



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Matthew L. Blomstedt
Commissioner
Nebraska Department of Education
301 Centennial Mall South
P.O. Box 94987
Lincoln, NE 68509-4987

October 19, 2018

Dear Commissioner Blomstedt:

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 Nebraska Department of Education (NDE) to prepare for the 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.

External peer reviewers and Department staff carefully evaluated NDE's submission and the Department found, based on the evidence received, the following:

- General assessments in reading/language arts for grades 3-8 (Nebraska State Accountability (NeSA R/LA): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**
- General assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science for high school (ACT): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**
- Alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) for grades 3-8 and high school in reading/language arts (NeSA Alternate): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**

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

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

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

The specific list of items required for NDE to submit is enclosed with this letter. NDE must submit a plan and timeline within 30 days for when it will submit all required additional documentation for peer review. The Department will also host regular (e.g., quarterly) progress calls with the State to discuss the State's progress on its timeline. If, following the peer review of the additional evidence, adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action.

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.

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 NDE peer review was conducted under the requirements of this statute. In the 2017-2018 school year, the assessment requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, began to 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 NDE administration of the NeSA alternate assessment needs 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 NDE until December 15, 2020, to submit evidence of an AA-AAAS that meets this ESSA requirement.

Also, please remember that, if NDE makes significant changes in its 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. If you have any questions, please contact Jameel Scott of my staff at: OSS.Nebraska@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank Brogan
Assistant Secretary for
Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Valorie Foy

Critical Elements Reviewed and Evaluated as “Not Meeting Requirements-Additional Evidence Needed”

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<p>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</p>	<p>For the State assessment system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State clearly and consistently communicates to districts and schools the requirement that all public elementary and secondary school students must participate in assessments. • Evidence of policies stating that all 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.
<p>2.1 – Test Design and Development</p>	<p>For the ACT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the test design is aligned to the depth and breadth of the State’s high school academic content standards (e.g., evidence of alignment of the test design blueprint to academic content standards).
<p>2.3 – Test Administration</p>	<p>For the NeSA Alternate R/LA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and consistent administration procedures for determining when a student is not responsive. <p>For the NeSA R/LA in grades 3-8:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a contingency plan to address possible technology challenges during online test administration.
<p>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</p>	<p>For all assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that NDE adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p>	<p>For the ACT reading/language arts (R/LA) and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the State’s academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity. <p>For the NeSA Alternate in R/LA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A plan and timeline for addressing the issues raised in the State’s alignment study.
<p>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</p>	<p>For all assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that NDE’s assessment items (and item types) tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.
<p>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</p>	<p>For the ACT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the scoring and reporting structures are consistent with subdomain structures of the State’s academic content

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based (such as a factor analysis).
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	For the NeSA Alternate in R/LA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the scores are related as expected with other variables.
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	For the NeSA R/LA and Alternate R/LA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the State administers multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, evidence that the State followed a design and development process and evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	For the NeSA Alternate in R/LA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of an ongoing process for monitoring, maintaining, and improving as needed, the technical quality of its assessment system.
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	For the ACT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Evidence that children with disabilities are not denied the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.
5.2 – Procedures for Including ELs	For the ACT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Evidence that children with disabilities are not denied the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.
5.3 – Accommodations	For all assessments, evidence demonstrating the accommodations provided: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments. • Do not alter the construct being assessed. • 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.
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	For all assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State monitors test administration in 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, to ensure that accommodations are administered with fidelity and State test administration procedures are followed.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	For the ACT: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evidence that the State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards. For the NeSA Alternate in R/LA: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. NDE should provide this evidence by December 31, 2020.
6.4 – Reporting	For the NeSA and NeSA Alternate in R/LA: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evidence that translated versions of the score reports and interpretive documents are available for students and parents in languages commonly spoken in the State, such as Spanish.• Evidence of a process and timeline for delivering reports to students, parents, teachers, principals, and other stakeholders as soon as practicable after each test administration.

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 Nebraska

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS . 4
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students 4
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards 5
1.3 – Required Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 6
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 7
1.5 – Participation Data (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 9

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS 10
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 11
2.2 – Item Development..... 13
2.3 – Test Administration 14
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)15
2.5 – Test Security 17
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 19

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 20
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 21
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 23
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure 24
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables 26

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER 28
4.1 – Reliability..... 28
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 29
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... 30
4.4 – Scoring 31
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 32
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment 33
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance 34

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS 35
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 36
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 38
5.3 – Accommodations..... 40
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations 42

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 44
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students 44
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 45
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 46
6.4 – Reporting..... 48

