



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Frank Edelblut  
Commissioner of Education  
New Hampshire Department of Education  
101 Pleasant Street  
Concord, NH 03301

June 27, 2017

Dear Commissioner Edelblut:

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). The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) 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. Therefore, as you know, the Department reinstated peer review of State assessment systems so that each State receives feedback from external experts on the assessments it is currently administering. We appreciate the efforts required to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in June and August 2016. State assessment systems provide essential information that States, districts, principals, and teachers can use to identify the academic needs of students, target resources and supports toward students who need them most, evaluate school and program effectiveness, and close achievement gaps among students. A high-quality assessment system also provides useful information to parents about their children's advancement against and achievement of grade-level standards. The Department's peer review of State assessment systems is designed to provide feedback to States to support the development and administration of high-quality assessments.

On October 6, 2016, the Department sent a letter to chief State school officers outlining the outcomes for States related to the assessment peer review. I am writing to provide you feedback on your State's recent submission of evidence. External peer reviewers and Department staff evaluated the New Hampshire Department of Education's (NHDE) submission and found, based on the evidence received, that the components of your assessment system met some, but not all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of section 1111(b)(1) and (3) of the ESEA. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and our own analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

- Reading/Language Arts (R/LA) and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (Smarter Balanced): **Partially meets requirements**
- R/LA and mathematics general assessments in high school (Smarter Balanced): **Partially meets requirements**
- R/LA and mathematics alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (DLM-YE) in grades 3-8 and high school: **Partially meets requirements**

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

The specific list of items required for NHDE to submit is enclosed with this letter. Because some of the State's components have partially met the requirements, the Department is placing a condition on the State's Title I grant award related to those components of the assessment system. To satisfy this condition, NHDE must submit satisfactory evidence to address the items identified in the enclosed list. NHDE must submit a plan and timeline within 30 days outlining 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. Additionally, the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) will monitor progress on matters pertaining to requirements in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) related to the participation of students with disabilities in Title I assessments. Insufficient progress to address such matters may lead OSERS to place a condition on NHDE's IDEA Part B grant award.

The Department notes that NHDE requested and received approval on June 24, 2016, for a waiver from assessing speaking standards for the 2016–2017, 2017–2018, and 2018–2019 school years.

In addition, the full peer review notes from the review are enclosed. These recommendations to the Department formed the basis of the Department's determination. Please note that the peers' recommendations may differ from the Department's feedback; we encourage you to read the full peer notes for additional suggestions and recommendations for improving your assessment system beyond what is noted in the Department's feedback. Department staff will reach out to your assessment director in the next few days to discuss the peer notes and the Department's determination and to answer any questions you have.

Thank you for your ongoing commitment to improving educational outcomes for all students. I look forward to our continued partnership as we move ahead with this critical work. I appreciate the work you are doing to improve your schools and provide a high-quality education for your students. If you have any questions, please contact Tawanda Avery or Collette Roney of my staff at: [OSS.NewHampshire@ed.gov](mailto:OSS.NewHampshire@ed.gov).

Sincerely,

/s/

Jason Botel  
Acting Assistant Secretary  
Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Sandie MacDonald, Assessment and Accountability Bureau Administrator

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

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<p><b>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</b></p>	<p>For the entire assessment system in the State, NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that explicitly indicates the State applies its formally adopted academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State; OR</li> <li>• Documentation regarding the policies and procedures the NHDE uses to ensure that an LEA that does not apply the State’s academic content standards that meet all of the criteria in ESEA section 1111(b)(1) and 34 CFR § 200.1 regarding such standards and that the standards apply to all students in the LEA.</li> </ul>
<p><b>1.2 – Rigorous and Coherent Academic Content Standards</b></p>	<p>For the entire assessment system in the State, NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See evidence requested under element 1.1.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></p>	<p>For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the assessment design measures the State’s academic content standards regarding the language domain, or presents an explanation as to why this domain was not included.</li> </ul> <p>For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the Smarter Balanced test design aligns the assessments to the full depth and breadth for all of the academic content standards in R/LA (including speaking) and mathematics at each grade level. [NOTE: NHDE has received a speaking waiver; therefore, the Department does not expect the State to submit additional evidence regarding speaking during the period of the waiver]</li> <li>• Evidence that the item selection procedures for the computer adaptive test (CAT) adequately deliver tests that meet test design requirements for the intended depth of knowledge (DOK) of the assessments (also applies to evidence requested for element 2.2).</li> <li>• Evidence that, for cases where an assessment includes off-grade-level content, assessments produce grade level student achievement scores that are based only on grade-level items.</li> <li>• Evidence that the item pools for all versions of the assessments (i.e., general, American Sign Language, Braille and Spanish) are sufficient to support the test design requirements.</li> </ul>

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Additional Evidence Needed</b>
<b>2.2 – Item Development</b>	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See evidence regarding DOK and item pools in element 2.1 above.</li> </ul>
<b>2.3 – Test Administration</b>	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), and for R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a comprehensive contingency plan to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>
<b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b>	<p>For the entire assessment system in the State, NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 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.</li> </ul>
<b>2.5 – Test Security</b>	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high (Smarter Balanced), NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Prevention of any assessment irregularities,</li> <li>○ Detection of test irregularities, and</li> <li>○ Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the assessments,</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Evidence of consequences in the State for confirmed violations of test security.</li> <li>• Evidence of annual training requirements for test security policies and procedures for anyone administering the State assessments.</li> </ul>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b>	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence as noted for all item pools in element 2.1 above.</li> <li>• Evidence that Smarter Balanced assessments that include off-grade-level content conform to the on-grade level blueprint for the assessment.</li> <li>• Evidence of alignment of sample test forms for grades 3, 4, 6 and 7 in R/LA and mathematics.</li> <li>• Evidence of improved alignment of the tests, based upon the findings of the independent alignment study.</li> </ul>
<b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b>	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<b>4.1 – Reliability</b>	<p>For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of monitoring and refinement of the diagnostic classification models from subsequent test administrations.</li> </ul>
<b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</b>	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of estimated reliability for students receiving accommodations using operational data.</li> </ul> <p>For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the development and selection of reading passages that includes information about steps that test developers have taken to ensure reading passages are accessible to students with significant cognitive disabilities.</li> <li>• Evidence of the development and selection and/or creation of graphic components in the assessment (e.g., drawn or photographed images) that includes information about steps that test developers have taken to ensure passages from general grade-level texts are made accessible to students with significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul>
<b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b>	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See evidence regarding DOK and item pools in element 2.1 above.</li> </ul>
<b>4.4 – Scoring</b>	<p>For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of monitoring procedures used for scoring DLM-YE writing items, including measures of inter-rater reliability.</li> </ul> <p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that Smarter Balanced has clear, unambiguous criteria to ensure and document inter-rater reliability for States that are conducting hand-scoring of Smarter Balanced performance items. These criteria should include minimum thresholds for all States.</li> </ul>
<b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b>	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the design and development of the item pools used to support multiple versions of the assessments, specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Computer-adaptive in American Sign Language (R/LA listening only, Math)</li> <li>○ Computer-adaptive in braille (R/LA, math)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Computer-based fixed form in braille (math)</li> <li>○ Paper in braille (R/LA, math)</li> <li>○ Computer-adaptive in Spanish (math)</li> <li>○ Paper in Spanish (math)</li> <li>● Evidence that item pools for these additional computer adaptive versions can support the adaptive test design.</li> </ul>
<b>5.1 – Procedures for the Inclusion of Students with Disabilities</b>	<p>For the entire assessment system in the State, NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence explaining any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards.</li> <li>● Documentation that the State informs parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities 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.</li> <li>● Documentation of procedures to ensure that the State’s implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes students’ access to the general curriculum.</li> </ul>
<b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</b>	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence of guidance regarding selection of the Spanish version of the Smarter Balanced assessments for English learners, and evidence of procedures for communication of this guidance to districts, schools, teachers and parents.</li> </ul>
<b>5.3 – Accommodations</b>	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Confirmation that it fully implements the Smarter Balanced Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines (i.e., that no accommodation or accessibility tool has been excluded).</li> </ul> <p>For the entire assessment system in the State, NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence that the State has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>
<b>5.4– Monitoring Testing of Special Populations</b>	<p>For the entire assessment system in the State, NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence that it monitors test administration of both general and alternate assessments, 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</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>○ Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>○ Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>○ Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner;</li> <li>○ Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</b></p>	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced) and the R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence that NHDE has formally adopted academic achievement standards (including cut scores, descriptions and levels), and that NHDE applies these standards to all public elementary and secondary school students, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities taking the AA-AAAS.</li> <li>● Evidence that NHDE has formally adopted alternate academic achievement standards (including cut scores, descriptions and levels), and that NHDE applies these standards to all public elementary and secondary school students who take an AA-AAAS.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p>	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Documentation of the use of tools and resources made available to parents, teachers, principals, and administrators to facilitate the interpretation and use of assessment results.</li> <li>● Documentation showing delivery or dissemination of individual student reports and guides to score interpretation to facilitate the interpretation and use of assessment results.</li> <li>● Documentation of the availability of results in alternate formats (e.g., Braille, other languages, etc.).</li> <li>● Documentation of a process and timeline for report delivery.</li> </ul>

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

## August 2016 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 NEW HAMPSHIRE

## Contents

<b>SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS .</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students ....	3
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards .....	4
1.3 – Required Assessments .....	5
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments .....	8
1.5 – Participation Data .....	11
<b>SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS .....</b>	<b>12</b>
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	12
2.2 – Item Development.....	13
2.3 – Test Administration .....	14
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration.....	16
2.5 – Test Security .....	17
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....	19
<b>SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....</b>	<b>20</b>
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	20
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	21
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure .....	22
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables.....	23
<b>SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER .....</b>	<b>24</b>
4.1 – Reliability.....	24
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	25
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	26
4.4 – Scoring .....	27
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms .....	29
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment .....	30
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance.....	31
<b>SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS .....</b>	<b>32</b>
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities .....	32
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	35
5.3 – Accommodations.....	37
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations .....	39
<b>SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .</b>	<b>40</b>
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students .....	40
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....	42
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards .....	43
6.4 – Reporting.....	44

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</b></p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all subjects</p> <p>NHG27 p26-assessment, p29-curriculum, p31-curriculum, p33-high school curriculum, p61-ela standards, p79, p82-mathematics standards</p> <p>C5, C20, C49 – competency system</p>	<p>The evidence provided shows that NH formally adopted the CCSS for reading/language arts and mathematics. The CCSS are widely recognized as “challenging.” NH peer reviewer noted, however, that F1 – FAQ Adoption of NH CCSS, question 7, seems to allow districts to “not adopt” the CCSS (and possibly use other standards). Can districts possibly adopt standards that do not meet this critical element, for instructional purposes? If so, does this create a conflict with the State’s adoption of CCSS? Please clarify.</p> <p>NH stated that this critical element was previously reviewed for science.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>Note: Some of the evidence required for this and subsequent summary statements apply to the Consortia and not the State.</p>		
<p><u>  </u>x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarification as to whether local districts are permitted to opt out of adoption of CCSS, and if so, what process the State has for reviewing district-level standards in these cases to determine if such standards meet this critical element.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</b></p> <p>The State’s academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science specify what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school to succeed in college and the workforce; contain content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all three subjects</p> <p>See in particular NHG3, B1-B3, pp47-49, p60</p> <p>F1 – FAQ Adoption of NH CCSS pp2-4</p>	<p>The evidence provided shows that the State’s content standards in reading/language arts and mathematics meet all aspects of this critical element.</p> <p>NH stated that this critical element was previously reviewed for science.</p> <p>Peer reviewers’ note under 1.1 applies here as well.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>_x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarification as to whether local districts are permitted to opt out of adoption of CCSS, and if so, what process the State has for reviewing district-level standards in these cases to determine if such standards meet this critical element.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p><b>1.3 – Required Assessments</b></p> <p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments (based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate academic achievement standards-AAAS) in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12);</li> <li>• Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12).</li> </ul>	<p>New Hampshire Ed 306.24 Assessment (R7).            (a) The local school board shall require that each school:            (1) Provides for the ongoing assessment of district and graduation competencies through the use of local assessments that are aligned with state and district content and performance standards as provided in (b)            (2) Participates in the state-wide education improvement and assessment program as provided in (c) below;            (3) Participates in the New Hampshire performance assessments;            (4) When selected by the United States Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics participates in the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP); and            (5) Supports student development of individual student digital portfolios.            (c) Each school shall maintain the following as evidence of participation in the state-wide education improvement and assessment program established under RSA 193-C:            (1) Written guidelines for the inclusion of and accommodations for student participation, including, but not limited to, inclusion of and accommodations for:                a. Students in major racial and ethnic groups;                b. Students with disabilities;                c. Economically disadvantaged students; and                d. Students with limited English proficiency;            (2) Procedures for test security and the accurate inclusion of student data; and            (3) Procedures by which assessment results are communicated to:</p>	<p>Requirements met.</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 NEW HAMPSHIRE**

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>a. Parents;  b. Faculty; and  c. The community.</p> <p>RSA 193-C, the “Statewide Education Improvement and Assessment Program,” is the primary New Hampshire statute that implements that responsibility, saying that the annual assessment is “an important element in educational improvement” and “an effective measure of accountability” when done right.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> R2 Section 193-C3 Program Established Goals  RSA 193-H, “School Performance and Accountability,” expands on this requirement, saying that schools “shall ensure that all pupils are performing at the basic level or above on the statewide assessment” and “shall meet statewide performance targets.”</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> R5 Section 193-H School Performance and Accountability  Evidence of binding statute can be found in the following documents:  <input type="checkbox"/> M4 NH DOE ESEA Flexibility Waiver Renewal Request March 2015. Assessments. Pg. 42-52  An assessment memo is sent annually to all NH Superintendents, School Principals, Special Education Directors and Assessment Coordinators. Includes information about New Hampshire’s statewide assessment system for the 2014-15 school year.  New Hampshire Peer Assessment Critical Evidence Pg. 22 Submission Date: June 3, 2016  The system includes Smarter Balanced, NECAP Science, Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM), NH Science Alternate Learning Portfolio’s (ALPs), ACCESS for</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 NEW HAMPSHIRE

