p>disability categories listed in the IDEA;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments);</li> <li>The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MT Evidence (SBAC) 28 - 17SmarterAccommodations</li> <li>MT Evidence (SBAC) 29 - 17UsabilityAccessAccomGuidelines</li> <li>MT Evidence (SBAC) 30 - Copy of ISAAP_Tool</li> <li>MT Evidence (SBAC) 31 - ISAAP_Tool_Instructions</li> <li>MT Evidence (SBAC) 32 - SBAC Video on Accommodations and Settings in TIDE</li> <li>MT Evidence (SBAC) 33 - Section 5.1.1 ISAAP Training Link</li> <li>MT Evidence (SBAC) 34 - Special Education in Montana</li> </ul>	<p>alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OPI did not provide evidence that procedures are in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.</li> <li><b>NOTE ABOUT ACT:</b> <u>MT Evidence (ACT) 23 - ACT Videos on Accommodations</u> explicitly states that ACT follows ADA in its accommodations and that some IDEA accommodations may not be applicable to its assessments.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>ACT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MT Evidence (ACT) 7 - Guidelines_IncludingAllStudents</li> <li>MT Evidence (ACT) 18 - 16ACTNonCollegeReportableAcomGuidance</li> <li>MT Evidence (ACT) 19 - 16FebOPIQuickFactsAltAssessments</li> <li>MT Evidence (ACT) 20 - 17AprilJUMP</li> <li>MT Evidence (ACT) 21 - 17MissoulaConfProgram</li> <li>MT Evidence (ACT) 22 - AccomsQA-MT ACT</li> <li>MT Evidence (ACT) 23 - ACT Videos on Accommodations</li> <li>MT Evidence (ACT) 24 – ACTSandDStdTimeManualPaper</li> <li><b>ACT Accommodations:</b></li> <li><b>• Evidence #[47] “11th Grade College Entrance Exam Accommodations Table.” Evidence 47, College Entrance Exam RFP Accommodations Table</b></li> <li><b>• Evidence #[48] “Test Accessibility and Accommodations User Guide” provides</b></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 Montana**

	<p>information about the process for requesting accommodations. Evidence 48, Test Accessibility and Accommodations User Guide</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #[49] “Frequently Asked Questions ACT State and District Testing” Evidence 49, FAQs_State_District_Testing_the_ACT o Practice materials, such as DVDs, are</li> <li>• available (p. 14).</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

**Section 5.1 Summary Statement**

<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale for general, alternate, and high school assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standard.</li> <li>• Provide evidence of how accommodation decisions regarding the testing of students with alternate assessments must be made by an IEP team, and based on each student’s individual needs.</li> <li>• Provide State guidelines for determining whether to assess a student without accommodation(s) on the general assessment, the general assessment with accommodation(s) or an alternate assessment.</li> <li>• Provide evidence of State guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities.</li> <li>• Provide evidence of instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA.</li> <li>• Provide documentation that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their child’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards, and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments.</li> <li>• Provide evidence that procedures are in place to ensure that OPI’s implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.</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 Montana

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 Montana**

<p><b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> <li>• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;</li> <li>• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>	<p><b>MSAA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence provided by MSAA</li> <li>• MT Evidence 35 - 13_MT_ELL_Guidance</li> </ul>	<p><b>MSAA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although OPI provided a list of possible accommodations, it did not provide procedures for determining which accommodations to use with English learners according to their needs.</li> <li>• Peers found no evidence on available accessibility tools for EL students.</li> <li>• OPI did not provide guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>SBAC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MT Evidence (SBAC) 11 - 2016-17_Montana-Smarter-Test-Administration-Manual_FINAL</li> <li>• MT Evidence (SBAC) 29 - 17UsabilityAccessAccomGuidelines</li> <li>• MT Evidence (SBAC) 35 - 13_MT_ELL_Guidance</li> </ul>	<p><b>SBAC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although OPI provided a list of possible accommodations, it did not provide procedures for determining which accommodations to use with English learners according to their needs.</li> <li>• Peers found evidence on accessibility tools.</li> <li>• OPI did not provide guidance regarding the selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>ACT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MT Evidence (ACT) 18 - 16ACTNonCollegeReportableAcomGuidance</li> <li>• MT Evidence (ACT) 26 - 13_MT_ELL_Guidance</li> </ul> <p><b>ACT Accommodations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #[3]: ACT_Technical_Manual 2017 Evidence 3, ACT_Technical_Manual 2017</li> <li>• Evidence #[4]: ACT Technical Manual Evidence 4, ACT_Technical_Manual 2014 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Content and fairness review of test forms (p. 14).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Evidence #[48] “11th Grade College Entrance Exam Accommodations Table.” Evidence 48, Test Accessibility and Accommodations User Guide</li> <li>• Evidence #[50] “Accommodations on the ACT Test: ACT State and District Testing” Evidence</li> </ul>	<p><b>ACT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although OPI provided a list of possible accommodations, it did not provide procedures for determining which accommodations to use with English learners according to their needs.</li> <li>• Peers found no evidence of available accessibility tools for EL students.</li> <li>• OPI did not provide guidance regarding the selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana

	<p>50, Accommodations on the ACT Test</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Information about the types accommodations (ACT-approved accommodations vs. non-college reportable accommodations) (p. 1).</li><li>○ Request process (p. 2)</li></ul>	
--	---	--