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nebraska

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nebraska

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>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State.</p>	<p>35_Nebraska Revised Statute 79-760.01.pdf 36_Nebraska Revised Statute 79-760.02.pdf 32_State Board of Education Meeting Minutes_September 2014.pdf 33_State Board of Education Meeting Minutes_September 2015.pdf 34_State Board of Education Meeting Minutes_September 2017.pdf</p> <p>Evidence #32 (Board adoption of ELA content standards)</p> <p>Evidence: #10, 13 & 14 (mandate EL & SWD participation in all state assessments and the state accountability system); #67 (Test Administration Manual) mandates participation by all students enrolled in tested grades.</p>	<p>Documents outline learning expectations per implementation of content standards over k-12 continuum in key subject areas. Post-secondary documents include college readiness standards.</p>
<p>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</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 Nebraska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science specify what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school to succeed in college and the workforce; contain content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.</p>	<p>37_Postsecondary System Designation_ELA.pdf 38_Postsecondary System Designation_Mathematics.pdf 39_Postsecondary System Designation_Science.pdf 40_Standards Writing Team_ELA.pdf 41_Standards Writing Team_Math.pdf 42_Standards Writing Team_Science.pdf 43_Nebraska College and Career Ready Standards_ELA.pdf 44_Nebraska College and Career Ready Standards_Math.pdf 45_Nebraska College and Career Ready Standards_Science.pdf</p> <p>Evidence #37-39 (Postsecondary system designation docs for ELA, Math & Science); #40-42 (Standards writing team rosters ELA, Math & Science); #43-45 (NE Content Standards ELA, Math & Science)</p> <p>Evidence #37 (Postsecondary System Designation_ELA) mentions an “extensive public input process” but provides no detail on the process to demonstrate stakeholder involvement.</p>	<p>The state provided documents that outline learning expectations per implementation of content standards over 9-12 continuum in key subject areas-reading/1A, Math, and Writing (Postsecondary System Designation, Standards Writing Team ELA, Math, Science). Evidence of College Writing Standards (Nebraska College and Career Ready Standards)</p> <p>The State should describe the standards development process and stakeholder involvement in the standards development/adoption process. To demonstrate stakeholder involvement the State could provide meeting agendas/sign in sheets for curriculum committees, Superintendent’s advisory groups, or parent/stakeholder group which documents meeting(s) focused on curriculum content and/or standards based assessment.</p> <p>Suggestions: State should consider a professional development plan to drive a standards based instructional strategy.</p> <p>Teacher team notes/agenda showing work to align standards and create crosswalk document and or instructional pacing guides that reveal teacher integration and teaching of standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Embedded professional development to encourage the teaching of advanced skills; • Broad stakeholder involvement in the development of content; and • Coherence between Academic Content Standards and College Ready Standards to ensure alignment and seamless instruction.
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The state must provide documentation of the standards development process, including evidence of broad stakeholder involvement. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nebraska

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>1.3 – Required Assessments</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"> • Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). 	<p>306_State Statute Assessment_pp.1-3.pdf 307_Update- Standards, Assessment, and Accountability April 2017_pp.3-6.pdf 308_Nebraska Department of Education Assessment Website April 2017_p. 1.pdf</p>	<p>Evidence provided demonstrates that the State’s assessment system includes all of the required assessments in the appropriate grades.</p>
<p>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u> </u>X_ No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nebraska

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">1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</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"> • For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system; • For English learners (EL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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; ○ 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. 	<p>10_Rule 51 Participation in Assessments.pdf 13_SAA April 2017.pdf 14_SAA Fall 2016-2017.pdf 20_Rule_15 Guide for Implementation.pdf 15_SAA Update 18 Nov_2016.pdf 16_SAA Update 19 April_2017.pdf 17_NeSA Approved Accommodations Sept_2016.pdf 18_Guide for Including ELLs in NeSA 2016-17.pdf 109_Directions for administering the Spanish translation versions of the NeSAELA_M_S Online tests.pdf</p>	<p>Evidence confirms that all public elementary and secondary school students must be assessed. It is unclear how the State communicates such requirement with districts and schools.</p> <p>Evidence confirms that recently arrived English Learners may be exempted from one administration of reading/ language arts assessment.</p> <p>The “18_Guide for Including ELLs in NeSA 2016-17.pdf” evidence specified that native language assessments are only allowed for up to three years.</p> <p>Although there is evidence about including all students with disabilities in assessments, NDE has not provided information on policies that 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.</p>
<p>Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</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 Nebraska

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"> • Evidence of communication to districts and schools about the policy that all public elementary and secondary school students must participate in assessments • Information on policies stating that all 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 	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nebraska

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">1.5 – Participation Data</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>306_State Statute Assessment_pp.1-3.pdf 307_Update- Standards, Assessment, and Accountability April 2017_pp.3-6.pdf 308_Nebraska Department of Education Assessment Website April 2017_p. 1.pdf</p>	<p>The evidence on participation data show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system.</p>
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> <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 Nebraska

