



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Kirsten Baesler  
Superintendent of Public Instruction  
North Dakota Department of Public Instruction  
600 East Boulevard Avenue, Department 201  
Bismarck, ND 58505

May 10, 2018

Dear Superintendent Baesler:

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

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

External peer reviewers and Department staff carefully evaluated NDDPI's submission and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that the components of your assessment system for reading/language arts and mathematics alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) in grades 3-8 and high school (Dynamic Learning Maps-Integrated Model (DLM-Int)) meet all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of section 1111(b)(1) and (3) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB. Congratulations on meeting these important ESEA requirements; an assessment system that produces valid and reliable results is fundamental to a State's accountability system.

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

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

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 AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-Int):  
**Meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB.**

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 NDDPI 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 NDDPI 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 NDDPI administration of the DLM-Int 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 NDDPI until December 15, 2020, to submit evidence of an AA-AAAS that meets this ESSA requirement.

Please be aware that approval of NDDPI’s DLM-Int assessments is not a determination that the system complies with Federal civil rights requirements, including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, and requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Finally, please remember that, if NDDPI makes other significant changes in its DLM assessments, the State must submit information about those changes to the Department for review and approval.

Thank you for your ongoing commitment to improving educational outcomes for all students. I look forward to our continued partnership as we move ahead with this critical work. I appreciate the work you are doing to improve your schools and provide a high-quality education for your students. We have found it a pleasure working with your staff on this review. I wish you well in your continued efforts to improve student achievement in North Dakota.

If you have any questions, please contact Jameel Scott or Megan Oberst of my staff at:  
[OSS.NorthDakota@ed.gov](mailto:OSS.NorthDakota@ed.gov).

Sincerely,

/s/

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

cc: Robert Bauer, Director of Assessment

Enclosures

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

<b>Requirement</b>	<b>Additional Evidence Requested</b>
<b>Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards (additional requirement under section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA)</b>	For the Dynamic Learning Maps-Integrated Model: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards ensure that a student who meets these standards is on track to pursue post-secondary education or employment.</li></ul>

# U. S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## February-March 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NORTH DAKOTA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><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>DLM Alternate Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This requirement was previously met by the Dynamic Learning Maps Consortium submission.</li> <li>• Please see Dynamic Learning Maps Consortium response.</li> </ul> <p>Additional DLM Assessment Preventative and Contingency Measures taken by NDDPI: The state has preventative measures in place to ensure adequate preparation is made for the DLM alternate assessment and contingency measures as technology issues arise during testing. These measures include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technology readiness surveys to gain feedback from schools indicating adequate bandwidth, network reliability, devices, and operating systems in place in order to administer the assessments properly. See Critical Element 2.3.3 response in June 2016 North Dakota Peer Review submission.</li> <li>• In the rare event it is determined that bandwidth, network reliability, or internet connectivity are not adequate for the number of students testing, the state has an option to test using the Local Caching Server (LCS) provided as an option on the DLM system. See Critical Element 2.3 response in DLM submission.</li> <li>• Test administration training and certification is required for all DLM test administrators to ensure that the technology is properly used to administer the tests.</li> <li>• In the event that neither the connectivity, network reliability, or device requirements are met, the state will make alternate sites that meet all technology requirements for testing available to students and test administrators.</li> </ul>	<p>The evidence provided met this Critical Element.</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NORTH DAKOTA

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>The state acquires help desk support with service level agreements for ongoing technology support for technology-based issues as they arise.</li> </ul>	
<b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement (2016 Review)</b>		
_x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For the entire NDDPI assessment system: Evidence of contingency plans to address potential technology issues during test administration</li> </ul>		
<b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement (2018 Review)</b>		
_X_ No additional evidence is required.		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>5.3 – Accommodations</b>  The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State: <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</li> </ul>	ND-146 Guidance on Exceptional Accommodations for North Dakota State Assessments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ND-147 Unique Accommodation Request Application</li> <li>ND-148 Accessibility Manual</li> </ul> NDDPI will be placing these <i>Unique Accommodation Guidance</i> documents on the NDDPI public website and in the appendices of the <i>NDDPI Accessibility Manual</i> for access by Local Educational Agencies.	The evidence provided met this Critical Element.

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NORTH DAKOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.		
<b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement (2016 Review)</b>		
_x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the entire assessment system, NDDPI must provide: 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>		
<b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement (2018 Review)</b>		
_X_ No additional evidence is required.		