### **Section 5.2 Summary Statement**

X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale for the general, the alternate and the high school assessments:

- Provide procedures for determining which accommodations to use with English learners according to their needs.
- Provide evidence of accessibility tools for all EL students taking the high school assessment, and for all EL students taking the alternate assessment.
- Provide State guidance for the 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 Montana**

<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>
-------------------------	---	---

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>5.3 – Accommodations</b></p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities (SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504;</li> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);</li> <li>Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> <li>Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>	<p>MSAA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence provided by MSAA</li> <li><b>MT Evidence (ACT) 18 - 16ACTNonCollegeReportableAcomGuidance</b></li> <li><b>MT Evidence (ACT) 24 – ACTSandDStdTimeManualPaper</b></li> <li><b>MT Evidence (ACT) 29 - AccommodationsGuidance10_17 updated</b></li> <li><b>MT Evidence (ACT) 30 - ACT.16TestAccessibilityAccommUserGuide</b></li> <li><b>MT Evidence (ACT) 31 - Text Complexity Rating Tool</b></li> </ul> <hr/> <p>SBAC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence provided by SBAC</li> <li><b>MT Evidence (SBAC) 11 - 2016-17_Montana-Smarter-Test-Administration-Manual_FINAL</b></li> <li><b>MT Evidence (SBAC) 12 - 2016-17 Mont SBAC Tech Report</b></li> <li><b>MT Evidence (SBAC) 36 - Accommodations for ELLs SBAC</b></li> <li><b>MT Evidence (SBAC) 37 - AccommodationsGuidance10_17 updated</b></li> <li><b>MT Evidence (SBAC) 38 - literature-review-of-testing-accommodations-and-accessibility-tools-for-students-with-disabilities</b></li> <li><b>MT Evidence (SBAC) 39 - SBAC Summary of Literature on ELLs</b></li> <li><b>MT Evidence (SBAC) 40 - Smarter</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>MSAA &amp; SBAC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence provided by MSAA &amp; SBAC</li> <li>Peers found evidence of appropriate accommodations under IDEA and Section 504.</li> <li>Peers found evidence of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> <li>Peers found evidence that accommodations provided are appropriate and validated.</li> <li>Peers did not find evidence for a process to review requests for accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</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 Montana**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>Resource.LiteratureReview.AccommodationsforELLs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>MT Evidence (SBAC) 41 - Smarter.item-accessibility-and-language-variation-conceptual-framework</b></li> <li>• <b>MT Evidence (SBAC) 42 - Smarter.QuickFactsTextSpeechReadAloudDecision</b></li> <li>• <b>MT Evidence (SBAC) 43 - Text Complexity Rating Tool</b></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 Montana

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>ACT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MT Evidence (ACT) 18 - 16ACTNonCollegeReportableAcomGuidance</li> <li>• MT Evidence (ACT) 24 – ACTSandDStdTimeManualPaper</li> <li>• MT Evidence (ACT) 29 - AccommodationsGuidance10_17 updated</li> <li>• MT Evidence (ACT) 30 - ACT.16TestAccessibilityAccommUserGuide</li> <li>• MT Evidence (ACT) 31 - Text Complexity Rating Tool</li> </ul> <p>Accommodations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #[51] “Policy for Documentation: The ACT”: Identifies the documentation requirements to receive accommodations for various types of disabilities. Evidence 51, ACT-Policy-for-Documentation</li> <li>• Evidence #[50] “Accommodations on the ACT Test: ACT State and District Testing” Evidence 50, Accommodations on the ACT Test <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provides a comparison of the types of accommodations (ACT-approved accommodations, non-college reportable accommodations, and local test arrangements) (p. 1).</li> <li>○ Request process (p. 2).</li> <li>○ Accommodation list (p. 5).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Evidence #[3] “ACT_Technical_Manual 2017”</li> </ul>	<p>ACT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peers did not find evidence of accommodations under IDEA and Section 504. <b>NOTE ABOUT ACT:</b> <u>MT Evidence (ACT) 23 - ACT Videos on Accommodations</u> explicitly states that ACT follows ADA in its accommodations and that some IDEA accommodations may not be applicable to its assessments.</li> <li>• Peers found evidence that appropriate accommodations are available for EL students.</li> <li>• Peers found evidence that accommodations provided are appropriate and validated.</li> <li>• Peers did not find evidence that there is a process to review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</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 Montana**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>provides an overview of accessibility (p.61-74). <b>Evidence 3, ACT_Technical_Manual 2017</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence #[48] “Test Accessibility and Accommodations User Guide” provides information about the process for requesting accommodations. <b>Evidence 48, Test Accessibility and Accommodations User Guide</b></li> <li>• Evidence #[49] “Frequently Asked Questions ACT State and District Testing”               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-college reportable accommodations available for English learners (p. 15). <b>Evidence 49, FAQs_State_District_Testing_the_ACT</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For all programs, provide evidence that there is a process to review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> <li>• Provide evidence that appropriate accommodations are available for high school students with disabilities (SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504.</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 Montana