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 Nebraska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">2.1 – Test Design and Development</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"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; • Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design. 	<p>ACT Evidence #143-145 (ACT test blueprints for Reading, English & Writing and Math); #147 (ACT Technical Manual (pgs. 1-2 and 24-25)); #148 (ACT Technical Manual (pgs. 7-15 and 17-37)); #149 (ACT Technical Manual (pgs. 9-11 and 16))</p> <p>3-8 Evidence #48-54 (Draft blueprints); #55-56 (Test designs); #351 (Final-NeSA-2017-Technical-Report (pg. 3)) provides 2008 statutory language indicating the purpose of the state content standards, “The standards adopted shall be sufficiently clear and measurable to be used for testing student performance with respect to mastery of the content described in the state standards.”</p> <p>3-8 & 11 Alt Evidence #57 (ELA 3-8 2.1 NeSA-ELA Test Definition); #58 (ELA 3-8 2.1 NeSA Style Guide); #59 (ELA 3-8 & 11 2.1 2017 Alternate Test Design)</p>	<p>ACT Existing evidence provides technical details regarding test construction and cognitive positioning of test question including the purpose of the test and uses of results (ACT Technical Manual) Documents are expansive and meet informational component as indicated in Test design and development critical element. Documentation submitted demonstrates the ACT was developed as a measure of college and career readiness.</p> <p>Documentation was not submitted demonstrating the ACT measures the full range of the state content standards or that it is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the state’s content standards.</p> <p>3-8 Test blueprints provided (evidence #48-54 and those included in #352 the Technical Manual Appendices) are all labeled “Draft”. Final test blueprints will be needed for all grades. #55 & 56 (Test design forms) appear to have data redacted.</p> <p>3-8 & 11 Alt Unable to find test blueprints for the Alt assessment that are of sufficient detail to support a test development process that is technically sound.</p> <p>Suggestion The state should consider authentic professional development and cognitive engagement to develop understanding of processes that guide assessment development and application, including connection with standards based content/teaching, i.e. meeting</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 Nebraska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		notes, agenda.
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the ACT general assessments in high school, the state must provide evidence that the test design measures the full range of the State’s high school academic content standards (e.g., evidence of alignment of the test design blueprint to academic content standards). • For both general and alternate R/LA assessments, the state must provide final test blueprints. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nebraska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.2 – Item Development</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>ACT 150_2011 EPAS Item Writer information_pp5-6 and 12-15.pdf 151_Evidence 11, English Multiple Choice Item Writer Guide.pdf 152_Evidence 12, Reading Item Writer Guide.pdf 153_Evidence 13, ACT English Essay Writers Guide.pdf 154_Evidence 14, ACT Reading Passage Selection Guide.pdf 156_Evidence 15, ACT Mathematics Item Writer's Guide.pdf 157_Evidence 16, ACT Science Item Writer's Guide.pdf 158_Evidence 17, Your Guide to the ACT Assessment.pdf 159_Evidence 18, ACT Mathematics Test item writer assignment.pdf 160_Evidence 19, 2011 EPAS Item Writer information p 3-4.pdf 164_Forms Construction Guide, Form Specifications_p2-6.pdf 165_Forms Construction Guide, Item passage mix_pp2-8 to 2-10.pdf 166_Forms Construction Guide, Item reviews_pp2-2 and 2-3.pdf 167_Forms Construction Guide, Reviews_pp2-15 to 2-20.pdf 168_Forms Construction Guide, Statistical Reviews_pp2-1 and 2-2.pdf 169_The ACT Technical Manual_pp7-16.pdf</p> <p>3-8 Evidence #60 (DOK chart); #61 (Item Development Tech Manual); #62 (Style Guide for ELA Item Writers); #63 & 64 (Item writer training)</p> <p>3-8 & 11 Alt No documentation provided for the 3-8 & 11 Alt.</p>	<p>ACT Considerable documentation was provided on the technical quality of the processes and procedures for ACT item development.</p> <p>3-8 Evidence #151 (English Multiple Choice Item Writer Guide) was not provided. Documentation submitted demonstrates reasonable and technically sound item development processes.</p> <p>3-8 & 11 Alt No documentation was provided on the item development process for the 3-8 & 11 Alt assessment.</p>
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The state must provide documentation demonstrating the item development process for the R/LA Alternate Assessment. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nebraska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>Evidence #315 (NE SEA SAA Update April 2017 (Includes ACT)); #316 (Test Administration Orientation for spring 2017)</p> <p>ACT Evidence #171 (The ACT Test Administration Manual State and District Testing Special Testing)</p> <p>3-8 Evidence #314 (NE SEA update Fall 2016-2017); #296 (ELA3-8_2.3_Online Test Administration Manual); #297 (ELA3-8_2.3_Paper Pencil Test Administration Manual); #300 (ELA 3-8 2017 Online Test Administration Training)</p> <p>3-8 & 11 Alt Evidence #68 (ELA3- NeSA-Alternate Assessment Administration Manual); #298 (ELA 3-8a & 11 Alt ALT TEACHER Form A and AA Test Administration Training); #299 (ELA 3-8 & ELA3-8 and 11 Alt Paper-Pencil and AA_Test Administration Training)</p>	<p>ACT Documentation provided for ACT describes an appropriate set of policies and procedures for test administration training.</p> <p>3-8 Documentation for the 3-8 assessments describes an appropriate set of policies and procedures for test administration training.</p> <p>The state provided no evidence of a documented contingency plan for failure of technology</p> <p>3-8 & 11 Alt Documentation for the 3-8 & 11 Alt assessments describes an appropriate set of policies and procedures for test administration training.</p> <p>Evidence #68 (Alt Assessment Admin Manual pg. 6) states, “The testing process may be concluded when a student does not respond to a minimum of one item and the Test Administrator determines that the student will have no response to the remainder of the test items.” Does this mean that if a student doesn’t answer a question the administrator may stop the test?</p>
<p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State must clarify R/LA Alternate Assessment administration procedures for determining when a student “will have no response to the remainder of the test items” (Alternate Assessment Administration Manual pg. 6). • The state must provide evidence of a contingency plan to address possible technology challenges during online test administration. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nebraska

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">2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</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>330_20162017 NeSA Observations.pdf 12_Alternate Assessment Observations 6_Monitoring Visits</p>	<p>The evidence includes a list of schools that were observed for NeSA. The State has not provided any description about its approach to monitoring, documentation about the selection of districts and schools, monitor roles, or results of recent monitoring.</p> <p>For 5.4, evidence “12_Alternate Assessment Observations” shows a list of the alternate assessment and evidence “6_Monitoring Visits” shows a list of the districts monitored for IEP compliance.</p>
<p>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the ACT, general E/LA assessment, and R/LA Alt Assessment, the State must provide a description about its approach to monitoring, documentation about the selection of districts and schools, monitor roles, or results of recent monitoring. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nebraska