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

# U. S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

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



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

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

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

**Contents**

<b>SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>4.1 – Reliability.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>4.4 – Scoring .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment .....</b>	<b>15</b>

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

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

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

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

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>accuracy of classifications, which will be satisfied by response to element 3.3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of model fit analysis, which will be satisfied by response to element 3.1.</li> </ul>	<p>IM_01Technical Manual_Update_IM 2016-2017, (pages 74-90).</p> <p>IM_01Technical Manual_Update_IM 2016-2017 (pages 86-90).</p> <p>IM_01Technical Manual_Update_IM 2016-2017, Analysis of model fit (pages 44, 54 and 58)</p>	
<b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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

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

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY**

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

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p align="center">28-29)</p> <p>c) Chapter V: Modeling            i) Model Fit (pp. 44-58, 59)</p> <p>d) Chapter IX: Validity Studies            i) Internal Structure Across Linkage Levels (p. 119)</p> <p>3) IM 03 TAC Materials (pp. 1-2)</p> <p>IM_01Technical Manual_Update_IM 2016-2017 (pages 38, 39, &amp; 44).</p>	<p>it is unclear why the selected model was chosen as the ‘best fit’, given that the lack of strong evidence to support this choice (“Preliminary model fit results indicated mixed support for the use of the current fungible scoring model”, page 58). Peer agreed with the TAC members (IM 03_TAC_Materials) conclusion that “larger sample sizes and refinements to methodology are unlikely to change the fundamental conclusion that the non-fungible model provides superior fit”.</p> <p>The TAC members thought that the model did have an impact of item classification and recommend calculating using Bayesian estimation methods or switching to a non-fungible model (IM 03_TAC_Materials). Peers support this recommendation, as well as continuing to study model fit over time as described in the last paragraph on page 59 of the 2016-2017 Technical Manual.</p> <p>The impact of model selection on mastery decisions for students may be differential at the state level than consortium wide, due to different Ns for states. While ongoing research is being conducted to improve the model fit, peers were concerned about how model fit impacts mastery decisions and</p>

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>how they are incorporated into guidance for interpreting scores and any resulting impact of the use of those scores (including the use of multiple measures to support actions based on mastery decisions).</p> <p>Peers recommend a revision of the Technical Manual to include an explanation of the two-down scoring rule and how it is applied, which is not sufficiently explained on page 43 of the IM Technical Manual (2016-2017).</p>
<b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b>                      For R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and HS (DLM-IM):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of consistency and accuracy of classifications resulting from the tests.</li> <li>• Evidence of item-level data (e.g., factor loadings or item-total correlations), or comparable node-level data that support the internal structure of the tests.</li> </ul> <p>Evidence that reliability estimates are based upon known item and testlet parameters.</p>	<p>Scoring and Reporting Structures’ Consistency with Sub-Domain Structures</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) IM 01 Technical Manual Update IM 2016-17                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Chapter III: Item and Test Development                                     <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Operational Assessment Items for 2016-2017 (pp. 11-16)</li> <li>ii) Field Test Results (pp. 19-26)</li> </ol> </li> <li>b) Chapter V: Modeling                                     <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Overview of the Psychometric Model (pp. 38-39)</li> <li>ii) Calibrated Parameters (pp. 39-42)</li> </ol> </li> <li>c) Chapter VIII: Reliability                                     <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Reliability Sampling Procedure (pp. 75-76)</li> <li>ii) Linkage Level Reliability Evidence (pp. 85-88)</li> <li>iii) Conditional Reliability Evidence by Linkage Level (p. 89)</li> </ol> </li> <li>d) Chapter IX: Validity Studies                                     <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Internal Structure Across Linkage Levels (p. 119).</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>The 2016-2017 correlation values, agreement and Kappa statistics, as compared to the evidence for reliability reported for Linkage Levels in 2014-15, are more in line with acceptable levels.</p> <p>Internal Structure Across Linkage Levels: (see comments in section 3.1 regarding flagged items).</p> <p>Internal Structure:                      Peers were concerned that there are issues with the non-masters having a greater than 50% change of responding correctly (File 1, p. 40-41), which could result in misclassification. This may resolve with further study of the scoring model, however, peers recommend that in addition to examining and revising flagged items, the consortium should continue to monitor this phenomenon.</p>

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b>		
_X_ No additional evidence is required		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b></p> <p>For R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and HS (DLM-IM):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</li> </ul>	<p>Score Relationship to Other Variables</p> <p>1) IM 01 Technical Manual Update IM 2016-17</p> <p>    a) Chapter IX: Validity Studies</p> <p>        i) Evidence Based on Relation to Other Variables (pp. 119-125)</p> <p>    b) Chapter XI: Conclusion and Discussion</p> <p>        i) Future Research</p> <p>IM01, (pp. 143-144).</p>	<p>The current study is an initial step. Although, as noted there are issues with the First Contact survey being used to determine the testlet linkage level. The proposed research in IM01, pp. 143-144 asking teachers to rate student mastery will be beneficial.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><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 DLM Integrated Model Consortium Re-Submission**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

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

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p align="center">Linkage Levels (p. 119) IM_01Technical Manual_Update_IM 2016-2017, (pages 74-90).</p> <p>Consistency and Accuracy of classifications (pages 86-90).</p> <p>Analysis of model fit (pages 44, 54, 58, and 59).</p>	
<b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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