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 Montana**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b></p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul>	<p><b>MSAA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence provided by MSAA</li> <li>• MT Evidence 40 - Alternate MSAA counts 2016</li> <li>• MT Evidence 41 - RE_ RE_ 1 percent rule for students who take the Alter...</li> <li>• MT Evidence 42 - 13AccommodationManual</li> <li>• MT Evidence 43 - AccommodationsGuidanceMemo 7_20_17 updates</li> <li>• MT Evidence 44 - AccommodationsGuidanceMemo 2015</li> </ul> <p><b>SBAC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence provided by SBAC</li> <li>• MT Evidence (SBAC) 11 - 2016-17_Montana-Smarter-Test-Administration-Manual_FINAL</li> <li>• MT Evidence (SBAC) 45 - AccommodationsGuidanceMemo 7_20_17 updates</li> <li>• MT Evidence (SBAC) 46 - AccommodationsGuidanceMemo 2015</li> <li>• MT Evidence (SBAC) 47 - RE_ RE_ 1 percent rule for students who take the Alter...</li> </ul> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MT Evidence (ACT) 18 - 16ACTNonCollegeReportableAcomGuidance</li> <li>• MT Evidence (ACT) 32 - RE_ RE_ 1 percent rule for students who take the Alter...</li> <li>• MT Evidence (ACT) 33 - 13AccommodationManual</li> <li>• MT Evidence (ACT) 34 - AccommodationsGuidanceMemo 7_20_17 updates</li> </ul>	<p><b>MSAA , SBAC, &amp; ACT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence provided by MSAA, SBAC, &amp; ACT</li> <li>• Documents submitted did not address this any aspect of Critical Element 5.4.</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide evidence that students receive accommodations consistent with State policies for accommodations.</li> <li>• Provide evidence that students receive accommodations appropriate for addressing students’ disabilities or language needs.</li> <li>• Provide evidence that students receive accommodations consistent with the accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or Section 504 Team for students with disabilities, or Language learners.</li> <li>• Provide evidence that students receive accommodations administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana

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

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana**

<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>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</b></p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities;</li> <li>• The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply;</li> <li>• The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</li> </ul>	<p><b>MSAA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence submitted by MSAA</li> <li>• MT Evidence 45 - Section 6.1 PLD Administrative Rules of the State of Montana_10.54.2501</li> <li>• MT Evidence 46 - Section 6.1 PLD Administrative Rules of the State of Montana_10.54.2502</li> <li>• MT Evidence 47 - Section 6.1 PLD Administrative Rules of the State of Montana_10.55.606</li> </ul> <p><b>SBAC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence submitted by SBAC</li> <li>• MT Evidence (SBAC) 48 - Section 6.1 PLD Administrative Rules of the State of Montana_10.54.2501</li> <li>• MT Evidence (SBAC) 49 - Section 6.1 PLD Administrative Rules of the State of Montana_10.54.2502</li> <li>• MT Evidence (SBAC) 50 - Section 6.1 PLD Administrative Rules of the State of Montana_10.55.606</li> </ul> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MT Evidence (ACT) 35 - Section 6.1 PLD Administrative Rules of the State of Montana_10.54.2501</li> <li>• MT Evidence (ACT) 36 - Section 6.1 PLD Administrative Rules of the State of Montana_10.54.2502</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence submitted by MSAA, SBAC, &amp; ACT</li> <li>• OPI submitted evidence for MSAA and SBAC that satisfies all subsections of Critical Element 6.1, with the exception of a description of the competencies associated with each achievement level [3<sup>rd</sup> Bullet, Subsection (b)].</li> <li>• MT Evidence (ACT) 38 is the evidence of (3<sup>rd</sup> Bullet, Subsection (b) for the high school program.</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana**

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>MT Evidence (ACT) 37 - Section 6.1 PLD Administrative Rules of the State of Montana_10.55.606</li> </ul>	

<b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b>
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level for the general and alternate 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 Montana**

<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>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b></p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence submitted by MSAA, SBAC, &amp; ACT</li> <li>• MT Evidence (ACT) 38 - Montana Technical Report Empirical Standard Setting for ACT</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence submitted by MSAA, SBAC, &amp; ACT</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence submitted by MSAA, SBAC, &amp; ACT</li> </ul> <p>ACT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence #[53] Montana Standard Setting Final Report: Results benchmarking the standards against predicted college success measures. Evidence 53, <a href="#">ACT Student Report with Sample Data 2015</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence submitted by MSAA, SBAC, &amp; ACT</li> <li>Evidence document (Evidence #53) provided for the high school assessment does not address this critical element.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide evidence 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 for the OPI’s chosen high school assessment.</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 Montana