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
<b>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>		
_x_ No additional evidence is required.		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE**

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p><b>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</b></p> <p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system;</li> <li>• For English learners (EL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment;</li> <li>○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> E1 NH Consolidated State Application for Title III Accountability Procedures</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> KM7 September 13 Assessment pg. 2</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> NHG61 Alternative Assessment Decision Making Worksheet</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> NHG63 State Approved Special Consideration Forms and Guide</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> NHG64 Statewide Assessment Required Student Participation</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> NHG66 Statewide Assessment Memo 2014-2015</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> R6 Title XV Chapter 193-C Statewide Education Improvement and Assessment Program</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> TA2 No Assessment Exemptions</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> TA3 Technical Advisory No Assessment Opt-out</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> TA5 Technical Advisory Required Participation 2014</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> NHG63 State Approved Special Consideration Forms and Guide</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> SB2 Literature Review of Testing Accommodations and Accessibility Tools for Students with Disabilities</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> SB3 Summary of Literature on Empirical Studies of the Validity and Effectiveness of Test Accommodations for ELLs</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> SB4 Translation Accommodations Framework for testing English Language Learners in Mathematics</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> SB5 Accommodations for English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> SB6 Usability Accessibility and Accommodation Guidelines</li> <li>SBAC Native Language Accommodations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> SB6 Usability Accessibility and Accommodation Guidelines pp. 13-17</li> </ul> </li> <li>DLM Native Language Accommodations</li> </ul>	<p>Requirements met.</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 NEW HAMPSHIRE

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><input type="checkbox"/> D1 DLM Accessibility Manual pp. 13-16 New Hampshire Peer Assessment Critical Evidence Pg. 25 Submission Date: June 3, 2016</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> E3 ESOL Guidance for Placement and Assessment pg. 3. Monitoring &amp; Exit</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Students transition to monitored status for two years upon attainment of proficiency in English, as measured by the ACCESS for ELLs© test.</li> <li>2. No ESOL instructional services can be provided during the monitoring period.</li> <li>3. ESOL teachers should check students’ progress quarterly (or three times a year, based on the district’s reporting cycle) by reviewing grades on report cards.</li> <li>4. If an English Learner does not receive grades of C or better and low grades are related to second language acquisition, he or she may be re-entered in ESOL program with parental permission. Upon attainment of proficiency on the ACCESS for ELLs© test, the student returns to monitored status.</li> <li>5. The ESOL teacher should document a student’s monitored status in the cumulative folder, as well as in the EL’s electronic or paper-based working file.</li> <li>6. When a student successfully completes the two-year monitoring period, he or she officially exits the ESOL program. Documentation of this fact should be clearly noted in the student’s cumulative folder, as well as in the electronic or paper ESOL files</li> </ol> <p><input type="checkbox"/> E1 NH Consolidated State Application for Title III Accountability Procedures pg. 7 Criteria for Determining Sufficiency of Individual Student Progress. Pg. 12 Starting Points and Targets for Academic Proficiency for LEP Students</p> <p>For students with disabilities, Instructions for</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 NEW HAMPSHIRE**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
	Individualized Education Program (IEP) teams and/or other key documents; <input type="checkbox"/> NHG3 State Innovation Plan Pg. A-36 <input type="checkbox"/> NHG64 Statewide Assessment Required Student Participation <input type="checkbox"/> ALT1 Participation 2-8 <input type="checkbox"/> ALT2 Participation High School <input type="checkbox"/> ALT3 Special Consideration <input type="checkbox"/> ALT4 Out of District Placement <input type="checkbox"/> ALT5 1% Presentation <input type="checkbox"/> ALT6 1% Summary <input type="checkbox"/> NHG21 Assessment Participation Decision Matrix <input type="checkbox"/> NHG33 NH 1% Rule for Alternative Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> NHG35 Statewide Exemption Guide	
<b>Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>		
___x_ No additional evidence is required.		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p><b>1.5 – Participation Data</b></p> <p>The State’s participation data show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system. In addition, if the State administers end-of-course assessments for high school students, the State has procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates on each required assessment and provides the corresponding data.</p>	<p>Student Participation Rates in New Hampshire on the 2014-2015 State Assessment are as follows:</p> <p>Grade 3 98%</p> <p>Grade 4 98%</p> <p>Grade 5 98%</p> <p>Grade 6 97%</p> <p>Grade 7 95%</p> <p>Grade 8 94%</p> <p>Grade 11 83%</p> <p>State Rate 95%</p> <p>Complete Data Files: (Separate Files on NH Electronic Report)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> SB29 SBAC Disaggregated Data File 2014-2015 ELA</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> SB30 SBAC Disaggregated Data File 2014-2015 Math</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> SB31 SBAC Disaggregated Data File 2014-2015</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> SB32 SBAC Disaggregated Data File 2014-2015</p>	<p>Data files submitted by State show disaggregated data for denominator and numerator. But no overall data indicating AA-AAAS participation is shown.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data indicating participation in AA-AAAS as part of overall tested population.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE

### SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results;</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills);</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>NH stipulated that the Smarter Balanced submission constitutes the complete presentation on this critical element for NH general assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics. This applies to 2.1.1-2.1.4. Given that, the additional evidence called for in the SB peer review must be provided. Refer to peer review of SB 2.1.</p> <p>Peer review of SB 2.1 indicates that a waiver to use SBAC due to the exclusion of speaking in the assessment is needed from each participating State and therefore must be provided by NH.</p> <p>NH stipulated that the Dynamic Learning Maps submission constitutes the complete representation on this critical element for NH alternate assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics. This applies to 2.1.1-2.1.4. Given that, the additional evidence called for in the DLM peer review must be provided. Refer to peer review of DLM 2.1.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A waiver to use SBAC due to the exclusion of speaking in the assessment.</li> <li>• Additional evidence called for in the Smarter Balanced and DLM peer reviews.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.2 – Item Development</b></p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>NH stipulated that the Smarter Balanced submission constitutes the complete presentation on this critical element for NH general assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics. Given that, the additional evidence called for in the SB peer review must be provided. Refer to peer review of SB 2.2.</p> <p>NH stipulated that the Dynamic Learning Maps submission constitutes the complete presentation on this critical element for NH alternate assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics. Refer to peer review of DLM 2.2.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional evidence called for in the Smarter Balanced peer review.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>• Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments;</li> <li>• If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>NH stipulated that the Smarter Balanced submission constitutes the complete presentation on this critical element for NH general assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics. This applies to 2.3.1-2.3.3. Refer to peer review of SB 2.3.</p> <p>Peer review of SB 2.3 indicates the following needed from individual member states for 2.3.3:</p> <p>“a. A contingency plan detailed for their State, and in alignment with SBAC’s guidelines.</p> <p>b. Documentation that test administrators have technology failure contingency procedures in place and access to helpdesk/troubleshooting support.</p> <p>c. Documentation of school readiness for operational administration of technology-based assessments.”</p> <p>Contingency planning and technology failure contingency procedures did not appear to be readily available in the NH Smarter Balanced Assessment Portal (<a href="http://nh.portal.airast.org">nh.portal.airast.org</a>). (SB review 2.3.3(a)&amp;(b)).</p> <p>System requirements for online testing are in Technical Specifications Manual for Online Testing – for Technology Coordinators – 2015-2016 (<a href="http://nh.portal.airast.org/wp-content/uploads/Tech_Specs_Manual_2015-2016.pdf">http://nh.portal.airast.org/wp-content/uploads/Tech_Specs_Manual_2015-2016.pdf</a>). However, the NH peer reviewers found no documentation of schools’ readiness per these requirements. (SB review 2.3.3(c))</p> <p>NH stipulated that the Dynamic Learning Maps submission constitutes the complete presentation on this critical element for NH alternate assessments in</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 NEW HAMPSHIRE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>reading/language arts and mathematics. This applies to 2.3.1-2.3.3. Refer to peer review of DLM 2.3.</p> <p>Peers note that for BOTH the general and alternate assessments, there needs to be (a) contingency plans in response to possible technology challenges, and (b) documentation of school technology readiness.</p>
<b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional evidence called for in the Smarter Balanced peer review.</li> <li>• Contingency plans for technology challenges/failures for both, general and alternate assessment systems.</li> <li>• Documentation of school readiness for operational administration of technology-based assessments.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p><b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p>Additional New Hampshire Evidence: Pursuant to Ed. 306.24:C (2) “Procedures for test security and the accurate inclusion of student data;” All New Hampshire schools should have process and procedure in place and an associated timeline for ensuring that Test Administrators, Coordinators, Proctors (and any other individuals who will be administering any secure assessment) have read and understand all test administration materials, information and forms associated with Smarter Balanced assessments. Schools and districts should also have a process in place for monitoring social media for the posting or discussion of any secure assessment items and/or materials. All improprieties, irregularities and breaches should be recorded on the appropriate Test Security Log sheet and reported to the New Hampshire Department of Education.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> R7Ed 306.24 Assessment</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> NHG11 SBAC Test Security</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> NHG12 SBAC Test Security Log</li> </ul> <p>Schools and districts are held accountable with a duty to report. Failure to report may result in revocation of educator credentials.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> R8 Ed511 Grounds for Revocation</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> R9 Ed510 Duty to Report</li> </ul>	<p>additional evidence is needed to document that New Hampshire 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><b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: additional evidence is needed to document that New Hampshire adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools</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 NEW HAMPSHIRE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.5 – Test Security</b></p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS</p>	<p>NH asserts strict adherence to the Smarter Balanced security guidelines described in SB 2.5.1-2.5.4. NH stipulates that SB 2.5.1-2.5.4 constitutes the complete presentation for NH. Refer to peer review SB 2.5.</p> <p>Peer review of SB 2.5 indicates the following needed from individual member States: “Documentation of State’s security policies and procedures and the relationship of the State’s policies and procedures to those of SBAC. In other words, a State’s security policies and procedures should reference SBAC’s policies and procedures and demonstrate coherence with these. It should be clear from all available documentation (regardless of source – SBAC or State) that all aspects of critical element 2.5 are addressed.”</p> <p>The NH Online Test Administration Manual (<a href="http://nh.portal.airast.org/wp-content/uploads/NH_Test-Administration-Manual-2015-2016.pdf">http://nh.portal.airast.org/wp-content/uploads/NH_Test-Administration-Manual-2015-2016.pdf</a>) provides procedures for administrators on preventing test irregularities (2.5.1). It provides instructions for administrators on how to report test irregularities by level of severity (2.5.3). 2.5.2 and 2.5.4 are not addressed in the online TAM.</p> <p>The NH Paper Pencil Test Administration Manuals for ELA (<a href="http://nh.portal.airast.org/wp-content/uploads/ELA_PaperAdmin_TAM.pdf">http://nh.portal.airast.org/wp-content/uploads/ELA_PaperAdmin_TAM.pdf</a>) and Math (<a href="http://nh.portal.airast.org/wp-content/uploads/Math_PaperAdmin_TAM.pdf">http://nh.portal.airast.org/wp-content/uploads/Math_PaperAdmin_TAM.pdf</a>) address only 2.5.1.</p> <p>With respect to 2.5.2 and 2.5.4, NH appears to have a data forensics program (Evidence X3 AIR Tech Report), but peers found no reporting on any of the</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 NEW HAMPSHIRE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>data forensics-related statistics in the program. Only one data forensics metric (year-on-year changes in student performance) requires more than one year of administration. The others (response latency and person fit) do not; data could have been reported on these.</p> <p>NH asserts strict adherence to the Dynamic Learning Maps security guidelines described in DLM 2.5.1-2.5.4. NH stipulates that DLM 2.5.1-2.5.4 constitutes the complete presentation for NH. Refer to peer review DLM 2.5.</p> <p>Under notes for DLM 2.5.2 and 2.5.3, the following is stated: “Evidence from DLM is sufficient in this section; more evidence is expected from States.”</p> <p>Peers located this evidence in the AIR Tech Report and Test Administration Manual.</p>
<b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional evidence called for in the Smarter Balanced peer review, specifically evidence of application of those aspects of the data forensics program for which NH has the requisite data to implement.</li> </ul>		