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 Nebraska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.5 – Test Security</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"> • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. 	<p>Evidence #317 (Nebraska Department of Education Test administration Orientation for Spring 2017); #318 (Nebraska State Department of Education Update (SAA); #319 (NE SEA Accountability Security Manual); #320 (All Security Documents Linked to Nebraska State Accountability Security Manual 2016-2017 Administration.pdf</p> <p>ACT Evidence #178 (Procedures for Investigating Testing Irregularities and Questioned Test Scores); #179 (excerpt from unidentified document)</p> <p>3-8 Evidence # 65-68 (Users guides and administration manuals); #299 (ELA 3-8 & ELA 3-8 and 11 Alt Paper-Pencil and AA Test Administration Training);</p> <p>3-8 & 11 Alt Evidence #65-69 (Users guides and administration manuals); #100 (test security, data & reporting excerpt from DRC contract); #137 (ELA 3-8_11 Test Development Security Plan)</p>	<p>While the State provided documentation of policies, processes & procedures to promote test security and investigate irregularities, the State did not provide documentation of reported irregularities or their response to reported irregularities. The State should provide documentation of reported test irregularities for all assessments (ACT & general and alternate) that indicates how many and what type of security breaches were reported in 2017 and the outcomes of their investigations.</p> <p>For an online assessment the state also needs to provide documentation from the vendor regarding the precautions they take to maintain security (processes, procedures & system monitoring) during administration. They also need to report summaries of any attacks, breaches, or suspicious activity.</p> <p>ACT Documentation submitted for ACT describe an appropriate set of policies and procedures to minimize test irregularities and strengthen the integrity of test results as well as processes and procedures for investigating testing irregularities and security breaches.</p> <p>3-8 Documentation submitted for 3-8 describe an appropriate set of policies and procedures to minimize test irregularities and strengthen the integrity of test results as well as processes and procedures for investigating reported testing irregularities and security breaches.</p> <p>3-8 & 11 Alt Documentation submitted for the 3-8 & 11 Alt describe an appropriate set of policies and procedures</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nebraska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		to minimize test irregularities and strengthen the integrity of test results as well as processes and procedures for investigating testing irregularities and security breaches.
Section 2.5 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The state must provide documentation of reported assessment irregularities and security breaches (for the ACT and general and alternate assessments) and the results of investigations. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nebraska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</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"> • To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 	<p>Evidence #115 (Nebraska Data Access and Use Policy and Procedures); #116-118 (Assessment Memorandum and appendixes)</p> <p>ACT Evidence #103 (ACT RP response excerpts); #183 (ACT Privacy Policy); #184 (ACT Information Security Program Summary)</p> <p>3-8 and 3-8 & 11 Alt Evidence #100 (excerpts from DRC contract); #301 (ELA 3-8 & ELA 3-8 and 11 eDIRECT User Guide); #302 (ELA 3-8 and ELA 3-8 and 11 Technical Proposal Excerpts); # 303 (ELA 3-8 and ELA 3-8 and 11 DRC Data Privacy Policy)</p>	<p>Documentation submitted demonstrates 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 for the ACT, 3-8 and 3-8 and 11 Alt assessments.</p>
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</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 Nebraska

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 Nebraska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</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"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. 	<p>ACT 187_Evidence 34, Reading content review panel instructions 2016.pdf 189_Evidence 4A - Supplement to ACT Technical Manual (4).pdf 191_The ACT Technical Manual_pp76-149.pdf 146_NE Alignment Report v2.pdf Evidence #146 (NE Alignment Report v2) provides no detailed analytics on the degree of alignment between the NE ELA state standards and the ACT ELA assessment.</p> <p>3-8 Evidence #70 (Technical Report excerpt - point-biserial Correlations); #97 (ELA3-8_ELAAA3-8n11_6.4_NeSA Reports Interpretive Guide (2016)) evaluated alignment between the standards and assessment for the 3 reporting areas assessed for 2016. Evidence #57 (ELA3-8_2.1_NeSA-ELA Test Definition (pg.3)) indicates 7 reporting areas.</p> <p>3-8 & 11 Alt Evidence #72 (ELA 3-8 and ELA 3-8 & 11 Third-Party Independent Alignment Report); #69 (ELA 3-8 & 11 Extended Standards Development); #71 (ELA 3-8n11 ALT point-biserial Correlations) Reviewers noted multiple areas in need of improvement.</p>	<p>ACT ACT Science test measures scientific inquiry. It does not measure content domains, but claims that foundational content knowledge helps students perform well on the test. Alignment part of the document shows that some science standards have a direct link to the ACT tests, while others have only an indirect link. There are many standards that do not have a direct link.</p> <p>The internal alignment study submitted for ACT indicated strong content coverage for the Math assessment but gaps in content coverage identified for both R/LA and Science.</p> <p>The State needs to provide an external alignment study demonstrating alignment of content and cognitive complexity between the state content standards and the ACT assessments.</p> <p>3-8 Independent alignment study was completed for ELA in 2017; It was a comprehensive evaluation using Webb’s method. Documentation provided shows alignment of College Ready standards with State Standards/Assessment (NE Alignment Report 3-21)</p> <p>3-8 & 11 Alt The alignment study indicates a number of areas where the alignment could be improved. State should consider options for improving the alignment of the 3-8 & 11 Alternate Assessment to the state content standards.</p>
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</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 Nebraska