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 Montana**

<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>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;</li> <li>• The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;</li> <li>• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;</li> <li>○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;</li> <li>○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>MSAA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence submitted by MSAA</li> <li>• MT Evidence 48 - 2016 Billings Conf. Program Final</li> <li>• MT Evidence 49 - Billings 2016 Assessment and Data Conference Agenda</li> <li>• MT Evidence 50 - JUMP Newsletter Oct 2 2015</li> <li>• MT Evidence 51 - Missoula Conference Agenda</li> <li>• MT Evidence 52 - Results Reports Tutorial</li> </ul> <p><b>SBAC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence submitted by SBAC</li> <li>• MT Evidence (SBAC) 51 - 2016 Billings Conf. Program Final</li> <li>• MT Evidence (SBAC) 52 - Billings 2016 Assessment and Data Conference Agenda</li> <li>• MT Evidence (SBAC) 53 - JUMP Newsletter OCT 2 2015</li> <li>• MT Evidence (SBAC) 54 - Missoula Conference Agenda</li> <li>• MT Evidence (SBAC) 55 - Results Reports Tutorial</li> </ul> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence submitted by ACT</li> <li>• MT Evidence (ACT) 39 - 2016 Billings Conf. Program Final</li> <li>• MT Evidence (ACT) 40 - Billings 2016 Assessment and Data Conference Agenda</li> <li>• MT Evidence (ACT) 41 - JUMP Newsletter OCT2 2015</li> <li>• MT Evidence (ACT) 42 - Missoula Conference Agenda</li> <li>• MT Evidence (ACT) 43 - Results Reports Tutorial</li> </ul>	<p><b>MSAA, SBAC, &amp; ACT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MSAA: Peers were unable to generate reports using the tutorial instructions (MT Evidence (SBAC) 55 - Results Reports Tutorial) because the site was a dead link (NCSCAssessment.org).</li> <li>• SBAC: The additional evidence does not address any part of the critical element.</li> <li>• ACT: The additional evidence does not address any part of the critical element.</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 Montana**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Reporting results</b></p> <p><i>Student</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence #[53]: The ACT Student Score Report <b>Evidence 53, ACT Student Report with Sample Data 2015</b></li> </ul> <p><i>High School</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence #[54]: The ACT High School Score Report <b>Evidence 54, ACT High School Score Report 14-15</b></li> <li>Evidence #[55]: The ACT High School Report Checklist <b>Evidence 55, The ACT High School Checklist 2015-2016</b></li> </ul> <p><i>State</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence #[56]: The ACT Profile Report (Sample). <b>Evidence 56, The ACT Profile Report - High School 2015-2016</b></li> <li>Evidence #[57]: The ACT State and District Data File Record Sample <b>Evidence 57, The ACT State and District Data File Record Sample 2015-2016</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence #[58]: Using Your ACT Results <b>Evidence 58, Using Your ACT Results 2015-2016</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describes for students how the composite scores are calculated and explain how scores are related to the ACT College Readiness Benchmarks (pp. 2-3).</li> </ul> </li> <li>Evidence #[59]: ACT Score Report Descriptions <b>Evidence 59, Using- Your-ACT-Results</b></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>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Montana

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>• Provide evidence that OPI reports (to the public) its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested, for all students and each student group, after each test administration.</li> <li>• Provide evidence that OPI 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>• Provide evidence that OPI provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments as specified above in 6.4.3.</li> <li>• Provide evidence that OPI follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT  
CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

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

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



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

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

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

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

<b>SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2.3 – Test Administration .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>4.1 – Reliability.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>4.4 – Scoring .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>5.3 – Accommodations.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>6.4 – Reporting.....</b>	<b>26</b>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAА ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

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

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results;</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills);</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.</li> </ul>	<p>The State did not provide evidence in the February 2018 submission for this critical element.</p>	<p>No relevant evidence located.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b>            State must provide evidence to support the NCSC/MSAA test design criteria for the writing portion of the reading/language arts AA-AAAS. This will also impact evidence for related critical elements in sections 3 and 4.</p> <p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</b>            State must provide evidence to support the MSAA/NCSC test design criteria for the operational writing portion of the reading/language arts AA-AAAS. This will also impact evidence for related critical elements in sections 3 and 4.</p>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State must provide evidence to support the MSAA/NCSC test design criteria for the operational writing portion of the reading/language arts AA-AAAS. This will also impact evidence for related critical elements in sections 3 and 4.</li> </ul>		

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

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

<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>
-------------------------	---	---

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>• Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments;</li> <li>• If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>	<p>MSAA Timeline for adding in writing item samples to the MSAA PowerPoint by February 2018 and Practice site by June 2018.</p>	<p>Final slide on PowerPoint: Display new sample writing items to practice site June 2018.</p> <p>Evidence is not sufficient to meet the outstanding requirement.</p> <p>After the sample writing items are added to the practice test, MSAA should provide evidence that this work was done, and describe how the sample items reflect the different components of the writing assessment.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide, then State must):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that State established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the NCSC/MSAA assessments that include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence of a troubleshooting guide for the NCSC/MSAA to address technology-related contingency plans.</li> <li>○ Evidence of policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration (including the assessment delivery devices, accessibility tools and features available for students, and item formats) prior to testing.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Evidence of training to ensure consistency of administration across districts and schools.</p> <p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that State established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the MSAA/NCSC assessments that include evidence of a policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration in writing (including the assessment delivery devices, accessibility tools and</li> </ul>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
features available for students, and item formats) prior to testing.		
<b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that State established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the MSAA/NCSC assessments that include evidence of a policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration in writing (including the assessment delivery devices, accessibility tools and features available for students, and item formats) prior to testing.</li> </ul>		