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



**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> <li>• If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>NH stipulates that SB 3.1 constitutes the complete presentation for NH on this critical element. NH asserts that it does not provide additional narrative and supporting evidence. Refer to peer review of SB 3.1.</p> <p>By asserting adherence to the use of the Smarter Balanced test blueprint, summative item pools, and proprietary adaptive algorithm, NH indicates that the Smarter Balanced peer review submission fully applies to NH.</p> <p>NH stipulates that DLM 3.1 constitutes the complete presentation for NH on this critical element. NH asserts that it does not provide additional narrative and supporting evidence. Refer to peer review of DLM 3.1.</p> <p>See recommendation under 4.1.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional evidence called for in the Smarter Balanced peer review.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>NH stipulates that SB 3.2 and DLM 3.2 constitute the complete presentations for NH on this critical element. NH asserts that it does not provide additional narrative and supporting evidence. Refer to peer reviews of SB 3.2 and DLM 3.2.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional evidence called for in the Smarter Balanced peer review.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b></p> <p>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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>NH stipulates that SB 3.3 and DLM 3.3 constitute the complete presentations for NH on this critical element. NH asserts that it does not provide additional narrative and supporting evidence. Refer to peer reviews of SB 3.3 and DLM 3.3.</p> <p>By asserting adherence to the use of the Smarter Balanced test blueprint, summative item pools, and proprietary adaptive algorithm, NH indicates that the Smarter Balanced peer review submission fully applies to NH.</p> <p>Although not explicitly required by this critical element, peer reviewers recommend that the State examine internal structure specifically for NH, using just NH data, as an additional source of validity evidence.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional evidence called for in the Smarter Balanced peer review.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>NH stipulates that SB 3.4 and DLM 3.4 constitute the complete presentations for NH on this critical element. NH asserts that it does not provide additional narrative and supporting evidence. Refer to peer reviews of SB 3.4 and DLM 3.4.</p> <p>By asserting adherence to the use of the Smarter Balanced test blueprint, summative item pools, proprietary adaptive algorithm, and cut scores, NH indicates that the Smarter Balanced peer review submission fully applies to NH.</p> <p>Although not explicitly required by this critical element, peer reviewers recommend that the State examine relationships with other variables specifically for NH, using just NH data, as an additional source of validity evidence.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional evidence called for in the Smarter Balanced peer review.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>4.1 – Reliability</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>NH stipulates that SB 4.1 and DLM 4.1 constitute the complete presentations for NH on this critical element. NH asserts that it does not provide additional narrative and supporting evidence. Refer to peer reviews of SB 4.1 and DLM 4.1.</p> <p>Peer review of SB 4.1 indicates that the following is needed from either Smarter Balanced or the member states: “Test reliability of the assessments estimated for each State separately and each subgroup within State (these estimates will also need to meet adequacy criteria).”</p> <p>By asserting adherence to the use of the Smarter Balanced test blueprint, summative item pools, proprietary adaptive algorithm, and cut scores, NH indicates that the Smarter Balanced peer review submission fully applies to NH.</p> <p>Recommendation: Reviewers call attention to DLM peer review notes, section 4.1, where there are references to additional data desirable as the program matures. We believe this recommendation is applicable to critical elements in Sections 3 (Technical Quality – Validity) and 4 (Technical Quality – Other).</p>
<p><b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional evidence called for in the DLM and Smarter Balanced peer reviews.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</b></p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>NH stipulates that SB 4.2 and DLM 4.2 constitute the complete presentations for NH on this critical element. NH asserts that it does not provide additional narrative and supporting evidence. Refer to peer reviews of SB 4.2 and DLM 4.2.</p> <p>By asserting adherence to the use of the Smarter Balanced test blueprint, summative item pools, proprietary adaptive algorithm, and cut scores, NH indicates that the Smarter Balanced peer review submission fully applies to NH.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional evidence called for in the Smarter Balanced and DLM peer reviews.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b></p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>NH stipulates that SB 4.3 and DLM 4.3 constitute the complete presentations for NH on this critical element. NH asserts that it does not provide additional narrative and supporting evidence. Refer to peer reviews of SB 4.3 and DLM 4.3.</p> <p>By asserting adherence to the use of the Smarter Balanced test blueprint, summative item pools, proprietary adaptive algorithm, and cut scores, NH indicates that the Smarter Balanced peer review submission fully applies to NH.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional evidence called for in the Smarter Balanced peer review.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>NH stipulates that SB 4.4 and DLM 4.4 constitute the complete presentations for NH on this critical element. NH asserts that it does not provide additional narrative and supporting evidence. Refer to peer reviews of SB 4.4 and DLM 4.4.</p> <p>By asserting adherence to the use of the Smarter Balanced test blueprint, summative item pools, proprietary adaptive algorithm, and cut scores, NH indicates that the Smarter Balanced peer review submission fully applies to NH.</p> <p>The account of scoring processes includes a statement to the effect that MI employs many experienced readers and recruits new ones. This general statement should be substantiated with detail relevant to the scoring of the State’s assessment (e.g., how many experienced raters were engaged in scoring the assessment, what kind of previous scoring experience had they had).</p> <p>MI uses three formats for training: in-person training, distance webinar training with a live trainer, and remote self-training. It would be helpful to know what analyses have been done—if any—to compare performance (both in training and live scoring) of raters trained under those different conditions.</p> <p>Anonymity of students whose responses are being scored is only one way to reduce/eliminate bias. More information on features of training that attend to reduction in rater bias is advisable.</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 NEW HAMPSHIRE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional evidence called for in the SB and DLM peer reviews.</li> <li>• Further detail related to (i) the qualifications of raters (specific previous scoring experience), (ii) evidence of analyses of performance of raters under different training conditions used in scoring, and (iii) evidence that training includes strategies to reduce rater bias.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</b></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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>NH stipulates that SB 4.5 and DLM 4.5 constitute the complete presentations for NH on this critical element. NH asserts that it does not provide additional narrative and supporting evidence. Refer to peer reviews of SB 4.5 and DLM 4.5.</p> <p>By asserting adherence to the use of the Smarter Balanced test blueprint, summative item pools, proprietary adaptive algorithm, and cut scores, NH indicates that the Smarter Balanced peer review submission fully applies to NH.</p> <p>Although DLM peer reviewers asked for no additional evidence, Section 4.5 of that review includes numerous comments that raise concern about clarification and detail that would have been helpful.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional evidence called for in the SB peer review.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b></p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>• Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>NH stipulates that SB 4.6 and DLM 4.6 constitute the complete presentations for NH on this critical element. NH asserts that it does not provide additional narrative and supporting evidence. Refer to peer reviews of SB 4.6 and DLM 4.6.</p> <p>By asserting adherence to the use of the Smarter Balanced test blueprint, summative item pools, proprietary adaptive algorithm, and cut scores, NH indicates that the Smarter Balanced peer review submission fully applies to NH.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional evidence called for in the SB peer review.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b></p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>NH stipulates that SB 4.7 and DLM 4.7 constitute the complete presentations for NH on this critical element. NH asserts that it does not provide additional narrative and supporting evidence. Refer to peer reviews of SB 4.7 and DLM 4.7.</p> <p>By asserting adherence to the use of the Smarter Balanced test blueprint, summative item pools, proprietary adaptive algorithm, and cut scores, NH indicates that the Smarter Balanced peer review submission fully applies to NH.</p> <p>Although DLM peer reviewers asked for no additional evidence, Section 4.7 of that review includes numerous comments that raise concern about clarification and follow-up that would have been helpful.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional evidence called for in the SB peer review.</li> </ul>		

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



## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;</li> <li>• Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments);</li> <li>• The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.</li> </ul>		<p>5.1.2: Peer reviewers were unable to locate evidence of the specific processes by which the IEP Team makes decisions about how to assess students with disabilities.</p> <p>5.1.3: <a href="#">NHG61 Alternative Assessment Decision Making Worksheet.pdf</a>, addresses whether a student should be assessed on the general assessment or on the alternate. <a href="#">SB6 Usability Accessibility and Accommodation Guidelines</a> addresses what accommodation(s) to use for different disabilities, thus addressing whether to assess with or without accommodation.</p> <p>5.1.4: Evidence to document this sub-factor is provided in <a href="#">SB6 Usability Accessibility and Accommodation Guidelines.pdf</a>, and the UAAG Implementation Guide on <a href="http://nh.portal.airast.org/resources/?section=smarter-balanced-test-administration">http://nh.portal.airast.org/resources/?section=smarter-balanced-test-administration</a>.</p> <p>5.1.5: Evidence to document this sub-factor is provided in sources under 5.1.4.</p> <p>5.1.6: The evidence does not explicitly exclude individuals from any disability category in IDEA. There is evidence (from the DLM Accessibility Manual) that an effort has been made to cast as wide a net as possible in including students from all disability categories.</p> <p>5.1.7: Peer reviewers could not readily locate a document informing parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities of these aspects of alternate assessment.</p> <p>5.1.8: No such procedures readily located among documentation.</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 NEW HAMPSHIRE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement regarding any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards.</li> <li>• Documentation that the State informs parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities 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.</li> <li>• Documentation of procedures to ensure that the State’s implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> <li>• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;</li> <li>• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS</p> <p>SB 6 E 3 – ESOL guidance for placement and assessment NHG3 – Test Coordinator Manual, p31-32</p>	<p>NH stipulates that SB 5.2 and DLM 5.2 constitute the complete presentations for NH on this critical element. NH asserts that it does not provide additional narrative and supporting evidence. Refer to peer reviews of SB 5.2 and DLM 5.2.</p> <p>Peer review of SB 5.2 indicates the following needed from individual member states: “Documentation that the State adheres to the SBAC Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines, or State-specific evidence to address this part of the critical element.”</p> <p>NH meets the requirement of peer review SB 5.2, as is evident by the presence of the SBAC UAAG on the Accommodation section of their assessment portal on the web.</p> <p>Peers note that these documents may not be clearly communicating this information to parents. There is adequate documentation that system has procedures for inclusion of ELs, and communicates this information clearly to teachers and instructional leaders. However, peer reviewers were unable to find evidence of means by which this information is communicated to parents, including any evidence that communication is available in languages other than English.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional evidence called for in the SB peer review. NH peer reviewers believe it would be sufficient to indicate in the Usability and Accessibility guidelines that the Guidelines pertain to all students, including ELs.</li> <li>• Evidence of means by which the procedures to ensure inclusion of ELs is communicated to parents, including any evidence that communication is available</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.3 – Accommodations</b></p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504;</li> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);</li> <li>• Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> <li>• Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS;</p>	<p>NH stipulates that SB 5.3 and DLM 5.3 constitute the complete presentations for NH on this critical element. NH asserts that it does not provide additional narrative and supporting evidence, for the proprietary components of SB and DLM. Refer to peer reviews of SB 5.3 and DLM 5.3.</p> <p>Peer review of SB 5.3 indicate the following needed from individual member states:</p> <p>5.3.1. If the State does not adhere to the SBAC Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines, State-specific evidence to address this critical element. If a State excludes some accommodation tools, then the State needs to provide a rationale that it is still meeting this critical element.</p> <p>5.3.2. If the State does not adhere to the SBAC Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines, State-specific evidence to address this critical element. If a State excludes some accommodation tools, then the State needs to provide a rationale that it is still meeting this critical element.</p> <p>5.3.4. All.</p> <p>5.3.1 &amp; 5.3.2: No evidence found that NH excludes any of the accommodation tools provided by SBAC. Peer reviewers recommend confirmation by the State that no accommodation tool in the SBAC UAAG is excluded.</p> <p>5.3.4. No process referenced by NH for considering exceptional (accommodation) requests. However, this information is included in SB 6, starting on page 28. Without direct reference to any process, peer reviewers assume that this is the State’s process for</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 NEW HAMPSHIRE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		exceptional requests for accommodations, short of exclusion from assessment altogether (NHG 63).
<b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional evidence called for in the SB peer review.</li> <li>• Confirmation by the State that no accommodation tool in the SBAC UAAG is excluded.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b></p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS;</p>	<p>NH stipulates that SB 5.4 and DLM 5.4 constitute the complete presentations for NH on this critical element. NH asserts that it does not provide additional narrative and supporting evidence, for the proprietary components of SB and DLM. Refer to peer reviews of SB 5.4 and DLM 5.4.</p> <p>Peer review of SB 5.4 indicates the following needed from individual member states: “Documentation of all aspects of this critical element as it relates to monitoring compliance with accommodation policies and procedures.”</p> <p>The documents provided for this critical element do not provide evidence that the State has monitored compliance with test administration accommodations policies and procedures.</p> <p>While the assumption can be made, based on the DLM peer review, that monitoring of the use of accommodation does indeed take place, NH peer reviewers were unable to find evidence of those monitoring procedures in the NH submission.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation that the State monitors compliance with test administration accommodations policies and procedures, for both the general and alternate assessments.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**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><b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</b></p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities;</li> <li>• The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply;</li> <li>• The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>NH stipulates that SB 6.1 and DLM 6.1 constitute the complete presentations for NH on this critical element. NH asserts that it does not provide additional narrative and supporting evidence for the proprietary components of SB and DLM. Refer to peer reviews of SB 6.1 and DLM 6.1.</p> <p>By asserting adherence to the use of the Smarter Balanced test blueprint, summative item pools, proprietary adaptive algorithm, and cut scores, NH indicates that the Smarter Balanced peer review submission fully applies to NH.</p> <p>Peer review of SB 6.1 indicates the following evidence is needed from individual member states: 6.1.1 &amp; 6.1.2: All.</p> <p>NH states in its peer review submission that it has adopted SBAC cut scores. And, SB27 State Board Minutes page 2 indicates that rule ED 306 (Minimum Standards for Public Schools) was adopted. However, the document (ED 306) does not appear to reference the CCSS or any of its assessments, or achievement standards, or cut scores. Peer reviewers could not locate documentation of formal adoption of the SB achievement level descriptors and the SB cut scores.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of formal adoption of SB achievement standards and SB cut scores, and that these standards and cut scores apply to all public elementary and secondary school students, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities (to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply).</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE