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"> For all ACT assessments the state must provide independent alignment studies that demonstrate each assessment blueprint is aligned to the full range of State’s academic content standards.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nebraska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</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>ACT Evidence #196 (Forms Construction Guide_pp2.15-2.19 and Appendix A); #197 (The ACT Technical Manual (pgs 8 and 13-15))</p> <p>3-8 Evidence #72 (ELA 3-8_NeSA-ELA Third-Party Independent Alignment Report); #136 (ELA 3-8 3.2 DOK Chart)</p> <p>3-8 & 11 Alt Evidence #72 (ELA 3-8_NeSA-ELA Third-Party Independent Alignment Report)</p>	<p>ACT, 3-8 and 3-8 & 11 Alt</p> <p>The documentation describes the item review by content experts and item writers. It does not refer to validity of cognitive processes. That is, there is nothing in the document about think-alouds or other methods for studying examinee cognition directly.</p> <p>Documents only contain instructions for reviewers. Documentation was not provided of the review’s results.</p> <p>State did not provide documentation of studies to validate that the items developed (including new innovative item types) were tapping the intended cognitive processes.</p>
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For ACT, 3-8 and alt assessments, the state must provide documentation demonstrating its assessment items (and item types) tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the state’s academic content standards. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nebraska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</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>ACT Evidence #198 (Evidence 27, Correlations among subscores); #199 (Evidence 28, DIF analysis); #350 (ACT Writing Test Technical Report (pgs.10-17))</p> <p>3-8 Evidence #80 (ELA 3-8 3.3 strand intercorrelations (pgs. 74-80 & pgs. 325-327); #351 (chapter 5);</p> <p>3-8 & 11 Alt Evidence #81 (ELA 3-8 n 11 ALT 3.3 strand intercorrelations)</p>	<p>ACT Correlation and DIF documents use data from South Carolina.</p> <p>Documents do not show a factor analysis. There is no evidence for the use of subscores.</p> <p>3-8 Documentation submitted by the state demonstrates acceptable validity for its internal structure and supports their scoring and reporting.</p> <p>3-8 & 11 Alt While documentation provided (#81) demonstrates acceptable strand intercorrelations for the R/LA Alternate Assessment. The document source is not identified.</p>
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The state must provide evidence (such as a factor analysis or the Rasch principal components analysis done for the R/LA general assessment) demonstrating the dimensionality of the ACT and R/LA Alternate assessments. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nebraska

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 Nebraska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>ACT Evidence #111, 196, 203-209, 211-214, & 217</p> <p>3-8 Evidence #46 (Correlation of Reading Assessments 2017); #47 (Correlation of Math Assessments 2017)</p> <p>3-8 & 11 Alt No documentation provided for the 3-8 & 11 Alt.</p>	<p>ACT Existing Evidence indicates the State has documented adequate validity evidence that relates ACT process and outcome with other variables-relationships ACT scores with pre-high school achievement and high school course achievement (204 Influence of achievement in core high school courses on ACT scores)</p> <p>Existing evidence predicts ACT success in correlation with high school GPA(203 A Multidimensional Perspective of College Readiness-Relating Student and School Characteristics to Performance on ACT)</p> <p>Correlation of ACT with Math performance The ACT Technical Manual_pp67-70 217_The ACT Technical Manual_pp67-70.pdf</p> <p>Existing evidence correlates ACT performance and standards with STEM standards to predict how students excel in math and science (Development of STEM Readiness Benchmark to Assist Educational and Career Decision making.</p> <p>Existing evidence correlates standards based content data subject matter specific-math and reading</p> <p>No additional evidence needed</p> <p>3-8 The state provided acceptable evidence of external validity of its general assessments.</p> <p>3-8 & 11 Alt The state provided no evidence for the alternate assessment for this element. The state must provide</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 Nebraska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		evidence demonstrating the ELA Alternate Assessment's validity based on relationships with other variables.
Section 3.4 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the 3-8 & 11 R/LA Alternate assessment the state must provide evidence its validity based on relationships with other variables. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nebraska