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

# STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

## SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> <li>• If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul>	<p>The State did not provide evidence in the February 2018 submission for this critical element.</p>	<p>No relevant evidence located.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b>                      For the NCSC/MSAA, as noted in element 2.1, evidence that demonstrates its assessments measure the full breadth and depth of the State’s content standards (writing). Following that, the State will need to document adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, including evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards. This will also effect other critical elements in sections 3 and 4.</p> <p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As noted in element 2.1, evidence that demonstrates its assessments measure the full breadth and depth of the State’s writing (ELA) content standards. Following that, the State will need to document adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments,</li> </ul>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>including evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards for writing. This will also affect other critical elements in sections 3 and 4.</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>• As noted in element 2.1, evidence that demonstrates its assessments measure the full breadth and depth of the State’s writing (ELA) content standards. Following that, the State will need to document adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, including evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards for writing. This will also affect other critical elements in sections 3 and 4.</li> </ul>		

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

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

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

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p>MSAA Graphics Resizing Change Order 2017</p>	<p>MSAA scrolling issue evidence (validity based on internal structure)--change orders and an amendment to the MSAA contract with Measured Progress were created to address the scrolling issue. The peers noted how timely this issue was addressed by the MSAA.</p> <p>The change order generally indicates how the MSAA addressed answer choice presentation and impact of scrolling, but no evidence details the impact(s) of the implemented change orders.</p> <p>The MSAA may wish to consider pilot studies to address impact before full consortium implementation.</p> <p>While the change order was submitted, it is not clear exactly how this will impact dimensionality. Evidence must be provided that illustrates and provides data regarding the impacts after the change order has been implemented. The MSAA must submit evidence that item response theory (IRT) assumptions of test unidimensionality are met.</p>
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</b>                      For the NCSC/MSAA, additional evidence that supports the internal structure of the tests, specifically a plan and timeline for documenting how the test meets item response theory (IRT) assumptions of test unidimensionality.</p> <p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide evidence of how NCSC will address answer choice presentation and impact of scrolling in the administration of the test as evidenced by NCSC 104 and MSAA11.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide evidence that item response theory (IRT) assumptions of test unidimensionality are met.</li> </ul>		

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

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

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

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

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

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide, then State must):**  
 For the NCSC/MSAA, evidence that the State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including:

- o Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); and
- o Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.

**Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:**

- Evidence that the State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including:
  - Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); and
  - 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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<u>X</u> No additional evidence is required.		

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide, then State must):**

- For both the NCSC/MSAA, evidence that the accommodations provided (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.
- Evidence that appropriate accommodations for English learners are available.
- For the NCSC/MSAA, evidence that the State has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the accommodations provided do not alter the construct being assessed, and allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## February 201 State Assessment Peer Review Notes

(resubmission of evidence based on 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 Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium**