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 NEW HAMPSHIRE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b></p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>NH stipulates that SB 6.2 and DLM 6.2 constitute the complete presentations for NH on this critical element. NH asserts that it does not provide additional narrative and supporting evidence for the proprietary components of SB and DLM. Refer to peer reviews of SB 6.2 and DLM 6.2.</p> <p>By asserting adherence to the use of the Smarter Balanced test blueprint, summative item pools, proprietary adaptive algorithm, and cut scores, NH indicates that the Smarter Balanced peer review submission fully applies to NH.</p> <p>Peer reviewers are aware that representatives from NH participated in the SB standard setting, which we believe is relevant to this critical element. Here and elsewhere, the submission would be strengthened by describing the involvement of NH educators and others representing the State who contributed to key SBAC activities addressed by critical elements of the peer review process.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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 NEW HAMPSHIRE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>NH stipulates that SB 6.3 and DLM 6.3 constitute the complete presentations for NH on this critical element. NH asserts that it does not provide additional narrative and supporting evidence for the proprietary components of SB and DLM. Refer to peer reviews of SB 6.3 and DLM 6.3.</p> <p>By asserting adherence to the use of the Smarter Balanced test blueprint, summative item pools, proprietary adaptive algorithm, and cut scores, NH indicates that the Smarter Balanced peer review submission fully applies to NH.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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 NEW HAMPSHIRE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;</li> <li>• The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;</li> <li>• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;</li> <li>○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;</li> <li>○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>A general note from peer reviewers: “Reporting” is distinct from “making available”. This distinction should be considered in whether states are meeting any critical element addressing “reporting.”</p> <p>If information is especially critical, intended report audiences should not be required to consult information services (such as web portals) to obtain the information.</p> <p>Peer reviewers believe it is likely that NH has produced the reports called for in this section and communicated them appropriately. Documentation of this would enhance the submission.</p> <hr/> <p>NH stipulates that SB 6.4 and DLM 6.4 constitute the complete presentations for NH on this critical element. NH asserts that it does not provide additional narrative and supporting evidence for the proprietary components of SB and DLM. Refer to peer reviews of SB 6.4 and DLM 6.4.</p> <p>Peer review of SB 6.4 indicates the following evidence is needed from individual member states:  6.4.1: All.  6.4.2: All.  6.4.3: All documentation under this bullet and sub-bullets as it pertains to delivery of reports.  6.4.3.1: All, if the State is not using the Smarter Balanced-hosted reporting system and the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium reporting system user guide.  6.4.3.2: All, if the State is not using the Smarter Balanced-hosted reporting system and the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium reporting system</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 NEW HAMPSHIRE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>		<p>user guide. 6.4.3.3: All. 6.4.3.4: All. 6.4.4: All.</p> <hr/> <p>6.4.1: Sample ORS reports very likely address this factor, and State submission claims: “In addition to online score report, ORS provides participation rate reports for the State, district, and school to help monitor student participation rate. Participation data are up to date each time students complete tests and they are handscored.”</p> <p>6.4.2: Sample ORS reports very likely demonstrate this. We would like to see examples of the use of tools and resources made available to parents, teachers, principals, and administrators to facilitate the interpretation and use of assessment results.</p> <p>6.4.3: Evidence of <u>delivery</u> of individual student reports not located.</p> <p>6.4.3.4: Evidence of availability of results in alternate formats not located.</p> <p>6.4.4: Peer reviewers could not locate evidence of State following a process and timeline for report delivery.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(6.4.2) Documentation of the use of tools and resources made available to parents, teachers, principals, and administrators to facilitate the interpretation and use</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>of assessment results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (6.4.3) Documentation showing delivery or dissemination of individual student reports and guides to score interpretation to facilitate the interpretation and use of assessment results.</li> <li>• (6.4.3.4) Documentation of availability of results in alternate formats (Braille, other languages, etc.).</li> <li>• (6.4.4) Documentation of NH following a process and timeline for report delivery.</li> </ul>		

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

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

## June, 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes Smarter Balanced Consortium Evidence



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

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

# STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

## Contents

<b>SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.2 – Item Development.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2.3 – Test Administration .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>2.5 – Test Security .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>4.1 – Reliability.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>4.4 – Scoring .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms .....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS .....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities .....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>5.3 – Accommodations.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations .....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students .....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards .....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>6.4 – Reporting.....</b>	<b>44</b>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED**