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;">4.1 – Reliability</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"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement. 	<p>ACT 110_NE-specific Validity Based on Internal Structure, Reliability, Consistency, and DIF analyses.pdf 220_The ACT Technical Manual_pp51-64.pdf</p> <p>3-8 Evidence #83 (ELA 3-8 4.1 Reliabilities (pgs. 68-78));</p> <p>3-8 & 11 Alt #84 (ELA 3-8 and 11 ALT 4.1 Decision Consistency Accuracy); #85 (ELA 3-8 and 11 ALT 4.1 Overall Reliability)</p>	<p>ACT Evidence submitted demonstrates ACT scores are sufficiently reliable.</p> <p>3-8 Documentation submitted by the state provides evidence demonstrating acceptable reliability for the R/LA general assessment.</p> <p>3-8 & 11 Alt Documentation submitted by the state provides evidence demonstrating acceptable reliability for the R/LA alternate assessment.</p>
<p>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</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 Nebraska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<p>ACT 151_Evidence 11, English Multiple Choice Item Writer Guide.pdf 222_Evidence 11, English Multiple Choice Item Writer Guide_p6.pdf 224_Evidence 12, Reading Item Writer Guide_p7.pdf 226_Evidence 13, ACT English Essay Writers Guide_p6-8.pdf 154_Evidence 14, ACT Reading Passage Selection Guide.pdf 228_Evidence 14, ACT Reading Passage Selection Guide_p6(2).pdf 156_Evidence 13, ACT Mathematics Item Writer's Guide.pdf 230_Evidence 15, ACT Mathematics Item Writer's Guide_p6-7.pdf 232_Evidence 16, ACT Science Item Writer's Guide_pp9-10.pdf 159_Evidence 18, ACT Mathematics Test item writer assignment.pdf 235_Evidence 28, Differential Item Functioning Analysis.pdf 236_Evidence 35, Consultants Fairness Review Guide.pdf 239_The ACT Technical Manual_p14.pdf 240_The ACT Technical Manual_p3.pdf</p> <p>3-8 and 3-8 & 11 Alt Evidence #139 (ELA 3-8 & 11 4.2 Fairness in Testing); #140 (ELA 3-8 & 11 4.2 Universal Design Manual)</p>	<p>ACT Documentation submitted by the state demonstrates ACT has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p> <p>While #235 DIF analysis was conducted for South Carolina, the results are good.</p> <p>3-8 Documentation submitted by the state demonstrates steps in the item development process, including universal design and bias and sensitivity training, that the state has taken to ensure fairness of the assessment across student groups. Document #351 provides DIF analysis and evidence of fairness of final assessment forms.</p> <p>3-8 & 11 Alt Documentation was not provided demonstrating the final assessment forms were accessible and fair across student groups.</p>
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The state must submit evidence for the R/LA alternate assessments demonstrating the assessment forms are fair and accessible. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nebraska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>ACT Evidence #244 (The ACT Technical Manual (pgs. 14 & 54-55))</p> <p>3-8 Evidence #86 (ELA 3-8 4.3 Raw to Scale Score Distributions (pgs. 256-263))</p> <p>3-8 & 11 Alt Evidence #87 (ELA 3-8 & 11 ALT 4.3 Raw to Measure Score Distributions)</p>	<p>ACT Documentation provided by the state demonstrates the ACT assessments provide an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum.</p> <p>3-8 Documentation provided by the state demonstrates the R/LA general assessments provide an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum.</p> <p>3-8 & 11 Alt Documentation provided by the state demonstrates the alternate assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the performance continuum.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</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 Nebraska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.4 – Scoring</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>ACT Evidence #248 (Evidence 45, Equating stability); # 196 Forms Construction Guide (pgs. 2.15-2.19 and Appendix A)); #251 (Forms Construction Guide (pgs.2.2-2.12)); #252 (The ACT Technical Manual (pgs. 50-51)</p> <p>3-8 Evidence #88 (ELA 3-8 4.4 Autoscoring Process Flow Chart); #89 (ELA 3-8 4.4 TD Autoscoring Process); #90 (ELA 3-8 & ELAAA 3-8 and 11 4.4 NeSA Corrections System Instructions); #138 (ELA 3-8 4.4 PAS Scoring Process)</p> <p>3-8 & 11 Alt Evidence #88 (ELA 3-8 4.4 Autoscoring Process Flow Chart); #89 (ELA 3-8 4.4 TD Autoscoring Process); #90 (ELA 3-8 & ELAAA 3-8 and 11 4.4 NeSA Corrections System Instructions); #138 (ELA 3-8 4.4 PAS Scoring Process)</p>	<p>ACT The state has provided evidence demonstrating the ACT scores are reliable and facilitate valid score interpretations.</p> <p>3-8 The state provided evidence of the training process for hand scoring writing responses and evidence demonstrating an acceptable degree of reliability in the scoring process.</p> <p>3-8 & 11 Alt Documentation submitted by the state demonstrated acceptable scoring procedures and protocols for its R/LA alternate assessment.</p>
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</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 Nebraska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</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>ACT 248_Evidence 45, Equating stability.pdf 196_Forms Construction Guide_pp2.15-2.19 and Appendix A.pdf 251_Forms Construction Guide_pp2.2-2.12.pdf 252_The ACT Technical Manual_pp50-51.pdf</p> <p>3-8 and 3-8 & 11 Alt 295_ELA3-8n11ALT_4.5_Linking_Equating.pdf</p>	<p>ACT Documentation submitted by the state provides sufficient evidence to demonstrate ACT forms yield consistent score interpretations across school years.</p> <p>3-8 The state provides only a single form for each grade and subject.</p> <p>3-8 & 11 Alt The ELA Alternate assessment is provided as a single form paper/pencil assessment.</p>
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</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 Nebraska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</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"> Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<p>ACT 262_Evidence 46, ACT Test Mode Comparability Study.pdf 189_Evidence 4A - Supplement to ACT Technical Manual (4).pdf</p> <p>3-8 and 3-8 & 11 Alt The state provided no evidence for this element.</p>	<p>ACT Document #262 found some evidence that online and paper and pencil forms were different in terms of scores and timing but also provided evidence of an equating process to ensure comparability of scores.</p> <p>Document #189 provides test blueprints and scoring information. Would be good to list under 4.4 and 4.5. It also includes results from a comparability study (provides summary of 262 and a follow-up study).</p> <p>Documentation provided by the state demonstrated ACT utilized acceptable processes for ensuring comparability of its paper/pencil and online assessment scores.</p> <p>3-8 and 3-8 & 11 Alt Peers were uncertain if the state made translated forms of the general and alternate R/LA assessments available.</p>
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The state must provide documentation indicating the availability of translated forms of the R/LA general and alternate assessments and, if translated forms are available, documentation of the development process and evidence of comparability of the assessment results. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nebraska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</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>ACT 262_Evidence 46, ACT Test Mode Comparability Study.pdf 265_ACT National Curriculum Survey 2012_ Policy Implications on Preparing for Higher Standards.pdf 266_Evidence 38, Overview of ACT Technical Advisory Committee (1).pdf 269_The ACT Technical Manual_pp3,5, and 64.pdf</p> <p>3-8 and 3-8 & 11 Alt 94_ELA3-8_ELA3-8n11_4.7_May 2016 Planning Meeting Summary.pdf 91_ELA3-8_ELA3-8n11_August 2016 Planning Meeting Summary.pdf</p>	<p>ACT Documentation submitted by the state demonstrate monitoring of the ACT assessments’ technical quality.</p> <p>3-8 Documentation submitted by the state demonstrated a plan for the transition from the prior assessments based on the previous generation standards to a new assessment system based on higher quality college and career ready standards.</p> <p>3-8 & 11 Alt The state must provide documentation demonstrating an ongoing process for monitoring and improving the technical quality of the R/LA alternate assessment.</p>
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The state must provide documentation demonstrating an ongoing process for monitoring and improving the technical quality of the R/LA alternate assessment. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nebraska