**Contents**

<b>SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2.2 – Item Development.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2.3 – Test Administration .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>4.4 – Scoring .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>5.3 – Accommodations.....</b>	<b>18</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 the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b> (stemming from 2016 review)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the Smarter Balanced test design aligns the assessments to the full depth and breadth for all of the academic content standards in R/LA and mathematics at each grade level.</li> <li>Evidence that the item selection procedures for the computer adaptive test (CAT) online assessment adequately deliver tests that meet test design requirements for the intended depth of knowledge (DOK) of the assessments (also applies to evidence requested for element 2.2).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Evidence #S021</i> – Evaluating Alignment in Large-Scale Standards-Based Assessment Systems</li> <li><a href="#">Evidence #S022 – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Common Core State Standards Analysis: Eligible Content for the Summative Assessment, Final Report</a></li> <li><i>Evidence #S023</i> – Race to the Top Application for New Grants Comprehensive Assessment Systems (p. 41)</li> <li><a href="#">Evidence #12b – Smarter Balanced Content Specifications for Mathematics</a></li> <li><i>Evidence #S024</i> – PCG - Claim/Target and Common Core Standard Associations Data Input Specifications</li> <li><a href="#">Evidence Packet #S010 – Blueprint Fidelity</a></li> <li><i>Evidence #S029</i> – Summary of Smarter Balanced CAT Algorithm on Depth of Knowledge</li> </ul>	<p>Peers felt that S021 was not relevant for this request.</p> <p>S022 was previously provided and calls out 48 (R/LA) and 3 (Mathematics) standards as “not measurable.” However, they were judged “not measurable” using the item types proposed by SBAC: “A standard was considered measurable via on-demand summative assessment tasks if it can be assessed by any of the item types listed in the following subsection, as defined in the SBAC proposal (SBAC, 2010b, pp. 42, 52–53).” (p.9) Page 6 lists the item types. Peers feel that the standards should drive the item types / components of the assessment system. It seemed, however, that the item types were determining the assessable content, rather than the standards determining the item types / components. Regulation and Guidance clearly state “full depth and breadth for all of the academic standards.”</p> <p>S023 includes a statement of intent, not evidence for this CE.</p> <p>S024 described the new coding scheme for the items. Peers felt it was not relevant.</p> <p>Suggestion: SBAC might provide evidence of how the other components of the assessment system (formative, interim, benchmark) cover the standards deemed ineligible for the summative, AND that the states using the SBAC incorporate those other elements meaningfully into their assessment system. (That is, those other elements contribute to scores / performance levels.)</p> <p>Peers commend SBAC for conducting a thorough blueprint fidelity study, and for taking measures to correct the error identified for Grade 6 Math. We would like to see the blueprint fulfillment rates at the student level, in addition to the claim / content category level, as presented in S010a. In other words, we’d like data answering the question, “What percent of students received a test event conforming to the blueprint?,” rather than “What percent of test events fulfilled blueprint requirement X?”</p> <p>Peers feel that 100% blueprint fulfillment (at the student level) is implied by this CE. A reason for less than 100% blueprint fulfillment may reside in the way in the which algorithm treats blueprint fulfillment as described in S029 – that is, not as an absolute constraint.</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 the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that, for cases where an assessment includes off-grade-level content, assessments produce grade level student achievement scores that are based only on grade-level items.</li> <li>Evidence that the item pools for all versions of the assessments (i.e., general, American Sign Language, Braille and Spanish) are sufficient to support the test design requirements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Evidence #S023</i> – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Race to the Top Grant Proposal (<a href="#">pp. 45-46</a>)</li> <li><a href="#">Evidence #S025 – Smarter Balanced Mathematics Expanded Item Pools</a></li> <li><i>Evidence #S026</i> – Pool Expansion Information Presentation</li> <li><a href="#">Evidence #S027 – 2016-17 Expanded Pool Standards Alignment</a></li> <li><a href="#">Evidence Packet #S010 – Blueprint Fidelity</a></li> <li><i>Evidence Packet #S012</i> – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses</li> <li><i>S013</i></li> </ul>	<p>This requirement is met.</p> <p>Peers would have appreciated a clarification that when expanded pool items are used, that the relevant psychometric considerations are being addressed – e.g., that item parameters used are established for all grades spanned.</p> <p>Peers noted that several items span a relatively large grade range (roughly 20% in MA and 13% in R/LA span 3 or more grades). (Peer calculations based on S027). This seemed high.</p> <p>Peers commend SBAC for producing the gap analyses (S012). Peers believe that steps taken to bridge the gaps as described in S013 should resolve the issues.</p> <p>Peers ask that the program continue to monitor those grades/versions where blueprint fulfillment was less than 100%, as well as those where there had yet to be administrations.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Evidence that the Smarter Balanced test design aligns the assessments to the full depth and breadth for all the academic content standards in R/LA and mathematics at each grade level.</li> <li>B. Evidence that the item selection procedures for the computer adaptive test (CAT) online assessment adequately deliver tests that meet test design requirements for the intended depth of knowledge (DOK) of the assessments (also applies to evidence requested for element 2.2).</li> <li>C. Evidence that the item pools for all versions of the assessments (i.e., general, American Sign Language, Braille and Spanish) are sufficient to support the test design requirements. Provide, upon completion of the item development plans, evidence that 100% of test events for students receiving any version of the assessment conform to the test blueprints.</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 the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2.2 – Item Development</b> (stemming from 2016 review)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See evidence regarding DOK and item pools in element 2.1 above.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Evidence #15a</i> – Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment Blueprints for Mathematics</li> <li><a href="#"><i>Evidence #15b – Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment Blueprints for ELA/L</i></a></li> <li><i>Evidence #S008</i> – Smarter Balanced Math Summative CAT and Interim Assessment Item Development Plan</li> <li><a href="#"><i>Evidence #S009 – Smarter Balanced ELA Summative CAT and Interim Assessment Item Development Plan</i></a></li> <li><i>Evidence Packet #S010</i> – Smarter Balanced Blueprint Fidelity Study</li> <li><a href="#"><i>Evidence Packet #S012 – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses</i></a></li> <li><i>Evidence #S013</i> – Gap Analysis and Development Plans</li> <li><a href="#"><i>Evidence Packet #S014 – Member Managed Item Development Assignments</i></a></li> <li><i>Evidence #S029</i> – Summary of Smarter Balanced CAT Algorithm on Depth of Knowledge</li> </ul>	<p>The item selection procedures for the CAT should result in test events that, for every student and for all versions of the assessments, meet all blueprint constraints.</p> <p>See Comments on 2.1, bullets 2 and 4.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b></p> <p>_x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See 2.1 B and C.</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 the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p> <p>(stemming from 2016 review-individual States may provide own evidence to address this item)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of contingency plans to address potential technology issues during test administration</li> </ul>	<p>No evidence provided.</p>	<p><u>Peers assume this evidence is provided by States using Smarter Balanced.</u></p>