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results;</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><b>Index p. 2 7 pp. 24-25</b></p> <p><b>15a 15b 17 29</b></p>	<p>Statements of purpose exist and are stated.</p> <p>One purpose statement relates to growth. Is there or will there be evidence to support that the SBAC summative test measures growth?</p> <p>Of note: There is no statement pertaining to the use of the SBAC test for teacher evaluation.</p> <p>The 5<sup>th</sup> purpose statement of the summative test is to gauge “how instruction can be improved...” Assessment results do not clearly indicate actions to improve instruction. Recommend either restating or deleting this purpose statement.</p> <p>In several places of Evidence 15a and 15b, the range of total items by claim on the test blueprints does not match the range implied by the sums of minimum and maximum numbers of items, respectively, by assessment targets. It is not clear if the range by claim is intended to be a tally of items or an additional constraint.</p> <p>Speaking is not included in the assessments for ELA.</p> <p>Re “measure the full range”: In Evidence 17 p. 31, what makes for sufficiently good alignment is unclear. Evaluation of alignment study results is exacerbated</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 SMARTER BALANCED**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>by the statement “low percentages of fully aligned and mostly aligned ratings do not necessarily reflect poor alignment.”</p> <p>The peers recommend including a clear discussion and supporting tables demonstrating the SBAC summative assessments cover the full range of the CCSS standards. The evidence should display the full range of the CCSS standards and indicate which are covered by the SBAC summative assessments. Those standards not assessed should be noted with the reason for their exclusion stated.</p> <p>Although off grade level tests may be administered via the CAT system, the conditions under which off grade level items may be given is not clear. It is not clear to what extent students receiving a test event with off grade level items are receiving and/or being scored on a grade-level test event that complies with the blueprints.</p> <p>It is claimed that off grade level items are realigned to the on grade blueprint, but how this alignment was done and evaluated are not included among the evidence documents.</p> <p>The peers’ understanding is that the decision of proficiency vs. non-proficiency is based only on on-grade level testing. The determination of other measures (levels I and IV, or student growth) may be impacted by the use of off grade level items and states must take this into account when using the assessments for accountability purposes.</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 SMARTER BALANCED**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills);</li>   <li>If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Guidance p. 14</b>  <b>15a 15b</b>  <b>28 § 2.1-2.2</b></p> <p><b>Guidance Index</b>  <b>8</b>  <b>15a 15b</b>  <b>27</b>  <b>28</b>  <b>29 p. 8</b>  <b>30</b></p>	<p>The relative scarcity of DOK 3+ items in the assessments makes it difficult to conclude that they reflect “appropriate inclusion of challenging content” and requires “complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills)”</p> <p>There are notes specifying a minimum number of DOK 3+ items in the blueprints. However, from Evidence 28, it is unclear how DOK requirements are being implemented.</p> <p>The discussion of custom item pools in sections Evidence 28, § 2.1 and 2.2 suggests that some students will receive a test with a different blueprint from other students. The current documentation lends itself to the interpretation that this might occur even for students not receiving accommodations.</p> <p>Evidence 29 page 8 identifies the inadequacy of the item pools in providing assessments to the full range of students. This issue needs to be addressed.</p> <p>In Evidence 27, the number of ELA items developed are short of the order, although the Index claims that deliveries exceeded orders. The rationale for the</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 SMARTER BALANCED**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
		<p>orders listed in Evidence 27 is not explained. Specifically, how was the pool size and item demand determined?</p> <p>The ELA shortfalls in Evidence 27 are not explained in terms of impact on standards coverage. There needs to be an identification of the DOK of these orders and the shortfalls.</p> <p>Evidence 29 states that not all assessments follow blueprint constraints. Please provide the remediation and the assurance that this is not happening in operation with actual students.</p> <p>Appendix B of Evidence 29 demonstrates that many students taking the Spanish language and Braille versions of the SBAC assessments may be receiving assessments not aligned to the blueprints.</p> <p>It is unclear from Evidence 29 if the algorithm used in the simulation would accurately reflect (or accurately reflected) that used in operational testing.</p> <p>Evidence 30 demonstrates issues meeting constraints for the performance tasks. This needs to be addressed – specifically, how the misalignment was resolved.</p> <p>Evidence 8, p. 6 states that states may use their own delivery engines. The peers agree that states will need to provide evidence either that they are using the SBAC engine or that their chosen delivery engine functions the same as the SBAC engine and conforms to the SBAC blueprints for tests being delivered. If a non-SBAC engine does not conform, then it is incumbent upon the state using it to provide all evidence beyond item development for their program. That is, the program will need to be treated as an assessment other than SBAC (although using the</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		SBAC pool).
<b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Further justification for Purpose 4. Purpose 4 is related to measuring student growth. Where appropriate (e.g., in § 3), evidence should be provided supporting (1) growth interpretations of assessment results, and (2) specific uses of growth estimates.</li> <li>b. Further justification for Purpose 5. Purpose 5 indicates that the assessment results will provide information about how instruction can be improved. This may be beyond the scope of a summative assessment system, since assessment results do not clearly indicate actions to improve instruction. Peers believe that this purpose should be restated or deleted. Alternatively, evidence can be provided where appropriate to support this interpretation / use of assessment results.</li> </ul> <p>2.1.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Clarification concerning whether the range of total items by claim identified in the test blueprints is intended to be a tally across assessment targets, or an additional constraint.</li> <li>b. Documentation concerning the basis for exclusion of speaking in the ELA assessments.</li> <li>c. Documentation concerning the Consortium’s criterion for “sufficient alignment” (see Evidence 17 p. 31) and an explanation of how the results of the alignment study cited meets this definition. If sufficient alignment cannot be demonstrated, a remediation plan to achieve sufficient alignment.</li> <li>d. A clear discussion and supporting tables demonstrating the SBAC summative assessments cover the full range of the CCSS standards. The evidence should display the full range of the CCSS standards and indicate which are covered by the SBAC summative assessments. Those standards not assessed should be noted with the reason for their exclusion stated.</li> <li>e. Documentation supporting adherence to the grade level blueprint of assessments administered to students that include off grade level items.</li> <li>f. Documentation that a suitable methodology was implemented for realigning off grade level items to on grade level content for use in administration of off grade level content.</li> </ul> <p>2.1.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Documentation supporting the claim that the DOK range of each assessment reflect “appropriate inclusion of challenging content” and requires “complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills)”</li> <li>b. Clarification regarding how DOK requirements are being implemented, for both CAT and fixed forms.</li> </ul> <p>2.1.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Explanation of how the implementation of custom item pools described in § 2.1 and 2.2 of Evidence 28 cannot result in test events that are inconsistent with the test blueprints. If they can result in such test events, then a plan for how this will be remedied.</li> <li>b. Documentation with plan addressing the inadequacy of the item pools in providing assessments to the full range of students, identified on p. 8 of Evidence 29.</li> <li>c. An explanation of how DOK requirements are being implemented in the test delivery algorithm.</li> <li>d. An explanation of the basis for the item counts in the orders listed in Evidence 27.</li> <li>e. An explanation of the impact, if any, that the ELA shortfalls in Evidence 27 had / have on standards coverage.</li> <li>f. Documentation that all assessments in operation now conform to blueprints.</li> <li>g. Documentation regarding remediation of the issue that many students taking the Spanish language and Braille versions of the SBAC assessments may be</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>receiving forms or test events that do not conform to the blueprints.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>h. Documentation regarding remediation of the issue in meeting constraints for the performance tasks.</li> <li>i. Documentation that SBAC is appropriately guiding and supporting states in using the appropriate algorithm. Clarification that a state using a different algorithm cannot rely on evidence gathered through the SBAC algorithm.</li> </ul>	
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>2.1.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. A waiver to use SBAC due to the exclusion of speaking in the assessment.</li> </ul> <p>States should note: Educator evaluation is not a listed purpose of this assessment.</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 SMARTER BALANCED**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.2 – Item Development</b></p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><b>7</b> <b>15a 15b</b> <b>53</b></p>	<p>The documentation states revision based on the results of the cognitive labs, but does not specify what revisions were done or what changes were made to address issues identified (i.e. use of equation editor).</p> <p>There does not appear to be a specific statement about the mode of delivery for review of items. Since this is an electronic assessment, the items should have been reviewed on screen. The Consortium needs to specify the review mode in addition to the thorough documentation already provided.</p> <p>Page 3 of evidence 53 states that the ethnic make-up of the reviews reflects the diversity of the governing states, however the make-up of those states is not listed and the make-up of the math review panel is different from the ELA. While the peers are sensitive to the issues of recruitment, increased transparency would be helpful and support the positive outcome of the review. For example, listing the targets for ethnic make-up of panels and the efforts to recruit. If there were no targets for diversity, instead of claiming the panels matched the diversity of the governing states, simply state that this is the make-up based on the recruitment.</p> <p>The blueprints have a scarcity of items at DOK 3+. This leads the reviewers to question the level of inclusion of higher order skills.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>2.2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Documentation regarding how usability issues discovered during the cognitive labs (e.g., student difficulties using the equation editor) have been addressed.</li> <li>b. Documentation showing that the mode of delivery during item review was the same as that for test administration – in other words, that reviewers reviewed items exactly as they would have been seen by students.</li> <li>c. Documentation regarding the targets for ethnic make-up of panels and the efforts to recruit panels consistent with those targets or, if there were no targets for diversity, a statement to the effect.</li> <li>d. Documentation as per Summary Statement 2.1.3.a.</li> </ol>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>None.</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 SMARTER BALANCED**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><b>11a p. 4 11b</b>  <b>65a</b>  <b>66</b>  <b>67 p. 24</b>  <b>68 pp. 36-41</b>  <b>69b 69c 69d 69e</b>  <b>77a 77b</b>  <b>76</b></p>	<p>The graphic on p. 4 of Evidence 11a is extremely helpful.</p> <p>Evidence 65a contains links that are important, however many are dead (the link to the collaboration site is not available to the reviewers).</p> <p>Since many documents are supplied as templates, the state will need to provide evidence that they are communicating clearly, effectively and accurately to its educators. These should include state-specific communications on the following issues: usability and accessibility guidelines, on-line test administration procedures, assessment technology requirements, test administrator manuals, and state specific procedures. These should include the content from the SBAC manuals as listed: on-line test administrator manual 67, usability accessibility and accommodations guide 68, UAA guidelines 11a 11b, state procedures manual 65a, test administrator users guide 66, paper pencil TAM 77a 77b, iPad guidelines 76, technology requirements training 69b, student interface training 69c, TA interface training modules 69d, ART training module 69e</p> <p>Evidence 67 p. 24: the thirty-minute timer mentioned in the first paragraph discussing the timeout, disagrees with the twenty-minute timer in the second paragraph. Please clarify.</p> <p>The definition of activity for the inactivity timer may be problematic since students can be clicking on the</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 SMARTER BALANCED**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments;</li> <li>If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>	<p>66</p> <p>65a 66 69 70 p. 4</p>	<p>screen every minute and still time out due to the definition. Typical computer activity conventions just require mouse movement, not specific activity.</p> <p>Evidence 68: The guidance provided for the read-aloud accommodation (table on pp. 36-41) appears to be challenging to implement or to adhere to during a live administration.</p> <p>If modifications are made to the SBAC systems, what process is in place to inform states of the changes?</p> <p>States need to provide evidence of their state training requirements.</p> <p>Contingency plans need to give more details and clearer guidance on issues such as how to resume test administration in case of lost internet connectivity. SBAC needs to develop contingency guidelines and procedures to address a broad range of possible technology challenges during test administration, and submit these as evidence.</p> <p>The implementation readiness package was not ready based on the evidence provided. The package modules should have been ready beginning in spring 2015. Please provide evidence that the package is ready and the date when it was ready (Evidence 70 p. 4).</p> <p>Since states may use different administration vendors, each state should provide the customized contingency plans detailed for their state, and in alignment with SBAC’s guidelines.</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 SMARTER BALANCED**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>States need to provide evidence that test administrators have procedures and access to helpdesk/troubleshooting support.</p> <p>States need to provide evidence that they have determined that schools meet the readiness guidelines prior to operational utilization.</p>
<b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>2.3.1</p> <p>a. A clarification to reconcile the disagreement, in Evidence 67 p. 24, between (1) the thirty-minute timer mentioned in the first paragraph discussing the timeout, and (2) the twenty-minute timer referenced in the second paragraph. Provision of the clarification to states.</p> <p>2.3.2</p> <p>a. Documentation of the communication plan (to states) when modifications are made to the SBAC systems.</p> <p>2.3.3</p> <p>a. Contingency plans addressing a broad range of technology challenges, providing more details and clearer guidance on issues such as how to resume test administration in case of lost internet connectivity.</p> <p>b. Documentation that the Implementation Readiness Package has been fully developed and released, together with the release date.</p> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>2.3.3</p> <p>a. A contingency plan detailed for their state, and in alignment with SBAC’s guidelines.</p> <p>b. Documentation that test administrators have technology failure contingency procedures in place and access to helpdesk/troubleshooting support.</p> <p>c. Documentation of school readiness for operational administration of technology-based assessments.</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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.5 – Test Security</b></p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS</p> <p><b>65a 65b</b> <b>66</b> <b>78</b></p>	<p>The documents appear to defer much of the test security and irregularity detection to the states. However, peers felt that this critical element implied that SBAC should have its own programs of post hoc assessment for irregularities (data forensics) and ongoing test security monitoring including social media monitoring.</p> <p>Information in 65b should be communicated to states</p> <p>SBAC should maintain a security log overall to ensure security of the summative assessment system itself.</p> <p>States need to provide evidence of their security policies and procedures in accordance with the investigation and remediation procedures for SBAC.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>2.5.1</p> <p>a. Documentation that SBAC has in place security protocols and procedures to protect SBAC items and assessments.</p> <p>2.5.2</p>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>a. Documentation that information in 65b is communicated to states.</p> <p>2.5.4</p> <p>Documentation of the implementation of the security logging and the remediation plan for incidents that may impact the validity of the assessment (including communications).</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>2.5</p> <p>Documentation of state’s security policies and procedures and the relationship of the state’s policies and procedures to those of SBAC. In other words, a state’s security policies and procedures should reference SBAC’s policies and procedures and demonstrate coherence with these. It should be clear from all available documentation (regardless of source – SBAC or state) that all aspects of critical element 2.5 are addressed.</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 SMARTER BALANCED**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</b></p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results;</li> <li>To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> <li>To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS</p> <p><b>65a</b> <b>66</b> <b>134</b></p> <p><b>133</b></p>	<p>SBAC needs to provide evidence that they are monitoring test item exposure and drift to ensure integrity on an ongoing basis. States must provide evidence of this item with respect to administration and use.</p> <p>Please detail what is the low risk item stated in Evidence 133 and explain what is being done about this issue or why the issue is not being addressed.</p> <p>States must provide evidence of this item.</p> <p>For reporting outside the SBAC system, states need to provide evidence of compliance with this item.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		
<p>2.6.1</p>		
<p>a. Documentation of monitoring of test item exposure and drift done by SBAC to ensure integrity of the assessment system.</p>		
<p>2.6.2</p>		
<p>a. Further explanation of the low risk item in Evidence 133, including any actions being taken to address it or a reason why it is not being addressed.</p>		
<hr/>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p>		
<p>2.6.1</p>		
<p>a. Documentation of compliance with this item with respect to “administration” and “use of test results.”</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.6.2 a. All. 2.6.3		
For states reporting outside of the SBAC system, documentation of compliance with this item.		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><b>Guidance</b>  <b>7</b>  <b>17</b>  <b>104</b>  <b>105</b>  <b>124 pp. 86-89</b>  <b>131</b></p>	<p>Evidence 104 and 105 are the most direct evidence.</p> <p>How have the low ratings from 104 and 105 been addressed if at all?</p> <p>Evidence 124 achievement level feedback on pp. 86-89 suggests panels not understanding the standard setting process. How has this been addressed?</p> <p>The ELA shortfalls in evidence 27 are not explained in terms of impact on standards coverage. There needs to be an identification of the DOK of these orders and the shortfalls.</p> <p>Evidences 104 and 105 are the only alignment between standards and test items, however these studies do not encompass each grade level. Please provide evidence of alignment between operational tests at each grade level and the CCSS.</p> <p>Since the system allows student tests to include off grade level items, SBAC needs to report the rate at which it occurs and the impact on student scores as well as describe the implications for match to blueprints since presumably the blueprints were developed for on grade level test forms / events.</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 SMARTER BALANCED**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul>		<p>SBAC needs to demonstrate adherence to the guidance regarding off grade level testing condition #2 on page 14. (Some reviewers felt the guidance means off grade level items cannot be used for any score purpose while others felt the guidance means off grade level items can be used in determining scores but not proficiency) Only on grade level items are used for score production and the on grade level items used cover the full range of the standards at that grade level.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence demonstrating the CAT forms students are scored upon match the blueprints submitted as evidence. Please submit this evidence for operational tests instead of simulations with the plan for monitoring this process.</p> <p>To maintain a valid item bank, SBAC needs to monitor item exposure and run post hoc analyses to ensure the system has the same characteristics as designed and approved.</p> <p>N/A: State responsibility.</p>
<b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>3.1.1</p> <p>a. Documentation regarding how issues of low ratings in Evidence 104 have been addressed. Examples: Evidence 104, p. 18 shows SBAC has a low rating on</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>“high quality items and variety of item types.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. Documentation regarding how the low ratings on panelist comprehension of the standard setting process (Evidence 124, pp. 86-89), was addressed.</li> <li>c. Documentation regarding the ELA item shortfalls in Evidence 27 affected the item pool and how those shortfalls were addressed.</li> <li>d. Evidence of alignment between operational tests and the CCSS for those grade levels not covered in Evidence 104 and Evidence 105. (There must be evidence of alignment for every grade level.)</li> <li>e. Documentation regarding the rate at which off grade level testing occurs, the impact of off grade level testing on student scores, and the implications of off grade level testing for blueprint satisfaction of test events.</li> <li>f. Documentation demonstrating adherence to the Guidance regarding off grade level testing condition #2 on p. 14. (Some reviewers felt the Guidance means off grade level items cannot be used for any score purpose while others felt the Guidance means off grade level items can be used in determining scores but not proficiency.)</li> <li>g. Documentation that the operational CAT test event that students are scored on match the blueprints submitted as evidence. A plan for monitoring the process of evaluating match to blueprint for all test events administered.</li> <li>h. Documentation of plan for monitoring item exposure and conducting post hoc analyses to ensure the system has the same characteristics as designed and approved.</li> </ul>	
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>3.1.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. All.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b></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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><b>7 25 130b</b></p>	<p>Cognitive labs are compelling and good evidence for this critical element.</p> <p>Documentation states that revisions were made based on the results of the cognitive labs, but does not specify what revisions were done or what changes were made to address issues identified (i.e. use of equation editor).</p>
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>x The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: 3.2 a. Documentation as per 2.2.a</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states: None.</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 SMARTER BALANCED**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b></p> <p>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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><b>7</b> <b>61</b> <b>130b</b> <b>130c</b></p>	<p>The summary of evidence in Evidence 130b p. 8 is not compelling for meeting this critical element.</p> <p>DIF and biserial correlations calculated and used...good.</p> <p>Evidence 61 does not discriminate between interim and summative items. Please provide confirmation that this applies only to the summative items.</p> <p>Evidence 7 p. 166: Good evidence for unidimensionality but again not specific to summative vs other tests - please specify.</p> <p>Evidence 130c p. 5: Bias estimates are unacceptable for 3<sup>rd</sup> grade in ELA and some other grades. Also for Math claims 2 and 4. Please provide evidence the claim level classifications that are reported are not negatively impacted by the bias.</p> <p>Please provide model fit information based on operational assessment data instead of just pilot data.</p> <p>Please provide clarification that items removed from the dimensionality analysis were removed from the bank as well and not merely removed from the analysis.</p> <p>The item vector dimensionality study could have bene stronger if it included the possibility of more than two dimensions.</p> <p>Not clear if scaling at the claim level was considered.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Confirmation that Evidence 61 and Evidence 7 p. 166 apply to the summative items.</li> <li>b. Documentation that claim level classifications are not negatively impacted by large bias estimates in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade ELA, and for Math Claims 2 and 4.</li> <li>c. Model fit information based on operational assessment data.</li> <li>d. Confirmation that items removed from the dimensionality analysis were retired from further operational use.</li> </ul>	
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p>		
3.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.</li> </ul>	