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 Nebraska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</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"> • Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards; • States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs; • Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment; • Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities; • Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities; • Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic 	<p>Evidence #1 (Accommodations PowerPoint); #2 Alternate Assessment Participation Criteria); #3 Alternate Assessment Participation Criteria); #5 (IEP Team Decision Making Guidelines); #7 (NDE ACT Crosswalk of Accommodations); #8 (NeSA Approved Accommodations); #9 (Rule 51 - IEP Requirement); #11 (Special Education Meeting Agenda)</p> <p>ACT Evidence #270 (ACT Policy for Accommodations Documentation); #271 (User Guide - Test Accessibility and Accommodations System (TAA)); #272 (Chapter 04 Accessibility rev 10.3.17)</p>	<p>ACT, 3-8 and 3-8 & 11 Alt</p> <p>For all assessments, the state provided evidence to demonstrated that: assessment decisions for SWD were based on IEP Team decisions, guidance was provided on determining participation in either the general or alternate assessment, guidance on the selection of appropriate accommodations, and selection and use of accessibility tools.</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 Nebraska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments); The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum. 		
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
<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 Nebraska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</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"> • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. 	<p>Evidence #17 (NeSA Approved Accommodations Sept_2016); #25 (Rule 15); #18 (Guide for Including ELLs in NeSA _2016-17); #15 (SAA Update 18 Nov_2016); #16 (SAA Update 19 April_2017); #31 (NDE ELL Accommodations 2015-16 (Trainer Version))</p> <p>ACT Evidence #273 (ACT English Learner Supports Guide); #274 (ACT Policy for Supporting English Learners); #271 (User Guide - Test Accessibility and Accommodations System (TAA)); #272 (Chapter 04_Accessibility rev 10.3.17)</p> <p>3-8 Yes, evidence: #18</p> <p>Yes, evidence: #272, 273,</p> <p>Yes, evidence: #18</p>	<p>ACT For all ACT assessments the state provided evidence demonstrating processes and procedures for the inclusion of English learners including guidance on the identification of appropriate accommodations and accessibility features.</p> <p>3-8 and 3-8 & 11 Alt For all general and alternate R/LA assessments the state provided evidence demonstrating processes and procedures for the inclusion of English learners including guidance on the identification of appropriate accommodations and accessibility features.</p> <p>Suggestion Peers suggest the Assessment Office work with the SEA offices providing district support for SWD and EL students to identify supports and guidance provided to districts as a way of demonstrating state efforts for possible future peer review submissions.</p>
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</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 Nebraska

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 Nebraska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">5.3 – Accommodations</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"> Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 	<p>Evidence #112 (IEP pages); #113 Monitoring Visits); #17 (NeSA Approved Accommodations Sept 2016); #18 (Guide to Including and Accommodating ELLs in NeSA_2016-17)</p> <p>ACT Evidence #273 (ACT English Learner Supports Guide); #270 (ACT Policy for Accommodations Documentation); #274 (ACT Policy for Supporting English Learners); #271 (User Guide - Test Accessibility and Accommodations System (TAA)); #272 (Chapter 04 Accessibility rev 10.3.17); #283 (Evidence 48, Test Accessibility and Accommodations User Guide); #284 (Evidence 49, FAQs State District Testing the ACT); #189 (Evidence 4A - Supplement to ACT Technical Manual (4)); #286 (Evidence 50, Accommodations on the ACT Test)</p> <p>3-8 and 3-8 & 11 Alt Evidence #313 (Nebraska State Department of Education Assessment Department Consideration of Requests for Accommodations)</p> <p>Yes, evidence: #313</p>	<p>ACT, 3-8 and 3-8 & 11 Alt</p> <p>Documentation submitted demonstrates that NE and ACT have clear policies about accommodations. However, none of the documents show research about the effectiveness of the accommodations, and none show that the construct has not been altered. Also, no research was provided demonstrating comparability of scores between accommodated and non-accommodated students.</p>
<p>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</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 Nebraska

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"> • For all assessments the State must provide evidence (such as DIF analysis comparing scores of accommodated & non-accommodated, Rasch principal components analysis of residuals for the accommodated students, or a review of accommodations research) demonstrating the accommodations provided: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments; ○ Do not alter the construct being assessed; and ○ Allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nebraska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</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"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. 	<p>Evidence #17 (NeSA Approved Accommodations Sept 2016); #18 (Guide for Including and Accommodating ELLs in the NeSA 2016-17); #12 (Alternate Assessment Observations); #4 (IEP pages); #6 (Districts monitored for IEP compliance)</p> <p>ACT</p> <p>3-8 Evidence #330 () provides a list of locations monitored but no information how the sites were selected or what monitoring entailed. Nebraska needs to provide documentation describing their 3-8 monitoring practice and how it includes availability of the correct accommodations for IEP, 504, & EL students and that the accommodations provided are provided in a manner consistent with state test administration policy. #320 (All Security Documents) provides a monitor checklist including a check that approved accommodations are provided.</p> <p>3-8 & 11 Alt AA evidence #12 () provides a list of locations monitored but no information how the sites were selected or what monitoring entailed. Nebraska needs to provide documentation describing their alternate assessment monitoring practice and how it includes availability of the correct accommodations for IEP, 504, & EL students and that the accommodations provided are provided in a manner consistent with state test administration policy. #320 (All Security Documents) provides a monitor checklist including a check that approved accommodations are provided.</p>	<p>ACT No evidence was provided to indicate any state monitoring of ACT test administrations.</p> <p>3-8 and 3-8 & 11 Alt Document #320 (All Security Documents) provides a monitoring checklist which included a check that approved accommodations are provided but provided no information on how that could be confirmed by observers.</p> <p>Document #113 would be more appropriate here. It shows districts that were monitored, but it does not say what information was reviewed during the monitoring visit. While #113 regards monitoring IEP compliance, rather than specific accommodation compliance, this monitoring process provides an opportunity states use to confirm IEP team decisions regarding accommodations were followed in the testing process.</p> <p>The IEP forms have a place where the alternate assessment can be indicated on the IEP plan. There is one place for “Assessment” notes, but there is nothing specific to accommodations. Presumably, the accommodations would be in the “Assessment” field.</p>
<p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</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 Nebraska