<p><b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence from States using SBAC is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of contingency plans to address potential technology issues 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 the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b> (stemming from 2016 peer review)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence as noted for all item pools in element 2.1 above.</li> <li>Evidence of a summary report that the CAT administered test forms matched test blueprints.</li> <li>Evidence that Smarter Balanced assessments that include off-grade level content conform to the on-grade level blueprint for the assessment.</li> <li>Evidence of alignment of sample test forms for grades 3, 4, 6 and 7 in R/LA and mathematics.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">Evidence #S005 – Hawaii Smarter Balanced Technical Report, 2014-2015</a> (pp. 42-46)</li> <li><a href="#">Evidence #S006 – South Dakota Technical Report 2014-2015</a> (pp. 44-49)</li> <li><a href="#">Evidence Packet #S010 – Blueprint Fidelity</a></li> <li><a href="#">Evidence Packet #012 – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses</a></li> <li><a href="#">Evidence Packet #S010 – Blueprint Fidelity</a></li> <li><a href="#">Evidence #S011 – Smarter Balanced Technical Report, 2015-2016</a> (pp. 6-6 through 6-9)</li> <li><a href="#">Evidence Packet #S010 – Blueprint Fidelity</a></li> <li><a href="#">Evidence #S030 – WestEd Alignment Study Proposal</a></li> <li><a href="#">Evidence #S032 – WestEd Alignment Study</a></li> <li><a href="#">Evidence #104 – Fordham Institute – Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation Assessments</a> (p. 18)</li> <li><a href="#">Evidence #S008 – Smarter Balanced Math Summative CAT and Interim Assessment Item</a></li> </ul>	<p>See Comments in 2.1.</p> <p>See Comments in 2.1, bullets 2 and 4. The evidence was provided but it does not support the claim that the CAT administered test forms matched the test blueprints in every case.</p> <p>This evidence has been provided. See Comment in 2.1, bullet 3.</p> <p>The WestEd alignment study (S032) assessed the extent to which each item in the noted grades matched its targeted CCSS standard. However, for DoK (cognitive complexity), the study did not assess the extent to which each item matched the cognitive complexity implied by its targeted standard. Rather, it documented experts’ judgments of the level of cognitive complexity at which the item appears to be assessing the standard. The study’s design can furnish appropriate evidence to support (or refute) a claim concerning the degree of content alignment between items and standards, but it cannot provide appropriate evidence for a claim about the match between the cognitive complexity of a test and the cognitive complexity of the standards to which the test is written.</p> <p>Peers felt that the study does not address the question “Does the item match the DoK of the standard?”</p> <p>The measures taken to improve alignment are entirely appropriate. However, evidence of <i>improved</i> alignment was not provided. Peers expected to see a before-after comparison.</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 the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of improved alignment of the tests, based upon the findings of the independent alignment study.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">Development Plan</a></li> <li><i>Evidence Packet #S010</i> – Blueprint Fidelity</li> <li><a href="#">Evidence Packet #S012 – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses</a></li> <li><i>Evidence #S013</i> – Gap Analysis and Development Plans</li> <li><a href="#">Evidence Packet #S014 – Member-Managed Assignments</a></li> <li><i>Evidence Packet #S015</i> – Member-Managed Item Development Training</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See 2.1 B and C.</li> <li>Evidence of alignment of sample test forms for grades 3, 4, 6 and 7 in R/LA and mathematics, specifically with respect to cognitive complexity (DoK).</li> <li>Evidence of improved alignment of the tests, based upon the findings of the independent alignment study.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b>                      (stemming from 2016 peer review-States may address this with State-level data)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that supports the internal structure of the Smarter Balanced assessments using operational data from the summative assessments (e.g., a correlational analysis of subscores and total scores).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Evidence #S004</i> - Assessing the Dimensionality of Smarter Balanced Summative Tests (pp. 2-4).</li> </ul>	<p>S004 provides the evidence requested.</p> <p>Recommendation: Peers recognize the challenge of assessing dimensionality using item scores in a CAT context; SBAC could contribute meaningfully to the literature on this topic by taking it on as a special research study.</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 the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b></p> <p>(stemming from 2016 peer review-States may address this with State-level data)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Validity evidence that shows the Smarter Balanced assessment scores are related as expected with other variables for all student groups (e.g., comparison of subscore relationships within content areas to those across content areas; a confirmatory factor analysis of math &amp; R/LA together; or other analyses that demonstrate positive correlations between assessment results and external measures that assess similar constructs).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">Evidence #S004 – Assessing the Dimensionality of Smarter Balanced Summative Test</a> (pp. 2-5)</li> <li><a href="#">Evidence #S005 – Hawaii Smarter Balanced Technical Report, 2014-2015</a> (pp. 48-50)</li> <li><a href="#">Evidence #S006 – South Dakota Technical Report, 2014-2015</a> (pp. 53-55)</li> <li><a href="#">Evidence #S007 – Dimensionality of the SBAC: An argument for its validity</a></li> <li><a href="#">Evidence #S031 – South Dakota BOR Policy</a></li> </ul>	<p>Peers appreciated the concurrent validity studies for high school R/LA and Math (S005 and S006). We believe that these studies help establish external validity evidence for the program.</p> <p>However, no evidence of validity based on relationships with other variables was provided for Grades 3-8 Math and R/LA.</p> <p>Please provide the results of a study or studies addressing this CE, such as correlations between SBAC scores and grades or correlations between SBAC adjacent grade scores.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.4 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>Validity evidence that shows the Smarter Balanced assessment scores are related as expected with other variables for all student groups for Grades 3-8 R/LA and Math.</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 the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</b> (stemming from 2016 peer review-States may address this with State-level data)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of estimated reliability for students receiving accommodations using operational data.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Evidence #S011 – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Draft 2015-16 Technical Report</u>, Chapter 2</li> <li><i>Index</i></li> </ul>	<p>Estimated reliabilities for the tests administered to these students are in the Index in Tables 11.1 and 11.2. Peers note that a few of the coefficients are low enough to raise concerns.</p> <p>It would be helpful in evaluating Tables 11.1 and 11.2 to know the source(s) of the data.</p> <p>Peers request a clarification about how item development plans (S013) specifically address the pool factors that are related to the low reliabilities for special versions of the test.</p> <p>Peers are also concerned by the statement in the Index “Students with lower scores have lower reliability than those with higher scores.” (p. 57). We were not sure that it was accurate.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.2 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>Peers request a clarification about how item development plans (S013) specifically address the pool factors that are related to the low reliabilities for special versions of the test.</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 the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b></p> <p>(stemming from 2016 peer review)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See evidence regarding DOK and item pools in element 2.1 above.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Evidence #015a</i> – Final Blueprint for Mathematics Summative Assessment</li> <li><i>Evidence #015b</i> – Final Blueprint for ELA/L Summative Assessment</li> <li><i>Evidence Packet #S010</i> – Smarter Balanced Blueprint Fidelity Study</li> <li><i>Evidence #S011</i> – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Technical Report, 2015-2016</li> <li><i>Evidence Packet #S012</i> – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses</li> </ul>	<p>See Comments for 2.1.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>x<u>  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See 2.1 B and C.</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 the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></p> <p>(stemming from 2016 peer review-States may address this with State-level evidence)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that Smarter Balanced has clear, unambiguous criteria, including minimum thresholds, to ensure and document inter-rater reliability for States that are conducting hand-scoring of Smarter Balanced performance items.</li> <li>• Evidence that the State has monitored the quality and reliability of performance task scoring conducted during its test administration for the Smarter Balanced tests.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Evidence #065a – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium: State Procedures Manual, 2014</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Evidence #S001 – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium: Member Procedures Manual, 2016</a></li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;">No evidence cited.</p>	<p>Peers appreciate the new guidance provided by the Consortium (S001). We believe the evidence requested was provided.</p> <p>Peers’ understanding is that this evidence is to be provided by <a href="#">States using Smarter Balanced.</a></p>
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence from States using SBAC is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has monitored the quality and reliability of performance task scoring conducted during its test administration for the Smarter Balanced tests.</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 the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