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><b>7 p. 443</b> <b>137</b> <b>139</b> <b>156</b></p>	<p>In Evidence 7 there is no clear explanation of how SBAC lines up with PISA or NAEP even though they used embedded items. The purpose appeared to be to ground the standard setting but how they actually helped to inform the process isn’t clear. It isn’t clear how inclusion of these items helped to show that “assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.”</p> <p>Evidence 7 p. 443: Not clear how the ACT benchmarks were projected on to the SBAC scale. Please clarify how this occurred and how this was used to provide the validity evidence relevant to this critical element.</p> <p>Evidence 139: The high pass rate for students who are failing the course does support this critical element.</p> <p>Evidence 137: Peers are not sure this is relevant to this critical element. The importance of the results was not presented.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>3.4</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Clarification of how inclusion of PISA and NAEP items in the standard setting, and how projection of ACT benchmarks onto the SBAC scale, helped to show that “assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.”</li> <li>b. Discussion of the high pass rates on the Smarter Balanced assessments for students failing the course in the Washington: Linking Course Grades to Smarter Balanced Cut Scores report, with respect to meeting this critical element.</li> </ol> <hr/> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>3.4</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.</li> </ol>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.1 – Reliability</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li>   <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments;</li>   <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results;</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><b>7 p. 472</b>  <b>130c pp. 14, 17, 22-34, 36-41</b></p>	<p>There needs to be additional information concerning which states were included in the calculations of reliability and categorical classification decisions. The calculations should include data from all states included in that round. Per follow-up communication, CT, MI, and NH were not included in these calculations.</p> <p>Per ED, this critical element implies a requirement for state-specific reliabilities. These state-specific reliabilities should be either in the submissions of the Consortium or the State.</p> <p>130c: Total score reliabilities are acceptable. Claim reliabilities are low, but impact is likely marginal. Total score reliabilities are low in Decile 1 for grades 7 and 11 in mathematics (p. 14) and 11<sup>th</sup> grade LEP and IDEA (p. 17).</p> <p>130c: CSEMs high for the low end (pp. 36-41), especially in relation to typical ranges for achievement levels (007: p. 472). Frequently the CSEM is about a 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of a typical range. This could impact achievement level accuracy for students and may limit the utility of the assessments for measuring student growth.</p> <p>130c: Classification accuracy for distinguishing between level 2 and 3 is low for ELA grades 3-5 (pp. 22-34). Since level 3 is proficient, this has an impact on proficiency designations.</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 SMARTER BALANCED**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement.</li> </ul>		<p>Consistency estimates are not provided or addressed. The submission should include a statement or rationale for claiming that test procedure produces test forms meeting this requirement, especially in light of potential differences in results for different algorithms.</p> <p>There needs to be evidence that all of the data included in computing the reliability-related estimates are based on the same implementation of the same algorithm.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>4.1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A statement responding to areas of low reliability and low accuracy</li> <li>(Either SBAC or the relevant state) Test reliability of the assessments estimated for each state separately and each subgroup within state (these estimates will also need to meet adequacy criteria)</li> <li>Estimates of consistency of classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results (these estimates will also need to meet adequacy criteria)</li> </ol>		
<hr/> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>4.1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(Either SBAC or the relevant state) Test reliability of the assessments estimated for each state separately and each subgroup within state (these estimates will also need to meet adequacy criteria)</li> <li>If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.</li> </ol>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</b></p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><b>11a</b> <b>30</b> <b>126</b></p>	<p>The evidence supports attention in design and development to ensure fairness and accessibility.</p> <p>Only simulation or field test data, showing no DIF or low DIF on the assessment.</p> <p>Peers agreed there should be ongoing tracking of DIF items that have been left in the pool.</p> <p>Accommodations are not tested; there are only lit reviews in Evidence 126.</p> <p>See notes on low IEP and LEP reliabilities.</p> <p>Evidence 11a is not prescriptive and does not provide data validating the use of the accommodations for certain students.</p> <p>Would like to see reliability estimates for students using accommodations, based on operational data.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>4.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Documentation supporting ongoing tracking of DIF items left in the operational pool, to ensure that any negative impact they have on fairness and accessibility remains minimal.</li> <li>b. Estimated reliability for students using accommodations, based on operational data.</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>4.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b></p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><b>Index pp. 76-77 104 130c pp. 33-35</b></p>	<p>It is not clear how Evidence 104 addresses this critical element.</p> <p>Evidence 130c: The reported SEMs are large and CSEMs are especially high for certain deciles and grades.</p> <p>The bin analysis in Evidence #130c pp. 33-35 demonstrates a need for more representation at the low end of the scales. The need is very pronounced for mathematics.</p> <p>Comments on earlier critical elements addressing representation across the scale are relevant here as well.</p> <p>Index pp. 76-78 calls attention to lack of items at the low end, impacting the test’s ability to test those students. SBAC should follow through on stated plans to enrich the item bank at the low end.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>4.3 Documentation that Smarter Balanced has enriched the item bank such that the assessments can provide a more precise estimate of student performance for low-achieving students.</p> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.</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 SMARTER BALANCED**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><b>70</b></p>	<p>Evidence 70: The scoring module was not ready, per this document. We would like evidence that the implementation readiness package was made available and the dates on which each module was released, especially the scoring module.</p> <p>We would like additional evidence of standardized scoring procedures and protocols, specifically with respect to the use of the same CAT algorithm across states. (Scoring and item selection for test forms are interdependent for CATs.)</p>
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>4.4 Evidence of established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols, specifically:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Documentation that the implementation readiness package was made available and the dates on which each module was released, especially the scoring module. A plan to ensure timely future delivery of materials and modules necessary for third party administration vendors.</li> <li>b. Documentation of reliable and accurate scoring for alternate test forms (i.e. paper and pencil, paper braille).</li> </ol> <hr/> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>4.4</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.</li> </ol>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</b></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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>Simulation studies provided evidence regarding adherence to blueprint (and those simulations did not always produce conforming forms).</p> <p>Need evidence that operational forms always produce conforming forms for all students.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>a. Documentation that the assessment system always produces blueprint conforming forms for all students who took an operational form or test event, regardless of format or accommodation.</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.</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 SMARTER BALANCED**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b></p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>42 49a 49b 50 51 70 130d 143 145 169</p>	<p>This critical element is largely redundant with the prior one, because of CAT. However, it is relevant to the paper-pencil version, Spanish version, ASL, and Braille versions.</p> <p>Noted systematic reviews for Spanish translations. Expected evidence of analogous reviews for ASL and Braille.</p> <p>We found no empirical evidence of this. For example, there was no analysis comparing descriptive statistics on students taking different versions, and discussion of results to address comparability. Some comparisons, for example adaptive Braille versus paper Braille versus CAT, are especially relevant.</p> <p>(We would expect to see this for operational data, now that it is available.)</p> <p>Has SBAC attended to comparability across devices empirically? Can it? (Is device information collected for test events?)</p>
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>4.6</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documentation that the Consortium followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments (i.e. evidence of systemic checking the ASL and Braille versions of items.)</li> <li>Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results (i.e. evidence of comparability between standard Smarter Balanced assessments, ASL, Braille, Spanish, and other versions of the assessment using operational data).</li> <li>Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results (i.e. evidence of comparability across the different devices allowed for standard Smarter Balanced assessments.)</li> </ol>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>4.6</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b></p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><b>Index 155</b></p>	<p>Useful to have advisory groups for different student populations.</p> <p>Evidence 155: Many of the proposed analyses seem standard for a tech report.</p> <p>Index (pp. 97-98): Outline of the review cycle.</p> <p>Unclear to the Peers whether a complete 2014-2015 Technical Report exists. We would like a complete technical report for 2014-2015 or an explanation for why it is still in process.</p> <p>For States using SBAC: 4.7 is covered by the SBAC submission.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: 4.7</p> <p>a. To support that the Consortium has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, a complete technical report for the operational administration of the Smarter Balanced assessments in 2014-15.</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states: None.</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 SMARTER BALANCED**

**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
<p><b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards;</li> <li>• States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs;</li> <li>• Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment;</li> <li>• Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS</p> <p><b>11a 11b 97 98 128</b></p>	<p>11a: SBAC should provide guidance when use of the SBAC test is not appropriate. This is not provided. (States also need to provide their specific guidance on this critical element for alternate assessment.)</p> <p>This critical element should be provided in the state-specific submission.</p> <p>126: This is met with respect to accommodations. See first bullet above.</p> <p>97 and 98: Evidence of this is provided. (States need to provide evidence that they have given appropriate guidance to their IEP teams.)</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 SMARTER BALANCED**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>students with disabilities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;</li> <li>• Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;</li> <li>• Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments);</li> <li>• The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.</li> </ul>		<p>128: Evidence of this is provided. (States need to provide evidence that they have given appropriate guidance to their IEP teams.) This is provided.</p> <p>Evidence of these last three critical elements should come from the state-specific or alternative assessment submissions.</p>
<b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  </u>X_ No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>5.1.1</p> <p>    a. States need to provide specific guidance associated with their AA-AAS.</p> <p>5.1.2</p> <p>    a. All.</p> <p>5.1.3</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.1.4	a. States need to provide specific guidance associated with their AA-AAS.	
	a. States need to provide evidence of specific guidance provided to IEP teams.	
5.1.5	a. Documentation that the state adheres to the SBAC Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines, or state-specific evidence to address this part of the critical element.	
5.1.6	a. All.	
5.1.7	a. All.	
5.1.8	a. All.	

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> <li>• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;</li> <li>• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS</p> <p>11a 11b 97 98 126 128</p>	<p>Evidence 97: Guidance unclear and not helpful. Steps 3 and 4 do not help schools determine whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodations, and if so, which accommodations are appropriate.</p> <p>Evidence 128: Provided as evidence, but does not pertain to ELs</p> <p>Evidence 126: Provides a framework, but needs operationalization to meet this critical element</p>
<p><b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>5.2</p> <p>a. Documentation regarding how schools determine whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodations, and if so, which accommodations are appropriate.</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>5.2</p> <p>a. Documentation that the state adheres to the SBAC Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines, or state-specific evidence to address this part of the critical element.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.3 – Accommodations</b></p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities (SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504;</li> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);</li> <li>Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> <li>Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS;</p> <p><b>11a 11b 65a 97 98 100a 100b 126 129</b></p>	<p>If a state excludes some accommodation tools, then the State needs to provide a rationale that it is still meeting this critical element.</p> <p>Points (i) and (ii) are not shown. Claim (iii) is not made or stated. There is no comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations. (And a discussion relevant to comparability in light of findings.)</p> <p>Suggestion: Meeting with the appropriate advisory group with information relevant to this critical element and soliciting their advice re need for follow-up investigation.</p> <p>65a: Consortium has a process, p. 15, which depends on the State having a process. The State needs to provide their process for requesting and reviewing.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: 5.3.3</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Documentation that the Consortium 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.</li> <li>b. Documentation that the Consortium has determined that the accommodations it provides 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 (e.g., a comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations, and a discussion relevant to comparability in light of findings).</li> </ul>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p>		
5.3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If the State does not adhere to the SBAC Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines, state-specific evidence to address this critical element. If a state excludes some accommodation tools, then the State needs to provide a rationale that it is still meeting this critical element.</li> </ul>	
5.3.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If the State does not adhere to the SBAC Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines, state-specific evidence to address this critical element. If a state excludes some accommodation tools, then the State needs to provide a rationale that it is still meeting this critical element.</li> </ul>	
5.3.4		
All.		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b></p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS;</p> <p><b>96</b> <b>97</b> <b>98</b> <b>99</b> <b>126</b></p>	<p>Monitoring compliance with accommodation policies and procedures: State responsibility</p> <p>Monitoring appropriateness of accommodation (that they are continuing to function as intended): Consortium responsibility</p>
<p><b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>5.4</p> <p>a. Documentation of all aspects of this critical element as it relates to monitoring compliance with accommodation 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 SMARTER BALANCED**

**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><b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</b></p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities;</li> <li>• The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply;</li> <li>• The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>49</b> <b>86</b> <b>95</b></p>	<p>States are responsible for first two critical elements.</p> <p>Evidence 86: This critical element is met for SBAC.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>6.1.1 a. All.</p> <p>6.1.2</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 SMARTER BALANCED**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
a. All.		
<b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b>	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet	
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.		Evidence of a technically sound procedure has been provided.  Please provide information re what the Consortium was targeting w/r/t panelist ethnicity distribution.
<b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b>		
_x_ No additional evidence is required of SBAC		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>6.2.</p> <p>a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.</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 SMARTER BALANCED**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b></p> <p>(1) 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>(2) 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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><b>86</b> <b>106</b> <b>107</b></p>	<p>The Consortium provided the evidence that could reasonably be expected of them at this early stage in the program. This critical element should be addressed more fully as the program develops – for example, through additional validity studies.</p> <p>This critical element is not relevant at the SBAC Consortium level. However, this needs to be addressed by states in their state-specific submission or through the submission of the alternate assessment consortium.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>6.3.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.</li> </ol>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;</li> <li>• The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;</li> <li>• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;</li> <li>○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;</li> <li>○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>Responsibility for meeting this critical element lies principally with the State.</p> <p>There is evidence that SBAC had a plan to develop a tool (with Amplify) for reporting. States need to produce evidence to meet this critical element.</p> <p>The SBAC reporting system appears to meet sub-bullets 1 and 2. However, the states not using the SBAC reporting tools need to provide evidence to meet sub-bullets 1 and 2.</p> <p>All states need to provide evidence showing that sub-bullets 3 and 4 are being met.</p> <p>In regards to sub-bullet 4, the SBAC system provides Spanish and Vietnamese reports upon request.</p> <p>All states need to provide evidence of report delivery.</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 SMARTER BALANCED**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="padding-left: 40px;">that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>		States must provide evidence for this critical element.
<b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  X  </u> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p> <hr/> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>6.4.1</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a. All.</p> <p>6.4.2</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">b. All.</p> <p>6.4.3</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a. All documentation under this bullet and sub-bullets as it pertains to delivery of reports.</p> <p>6.4.3.1</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a. All, if the state is not using the Smarter Balanced-hosted reporting system and the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium reporting system user guide.</p> <p>6.4.3.2</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a. All, if the state is not using the Smarter Balanced-hosted reporting system and the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium reporting system user guide.</p> <p>6.4.3.3</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a. All.</p> <p>6.4.3.4</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a. All.</p> <p>6.4.4</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a. All.</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.

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

## June 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes DLM End of Year Consortium Evidence



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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-  
YEAR END MODEL**