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"> • The state must provide evidence it monitors ACT test administrations in its districts and schools to ensure that accommodations are administered with fidelity and state test administration procedures are followed. • The state must provide documentation of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Guidance/protocols for use of the on-site monitoring checklist, including steps taken to ensure IEP identified accommodations are provided; ○ Any existing monitoring process(es) implemented by districts; ○ The process used for identifying districts/schools for onsite monitoring; ○ Processes for Special Education Office monitoring ensuring IEP identified accommodations were provided; ○ The results of onsite monitoring. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nebraska

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</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"> • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; • The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels. 	<p>ACT Evidence # 321 (Nebraska State Department of Education PowerPoint Presentation to State Board of Education ACT Cut Scores); #322 (Nebraska State Department of Education State Board of Education Minutes ACT Cut Score Vote Sept 8, 2017 (pgs. 1,9)); #324 (Nebraska State Department of Education Announcement of Cut Scores for ACT to Nebraska Districts)</p> <p>3-8 and 3-8 & 11 Alt Evidence #323 (Nebraska State Department of Education State Board of Education Minutes)</p>	<p>ACT Documentation was provided by the state demonstrating adoption of academic achievement standards for the ACT distinguishing at least 3 levels of achievement, descriptions of competencies associated with each achievement level and achievement scores that differentiate between the achievement levels.</p> <p>3-8 Documentation was provided by the state demonstrating adoption of academic achievement standards and that the achievement standards apply to all public elementary and secondary school students.</p> <p>3-8 & 11 Alt Documentation was provided by the state demonstrating alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p> <p>Cut scores and board vote to adopt them are shown in the documents.</p>
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</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 Nebraska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p>ACT 325_2017 Nebraska Standard Setting for ACT July 10-11, 2017 Technical Report.pdf 326_Nebraska State Department of Education Materials for ACT Standard Setting July 2017.pdf</p> <p>3-8 95_ELA3-8_6.2_NeSA-ELA Standard Setting Technical Report.pdf</p> <p>3-8 & 11 Alt 96_ELA3-8n11AA_6.2_NeSA-AAELA Std Setting Technical Report.pdf</p>	<p>ACT The ACT empirical approach to standard setting is clearly described and meets requirements.</p> <p>Peers note that one problem with this method is that it places a heavy emphasis on college-bound students. Student who do well in NE but chose to not attend college are not factored into the prediction of “success”. “Career Ready” is not factored into the cut-score.</p> <p>Peers suggest ACT consider, if the claim is that the cut-scores indicate “College and Career Readiness” then the process does not fully support the claim as the current process only considers “College Readiness”.</p> <p>3-8 and 3-8 & 11 Alt</p> <p>Document #95 shows that standard setting for grades 3-8 was conducted by DRC. They used the Bookmark method.</p> <p>Document #96 shows that the NE alternate assessment used an Angoff procedure with the yes/no variation</p>
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</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 Nebraska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p>ACT 325_2017 Nebraska Standard Setting for ACT July 10-11, 2017 Technical Report.pdf 326_Nebraska State Department of Education Materials for ACT Standard Setting July 2017.pdf</p> <p>3-8 95_ELA3-8_6.2_NeSA-ELA Standard Setting Technical Report.pdf</p> <p>3-8 & 11 Alt 96_ELA3-8n11AA_6.2_NeSA-AAELA Std Setting Technical Report.pdf</p>	<p>ACT Documentation was not provided demonstrating ACT academic achievement standards alignment to the state content standards but did provide considerable documentation demonstrating alignment to College Readiness.</p> <p>3-8 and 3-8 & 11 Alt Documentation provided by the state provided sufficient evidence demonstrating the adoption of challenging and aligned academic achievement standards.</p>
<p>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</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 Nebraska

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 Nebraska

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">6.4 – Reporting</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"> • The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration; • The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results; • The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement; ○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors); ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; ○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to 	<p>Evidence #119 – 135 (Screen shots of State online assessment reporting system)</p> <p>ACT 189_Evidence 4A - Supplement to ACT Technical Manual (4).pdf 289_Evidence 53, ACT Student Report with Sample Data 17-18.pdf 290_Evidence 54, ACT High School Score Report 17-18.pdf 291_Evidence 55, The ACT High School Checklist 2017-2018.pdf 292_Evidence 56, 2016-2017 Profile Report - High School Sample (1).pdf 293_Evidence 57, State and District Record Layout 16-17.pdf 294_Using Your ACT Results.pdf 103_Peer Review,2.6, 6.4 Protecting data, Reporting.pdf</p> <p>3-8 and 3-8 & 11 Alt 100_Peer Review 2.5, 2.6, 6.4, Test security, Protecting data, Reporting.pdf 97_ELA3-8_ELAAA3-8n11_6.4_NeSA Reports Interpretive Guide.pdf 98_Reports Interpretive Guide NeSA-ELA, M, S 2017.pdf 99_2016-2017 Online Test Administration Manual Spanish Translation</p>	<p>ACT</p> <p>The ACT reports provide necessary information for interpretation of score results.</p> <p>3-8 and 3-8 & 11 Alt</p> <p>While documentation indicates Spanish translations are available as a testing accommodation it does not appear that student reports or support documentation is available in Spanish.</p> <p>The state assessment reporting website does not appear to provide any links to Spanish translations or support documents for parent.</p> <p>No evidence was found demonstrating assessment results were delivered in a timely manner.</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 Nebraska

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"> 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. 		
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that translated versions of the score reports and interpretive documents are available for students and parents in languages commonly spoken in the state, such as Spanish. Evidence of a process and timeline for delivering reports to students, parents, teachers, principals, and other stakeholders as soon as practicable after each test administration. 		

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