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> (stemming from 2016 peer review)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the design and development of the item pools used to support multiple versions of the assessments, specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ computer-adaptive in ASL (R/LA listening only, Math);</li> <li>○ computer-adaptive in Braille (R/LA, math);</li> <li>○ computer-based fixed form in Braille (math);</li> <li>○ paper in Braille (R/LA, Math);</li> <li>○ computer-adaptive in Spanish (math); and</li> <li>○ paper in Spanish (math).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Evidence that item pools for these above-listed additional computer adaptive versions can support the adaptive test design.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Evidence #011a</i> – Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines</li> <li>• <a href="#">Evidence #143 – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium: Signing Guidelines</a></li> <li>• <i>Evidence Packet #S010</i> – Blueprint Fidelity Studies</li> <li>• <a href="#">Evidence #144 – Unified English Braille Implementation Guide</a></li> <li>• <i>Evidence #146</i> – Theory of Test Translation Error</li> <li>• <a href="#">Evidence #S011 – Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment Technical Report, 2015-2016</a></li> <li>• <i>Evidence Packet #S012</i> – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses</li> <li>• <a href="#">Evidence #S013 – Gap Analysis and Development Plans</a></li> <li>• <i>Evidence #S016</i> – Literature Review of Testing Accommodations and Accessibility Tools for Students with Disabilities</li> <li>• <a href="#">Evidence #S017 – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Style Guide</a></li> <li>• <i>Evidence #S018</i> – Tri-Lin Proposal Response to Smarter Balanced RFP 13</li> <li>• <a href="#">Evidence #S019 – Grade 8 Mathematics Item Specifications Claim 1 Target A</a></li> </ul>	<p>See Comments in 2.1 and 4.2.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>x The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Comments in 2.1 B and C, and 4.2.</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 the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</b> (stemming from 2016 peer review-States may address this with State-level evidence)</p> <p>Evidence of guidance regarding selection of the Spanish version of the Smarter Balanced assessments for English learners, and evidence of procedures for communication of this guidance to districts, schools, teachers and parents.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Evidence #11a</a> – Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines (p. 11; pp. 32-33)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Evidence #68 – Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Implementation Guide</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Evidence #69h</a> – Accessibility and Accommodations Training Module (Slide 59)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Evidence #99 – Resources and Practices Comparison Crosswalk</a> (p. 4)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Evidence #127 – ISAAP Training Module Screenshot</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Evidence #S002 – UAAG Survey</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Evidence #S003</a> – Including All Students in Assessments Digital Library Module</li> <li>• <a href="#">Evidence #S020 – Template Letter for Parents of English Learners</a></li> </ul>	<p>The SBAC response shows where to locate evidence of the guidance in the original submission, and evidence of communication of this guidance to school personnel. Provision of #S020 shows evidence of communication of this guidance to parents.</p> <p><u>The Peers understand that provision of greater specificity beyond the guidance provided by SBAC is a State level responsibility for any State using SBAC.</u></p>
<p><b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>x<u>  </u> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p> <p><u>  </u>x<u>  </u> The following additional evidence from States using SBAC is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of guidance regarding selection of the Spanish version of the Smarter Balanced assessments for English learners at a level of specificity such that an educator can apply the decision for an individual student.</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 the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>5.3 – Accommodations</b> (stemming from 2016 peer review-States may address this with State-level evidence)</p> <p>Evidence of a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</p>		<p>SBAC did not provide evidence for this request.</p> <p><u>Peers’ understanding is that States using Smarter Balanced are to provide this evidence.</u></p>
<p><b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence from States using SBAC is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</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 the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.