Contents

<b>SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.2 – Item Development.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2.3 – Test Administration .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only).....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>2.5 – Test Security .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>4.1 – Reliability.....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>4.4 – Scoring .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance.....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>5.3 – Accommodations.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations .....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students     .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards .....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>6.4 – Reporting.....</b>	<b>41</b>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Purposes and Intended Interpretations and Uses of Results</b></p> <p>File 06: page 1, page 5</p>	<p>PLEASE NOTE: The peer reviewers wish to acknowledge the magnitude and significance of this endeavor to create and implement a assessment for students with significant cognitive disabilities based on an articulated learning map aligned to content standards for the general student population. While the feedback that follows contains questions and a few requests for additional evidence, as well as some suggestions for consideration in the future, peers were cognizant of the enormous amount of work and time that went into the DLM assessment.</p> <p>The technical manual provides a clear statement of the purpose and intended interpretations and uses of the results of the DLM assessment.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Test Structure and Blueprints</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 41-46</p> <p>File 08</p> <p>File 09</p> <p>File 10</p> <p>File 11</p>	<p>Test blueprints clearly present the structure of the DLM testlets and the assessment as a whole.</p> <p>The DLM year-end-model assesses EEs in five conceptual areas across two claims. Coverage is summarized on page 2 of File 10.</p> <p>The DLM year-end-model assesses EEs in mathematics across all four major claims (File 11 p. 1).</p> <p>Peer reviewers were unable to gain a sufficiently clear understanding of how EEs were “prioritized” for inclusion in the assessment (which includes a subset of EEs rather than all per grade level).</p> <p>Although various documents (e.g., Sample Student</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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
		<p>Report in File 07, Appendix E.1) illustrate that not all EEs eligible for assessment are addressed by every student, it would have been extremely helpful to peer reviewers for DLM to have provided more detail, and in the appropriate sections of the submission, on what constitutes a typical assessment experience at the student level. This might take the form of a summary that describes the minimum-maximum number of testlets, the minimum-maximum number of items per testlet, and the minimum-maximum coverage across EEs in both ELA and Math. To frame differently, it would have helped to see how the distribution of EEs presented in Files 10 and 11 is operationalized for individual students. The picture of the DLM assessment at the global level is far clearer and richer than the picture of the assessment at the student level.</p> <p>Peers could not find evidence that the EEs address Speaking and Listening, which are among the domains in the CCSS.</p> <p>While the ELA blueprints include a few EEs that correspond to certain CCSS Language standards, these are identified in the blueprint under one or another of the five Conceptual Areas (CAs) covered by the DLM assessment (sometimes C.1.2. and other times C.2.1.) The peers could not find evidence that the CCSS domain of Language is explicitly addressed.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills);</li> </ul>	<p><b>Representation of Knowledge and Skills in the Assessment and the Standards</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 5-8, 24-28, 38-41, 46, 61-64</p>	<p>Evidence conveys the degree and nature of coverage of the EEs (learning targets for students with significant cognitive disabilities [SWSCD]) and their correspondence to CCSS.</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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Item Pool and Selection Procedures</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 60-61, 83-84, 101-106, 112-114</p>	<p>The adaptive delivery of testlets via KITE is well designed as described in the Technical Manual (112-14).</p> <p>While computer-adaptive procedures described made clear how linkage level would be adjusted based on performance, the peers were unable to find evidence to explain how this might impact EE coverage at the student level.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DLM should explain why some CCSS ELA domains are not directly addressed (Language) or are not addressed at all (Speaking/Listening)</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.2 – Item Development</b></p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p><b>Item Development</b></p> <p>File 06: Introduction, pp. 20-21, 46,47-48, 37-38, 69-70, 69, 65-68, 68-69, 61-64, 60-61, 85-87, 46-47, 75-76, 76-77, 82-83, 89-93,126-130, 219-233, 210-217</p> <p>File 18: pp. 9-10, 11-15</p>	<p>Evidence was sufficient for this section. Training materials for item writers are described and in some instances, provided in their entirety.</p> <p>One concern, however, is that peers could not find much evidence, beyond simple criteria for writing keys and distractors, that item development has attended fully and well to matters related to determining a correct/complete response (e.g., specifically how to screen for flaws in item options (ambiguous options, multiple options where not intended, etc.). Training might be enhanced with examples of well-written and poorly written items. If more training resources are available (e.g., the section of File 18 on bias and sensitivity review), then these should be cited, as they are likely to only strengthen the submission.</p> <p>The assumption must be made that all items are treated as dichotomous items, although this is never stated/made explicit. Why and how DLM decided against awarding partial credit for multiple select items and others with multiple correct response options should be included in evidence for this Critical Element. The testlet design (with % items correct to indicate “mastery”) may not permit this, but perhaps that should/could be explained.</p> <p>More detail on the duration of training of item writers—as well as a typical training agenda—would be useful as evidence of sound procedures to develop and select items.</p> <p>Some background/rationale for item types and</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>features (e.g., use of three response options in MC item, use of color photograph as text feature in ELA testlets) would be helpful—In other words, documentation of the research/best practice behind key item features/formats.</p> <p>Peers suggest that additional cognitive labs to investigate possible option order effect on student response be considered.</p>
	<p><b>Item Selection</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 77- 82, p. 93, 46- 47, 75-83, 93-101, 97- 98, 101-106, 98</p>	<p>The Technical Manual (p. 233) indicates the intention to follow up on DIF analysis by expanding in future years; DLM should be encouraged to submit this supplementary analysis when available.</p> <p>Overall, the evidence was sufficient for this section. However, while observations are described as part of validity studies, peer reviewers did not see any evidence of the use of observation during field-testing to inform item development, review and revision. This additional source of information might be helpful and should be considered for future rounds of item development.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Standardized Procedures</b></p> <p>File 05: pages 9-12, 89-116, 78-150, 149-159, 22-38, 38-50, 49-50</p> <p>File 02: pp. 7-13</p> <p>File 03: p. 8</p> <p>File 04: pp. 6-7</p>	<p>The evidence provided collectively identifies all of the steps necessary (and the resources to guide key individuals involved) to conduct standardized administrations of the assessment. The Test Administration manual is made easier to follow with supporting visuals (screen shots from Educator Portal and KITE) and numerous “hints” in sidebars to address specific needs/issues. DLM provides states with live updates through “state landing page” and updates on website.</p> <p>Detail is provided on the range of testing devices that may be used. DLM provides some information on handling such matters as extended inactivity when KITE is open, and exiting and returning. One incident summary (involving incorrect testlet information pages) is provided among evidence to illustrate/document contingency plans. State landing pages and updates on the DLM website appear to serve as a mechanism—if needed—to deal with unexpected technology challenges during test administration.</p>
	<p><b>Communication</b></p> <p>File 17: a) Sample state landing page from DLM website; b) Test updates – website and email example</p>	
	<p><b>Administration with Accommodations</b></p> <p>File 01: pp. 19-22, 15-18</p> <p>File 05: pp. 32-37</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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Training</b></p> <p>File 06: pp.251-254, 250-251, 254, 248-249, 124-125</p> <p>File 07: Appendices G.1, C.14</p> <p>File 16: p. 5</p> <p>File 02: pp. 7-13</p> <p>File 03: p. 8</p> <p>File 04: pp. 6-7</p>	<p>Training resources are provided as evidence for all key personnel: Test Administrators, Data Stewards, and Technical Liaisons.</p> <p>Required training for test administrators consists of eight modules on such topics as accessibility, preparing for the test, computer delivered testlets and teacher delivered testlets. Detail on required performance (80%) on post-test quizzes is provided.</p> <p>Peer reviewers could not find any information on “next steps” or consequences if trainee failed to reach that performance on one or more of the post-test quizzes. More detail would be helpful on how training can ensure that ALL teachers of SWSCD will be able to administer DLM to their students.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Technology Requirements</b></p> <p>File 06: pp.110, 251-254</p> <p>File 07: Appendix G.1</p> <p>File 04: pp. 9-13, 8</p> <p>File 05: pp. 149-150, 62-65</p> <p>File 02: p. 55</p>	
	<p><b>Contingency plans for technology-based assessment administration</b></p> <p>File 06: p. 111, 123-125, 133-134,193-195</p> <p>File 07: Appendix C.7</p>	<p>Good systems in place for addressing localized administration issues (Technical Manual, p. 111) and internet connectivity issues (see Technical Liaison Manual p. 12).</p> <p>Peer reviewers would like to have seen more</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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	File 04: pp. 6-7, 12  File 17:	information on contingency plans based on potential disruptions of service/functioning of technology.
<b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required from the DLM consortium		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p><b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p>_____ policies and procedures apply to all grade-level and AA-AAAS in all subjects</p>	<p>The DLM consortium submitted evidence of procedures to monitor test administration (File 06 p. 123-125 and p. 225-231) and made a variety of materials and resources available to partner states for the purpose of monitoring test administration. These included a test administration monitoring protocol and an observation protocol for use by SEAs and LEAs. Among other things, the monitoring protocols captured accessibility supports used, level of engagement and barriers to engagement (File07 Appendix C 13). In addition, training tools were provided on the use of these protocols. Monitoring of test administrations was also possible at the SEA and LEA levels through the DLM Educator Portal which permitted checking on progress toward test completion at the student level. Again, training on this feature was submitted (File 07 appendix C 14). Focused monitoring of the test administration was conducted both by DLM and at the SEA and LEA levels, indicating fidelity of test administration (File 06 p.225-231). Errors in routing of students to testlets was also monitored and procedures provided to test administrators to rectify errors (File 06 pp. 142-143 and pp. 193-195) . Finally, states were provided with summaries of these errors as addenda to score reports (File 06 pp. 193-195)</p>
<p><b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>x_ No additional evidence is required from the DLM consortium-State specific.</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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.5 – Test Security</b></p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Evidence of Prevention of Irregularities</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 46-47, 68-69, 69-70, 75-76, 77, 132-133, 134, 133, 135, 252</p> <p>File 07: Appendices B.3 and C.3</p> <p>File 05: p. 121-12</p> <p>File 02: p. 36</p>	<p>Evidence of detection, remediation, and investigation of test irregularities focused on data breaches.</p> <p>Page 252 of File 06 provides a broad statement of expectations regarding security in context of training.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detection of test irregularities;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Evidence of Detection of Irregularities</b></p> <p>File 06: pp.135-136</p> <p>File 07: Appendix C.15</p>	<p>Evidence from DLM is sufficient in this section; more evidence is expected from States.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities</li> </ul>	<p><b>Evidence of Investigation of Remediation Following Incidents</b></p> <p>File 06: p. 133, 134-135</p> <p>File 07: Appendices C.5, C.6</p>	<p>Evidence from DLM is sufficient in this section; more evidence is expected from States.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> </ul>	<p><b>THIS PORTION OF THE CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</b></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> No additional evidence is required from the DLM consortium.</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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</b></p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results;</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS</p> <p><b>Security and Integrity of Test Materials</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 133-134, 134- 135</p>	<p>Detailed evidence documenting policies and procedures to protect integrity and confidentiality of data is provided. Evidence includes definition of minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students/student groups.</p> <p>There is evidence of an appropriately hierarchical system of access to data based on scope of responsibility.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> </ul>	<p>File 06: 133-134, 135</p> <p>File 07: Appendices C.4, C.5, C.6</p>	<p>Evidence is sufficient for this section.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.</li> </ul>	<p><b>PII Protection in Reporting</b></p> <p>File 06: pp.134-135, 186-188, 191</p> <p>File 07: Appendices C.4, C.5, C.6</p>	<p>Evidence is sufficient for this section.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>X_ No additional evidence is required from the DLM consortium.</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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Validity Framework and Overall Evaluation</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 5-7, 279-280 (Tables 108 and 109), 264-278), p. 281 (Table 110), 283-284, 282-283, 263-264</p>	<p>Overall, the interpretation and use argument was clearly tied to four validity claims (how the scores could be used) and these guided validation efforts.</p> <p>The submission provides evaluative evidence of technical quality through an overview of the review process, criteria used, and results (pp. 75-76; 77-82; 82-83). The External Alignment Study (File 15) provides detail on fidelity to the content in the grade-level standards (see pp. 4-8 for Executive Summary).</p> <p>It is worth noting that DLM acknowledges the need to do further alignment studies (see Technical Manual p. 267) since earlier study was done on limited sample rather than on operational testlets as administered.</p> <p>Over time peer reviewers would like to see more evidence of alignment between instructional content and assessment content.</p> <p>The Technical Manual (282-284) included a detailed account of anticipated areas for continuous improvement and future research.</p> <p>Follow-up on consequential validity evidence is advisable, since admittedly limited based on 2014-15 administration.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated</li> </ul>	<p><b>Measurement of Academic Content Standards</b></p> <p>File 06: Introduction, pp. 5-7, 10-21, 14-17, 17-19, 26-27, 38-41, 41- 46, 61-64, 46-47, 68-69, 75-82</p>	<p>Evidence demonstrates that the EEs of the DLM (the equivalent of alternate academic content standards) are adequately linked to State academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.		cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. Testlets are constructed from items that each address an EE aligned to college and career ready standards.
	<p><b>Evaluative Evidence</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 75-76, 77-82, 82-83</p> <p>File 12</p> <p>File 13</p> <p>File 15: pp. 8-9, 16 (Table 5), 15-16, Appendix B, 4-8</p> <p>File 07: Appendix H.1</p>	
<b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b>		
_X_ No additional evidence is required.		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p><b>Assessments Tap Intended Cognitive Processes</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 61-64, 68-69, 46-47, 69-70, 75-76, p. 230 (Table 95), Conclusion, 270-271</p> <p>File 18: pp. 9- 19, Appendix A</p>	<p>The use of Essential Element Concept Maps (EECMs) in item and testlet development is intended to ensure that the assessments tap intended cognitive processes as represented in State academic content standards. This is confirmed in external review. For classification purposes, Anderson and Krathwohl’s (2001) revision to Bloom’s taxonomy is used by DLM. The assignment of cognitive levels for 2014-15 items/testlets was reviewed and confirmed by various stakeholders (item writers/reviewers, teachers, advisory panel members).</p>
	<p><b>Interaction with Testlet Content</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 219-223, 224-225</p>	<p>Additional cognitive labs to investigate possible option order effect on student response.</p>
	<p><b>Fidelity of Administration</b></p> <p>File 06: p. 254, 251-254, 147 (Table 55), 117-121,123-124, 225- 229</p> <p>File 07: Appendix C.12</p>	<p>The submission contains adequate evidence of administration fidelity was provided.</p>
	<p><b>Accessibility</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 125-132, 148-150, 119 (Table 43), 121, 150 (Table 57), p. 230 (Table 95), 252-253, 258- 259</p>	<p>The submission contains acceptable evidence of accessibility.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b></p> <p>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><b>Scoring and reporting structures’ consistency with sub-domain structures</b></p> <p>File 06: Introduction, pp. 14-17, 43-46, 61-64, 85 (Table 21), 58-160, 190-191, 193, 25-34, 35-36, 28-29, 214-215, 263-264</p> <p>File 07: Appendices E.1, E2</p> <p>File 15: pp. 22-23</p>	<p>Adequate evidence has been provided. The data files provide for accountability and school improvement purposes indicate overall performance level results for each content area and highest linkage level mastered for each EE (See Chapter VII of Technical Manual).</p>
	<p><b>Consistency of Measurement</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 203-204, 205-206, 207-209</p>	<p>Evidence is adequate for the consistency of the scoring and reporting with the sub-domain structures of the consortium content standards.</p>
	<p><b>Differential Item Functioning (DIF)</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 231-236, 283-284</p>	<p>Evidence of appropriate procedures is provided; DLM has only considered gender because of sample size. Peers suggest that as more data are available (recommended as &gt;200 per class), further analyses be conducted on other categories (e.g., race, ethnicity, different disability classifications, etc.)</p>
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p><b>Score Relationship to Other Variables</b></p> <p>File 06: p. 85 (Table 21), 327 (Table 102)</p>	<p>DLM acknowledges that evidence of the relationship between student responses on the assessment and other measures is limited, given that the first operational administration was in 2014-2015. However, they provide information about test administrators’ judgments regarding difficulty level of testlets (Technical Manual, pp. 236-237).</p> <p>Per the DLM Consortium’s self-analysis of this Critical Element: “To date, evidence on the relationship between student responses on the DLM assessments and other measures is limited to teacher evaluations of student academic knowledge and skills as measured by the First Contact survey, and teacher perception of testlet difficulty.”</p> <p>Recognizing that that the submission reflects only the 2014-15 administration, peer reviewers would like to see included other evidence such as correlations between student performance on DLM and States’ previous alternative assessment or another measure (for consortium members who have such data available).</p>
<p><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.1 – Reliability</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Reliability for Student Population</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 161- 162, 190- 193, 203-204, 205-206, 207-209)</p>	<p>General comment: DLM made a very strong assumption about the fungible item parameters (items at the same linkage level have the same intercept and main effect). Peers have not found any evidence that this assumption was tested.</p> <p>DLM calculates reliability by using simulation. They use a model but peers did not see evidence that the model fits adequately to the data. Peers acknowledge that DLM plans to examine model fit (File 06, p. 36) and support that plan.</p> <p>Evidence includes documentation of involvement of TAC in decisions regarding the scoring model (p.162).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Overall and Conditional Standard Error of Measurement</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 196-200, 283-284</p>	<p>DLM indicates that due to the model chosen, they will report classification consistency instead of overall and conditional standard error.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Achievement Levels</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 203-204</p>	<p>From Table 74 in File 06 (p. 204), results appear to be adequate. These analyses need to be extended to subgroups as more data are available.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Computer-Adaptive Tests</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 207-209</p>	<p>From Table 77 in File 06 (page 208), results are acceptable. Again, these analyses need to be extended to subgroups as more data are available.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Beyond the one paragraph on p. 162 of File 06, provide clarification as to what was done so far and anticipated plans for what will be done in the future with</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
regard to model fit.		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As 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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</b></p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<p><b>Accessibility</b></p> <p>File 06: 61-64, 46-61, 37, 69-70, 83, 69, 61-64, 82, 126-130, 136-139, 219-223, 225- 229</p> <p>File 01: 15-18</p> <p>File 18: 11-16</p> <p>File 19: 5-16</p>	<p>External review of testlets is described in the Technical Manual (pp. 78-82). Content review criteria are provided (p. 79). These seem very general and perhaps limited in scope (e.g., nothing to direct writers to ordering of response options, inadvertent cueing). This has a potential impact on fairness and accessibility.</p> <p>The ability to evaluate the sufficiency of evidence related to fairness and accessibility is impacted by the fact that there is no reference in evidence to the process by which text passages are created (when, by whom, using what specific selection and creation/revision processes, specification, etc.) beyond indicating that they are based on/drawn from grade appropriate selections and then reduced in cognitive complexity level. (See p. 48; “short narrative passages were constructed from books commonly taught in general education, and short informational texts were written to relate to thematic elements from narratives”). There is also no reference to the processes involved in providing images/graphic adjuncts to items and testlets.</p> <p>Peer reviewers could find no information on when, how, and by whom images included in the assessment are selected and/or created, nor could they find any evidence of specifications or review criteria for this component of items and testlets.</p>
	<p><b>Fairness</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 69-70, 78-82, 130-132, 133, 219-223, 225-229, 231-236</p>	<p>See comments about DIF (3.3)</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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	File 05: pp. 51-53	
<b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include detail on development and selection of reading passages to address accessibility per above. Peers need to see steps that test developers have taken to ensure passages from general grade level texts are made accessible to SWSCD.</li> <li>• DLM needs to provide information to address the selection and/or creation of graphic components in the assessment (e.g., drawn or photographed images) and include criteria used to evaluate this component to ensure fairness and accessibility.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b></p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p><b>Adequately Precise Estimate Across the Continuum</b></p> <p>File 06: p. 83, 112-114, 161-162, 162, 184-185,189-190, 203-204, 205-206, 207-209</p> <p>File 14: 62- 63</p>	<p>The design of the DLM (nodes, linkage levels, EEs, etc.) and test administration placement (see first contact survey, Technical Manual pp. 83) and adaptive delivery (Technical Manual pp. 112-114) supports the capacity of the assessment to provide an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum as reflected in the linkage levels.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p><b>Standardized Scoring Procedures</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 47-48, 52-56, 151-152, 161-162, 172-178, 190- 193, 194-195, 193-195, 193-195, 203-204, 205- 206, 207-209, 253, 254.</p> <p>File 05: pp. 38-50</p> <p>File 17: pp. 8-10)</p>	<p>The evidence provided makes clear the automated scoring procedures for the majority of items in the DLM assessment system.</p> <p>However, additional information may be warranted for those writing testlets (File 06, pp. 47-48) and other testlets for which teachers make score judgments while the testlet is being administered. While there is documentation of support for teacher fidelity in the training modules (pp. 253 and 254) and teacher input on student response was evaluated as part of DLM’s validity studies, peer reviewers were unable to find any evidence of monitoring procedures for this particular aspect of scoring to ensure reliable results (e.g., inter-rater reliability). That is, where the Test Administer must “choose the description that matches the highest level of evaluation of the student’s writing” (File 05, p. 47), it is not clear whether, or how often, these choices that impact scoring are checked/confirmed.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Because some writing testlets and other testlets involve teacher judgment on scores, DLM needs to provide an explanation of what scoring monitoring procedures (e.g., the equivalent of “read-behinds”) are being used, or what one(s) were considered but rejected and the rationale for that decision (fidelity of scoring).</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</b></p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p><b>Assessment Forms Represent Academic Content Standards</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 112-114, 142-143, 125</p> <p>File 07: Appendix C.7</p>	<p>While the DLM assessments are customized to each student—who is assigned a series of testlets rather than a fixed test form—each battery selectively represents an approved minimum number of Essential Elements which correspond to state academic content standards. The adaptive delivery method is designed to ensure coverage of the test blueprint (pp. 112-114).</p> <p>However, peers noted that the ELA test blueprint is presented by grade, and it is not clear what the EE coverage for each student might be (see FILE 10: ELA Blueprint—specifically page 2). See comments under 2.1.</p> <p>Peer reviewers were unable to find evidence to explain the comparability of coverage among students, given that each will address different EEs (although distribution of EEs across Conceptual Areas appears to be the same).</p>
	<p><b>Assessment Forms Yield Consistent Score Interpretations</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 101-106, 97-98, 61-64, 69-70, 93-101,161-162)</p>	<p>Because the calibrations were done separately for each linkage level, it was unclear to peer reviewers how estimated parameters were linked to the same scale. Peers felt it would be helpful if clarification were provided as to how item parameters were put on the same scale for a given linkage level.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b></p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Comparable Interpretation of Results</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 60-61, 69-70, 69, 61-64</p>	<p>The evidence supports comparable interpretation of results for students taking the general form of testlets, the version for students who are blind or have visual impairment (BVI), and blind/visually impaired students who read braille.</p> <p>The evidence provided focuses on the item writing process and resources (Technical Manual, pp. 69-70) but does not explicitly address the implications for developing alternate versions of testlets that have a considerable visual load—but based on sample items/testlets interspersed in the Technical Manual, it appears that many include images (drawings or photographs). It is not clear how the determination of general forms of testlets that would not introduce accessibility barriers for blind students is made, prior to transcription.</p> <p>Peers suggest including more detail on role/impact of graphic components in items/testlets and how this is addressed in multiple versions of the assessment.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Documented Evidence of Comparability</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 97-98, 101-106, 126, 121, 130- 132, 161-162</p>	<p>As more data become available, peers suggest conducting modality study(ies) comparing test administration modes.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b></p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p><b>Monitoring, Maintaining, and Improving Quality of Assessment</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 64-75, 97- 98, 97, 135-136, 136- 139, 231-236,283-284, 279 (Table 108), 280 (Table 109)</p> <p>File 15</p> <p>File 20: pp. 2-17</p> <p>File 23</p> <p>File 14: Appendix B, pp. 62-63</p> <p>File 15: pp. 24-25, 25-30</p> <p>File 22.</p>	<p>In DLM notes under this section of their submission, they reference State partners’ responsibilities for maintenance of EEs (page 15 in Section 4). Peers were unclear as to what this entails.</p> <p>As DLM moves to subsequent years’ administrations, peers were interested in knowing how year-to-year equating would be conducted, based on the design features of this assessment.</p> <p>Procedures for obtaining reliability evidence are based on AERA Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (2014); see Technical Manual p. 203.</p> <p>DLM appears to have a solid system in place for identifying and implementing future studies to inform/enhance the assessment; However, it is not sufficiently clear to peers what role state partners play beyond input on topics (since the TAC “provides input on conceptualization, preliminary/exploratory analyses, and final products”), based on evidence provided (FILE 23: TAC Materials).</p> <p>Peers suggest that DLM clarify/provide more detail on roles/responsibilities of partners in future research.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards;</li> </ul>	<p><b>THIS PORTION OF THE CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs;</li> </ul>	<p><b>THIS PORTION OF THE CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Guidelines for choice of assessment</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 252-253</p> <p>File 07: Appendix C.16, G1</p> <p><b>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC GUIDANCE IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</b></p>	<p>Technical Manual Appendix C.16 sets forth three basic guidelines for assigning a student to the alternate assessment, as well as extraneous factors that should not come into play; The Technical Manual indicates these are all reinforced during test administrator training and this is borne out in Module 1 (FILE 07 pp. 199-227)</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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Information on Supports and Accommodations</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 125-132, 252-253</p> <p>File 07: Appendix G.1</p> <p>File 01: pp. 15-18</p> <p><b>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC GUIDANCE IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</b></p>	<p>Peers noted that this was well addressed in the Technical Manual pp. 125-132 and Module 3 (FILE 07 pp. 242-278) and in Accessibility Manual (pp. 15-18) in section on DLM accessibility features.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Guidance on Selection of Accommodations</b></p> <p>File 01: pp. 11-12, 19-22, 30</p> <p>File 06: pp. 252-253</p> <p>File 07: Appendix G.1</p> <p>File 05: pp. 95-106, 60, 76</p> <p><b>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC GUIDANCE IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</b></p>	<p>Peers took note of well documented procedures; a particular strength is the DLM practice of allowing test administrators to change PNP selections and evaluate the effectiveness of accommodations determined for each student (see p. 30 of FILE 01 for questions to guide this evaluation).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Disability Categories for Alternate Assessment</b></p> <p>File 07: Appendix C.16</p> <p><b>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC GUIDANCE IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</b></p>	<p>See under Guidelines for choice of assessment, above.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student's achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of</li> </ul>	<p><b>THIS PORTION OF THE CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</b></p>	<p>N/A</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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State's general assessments);</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Promote Access to the General Curriculum</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 255-261, 254-261, 251-252</p> <p>File 07: Appendix G.1</p> <p>File 05: pp. 20-22</p> <p>File 08</p> <p>File 09</p> <p><b>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC PROCEDURES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</b></p>	<p>The submission includes ample evidence that the design of the alternate assessment promotes access to grade level content standards.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> </ul>	<p><b>Determining Appropriateness of Accommodation</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 181-183</p> <p>File 01: pp. 13-30</p> <p><b>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC GUIDANCE IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</b></p>	<p>There are procedures in place for determining accommodations that are appropriate for all SWSCD including ELS (File 01, pp. 13-30). ELs with significant cognitive disabilities may have translation provided outside the DLM system (p. 16, 17).</p> <p>Detail is provided in Testlet Information page (TIP) about any exceptions to allowable translation (e.g, a vocabulary item); test administrators are also permitted to translate words and provide synonyms and definitions in preferred language (FILE 05 p. 48-49).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Information on Supports and Accommodations</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 125-132, 252-253</p> <p>File 07: Appendix G.1</p> <p>File 05: pp. 35-36, 48-49</p> <p>File 01</p> <p><b>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC GUIDANCE IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</b></p>	<p>Evidence provided is adequate for this factor.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Guidance on Selection of Accommodations</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 125-132, 252-253</p> <p>File 01: pp. 15-18, 30</p> <p>File 05: p. 159, 60</p> <p><b>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL</b></p>	<p>Consortia-level evidence provided by DLM is adequate for this section. States must provide additional evidence.</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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC GUIDANCE IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.	
<b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b>		
_X_ No additional evidence is required.		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.3 – Accommodations</b></p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities (SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Evidence of appropriate accommodation availability</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 125-132, 254</p> <p>File 01: pp. 11-12, 15-18</p> <p>File 05: pp. 51-53</p>	<p>Based on detail in the Technical Manual and Accessibility Manual, test administrators are trained annually on IEP decision-making, which drives selection of accommodations on the assessment.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);</li> </ul>	<p><b>Evidence of appropriate accommodations for English learners</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 120-121, 181-183</p>	<p>Translation is available as an accommodation, appropriately implemented by the test administrator, given the small % of students with significant cognitive disabilities who are EL (no translated forms)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Appropriateness and effectiveness of accommodations</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 125-132, 143-147, 126-130, 130-132, 127-128, 217-218, 270-271, 283-284</p> <p>File 05: pp. 159, 55, 150-151</p> <p>File 01: p. 30</p> <p>File 21</p>	<p>Decisions on supports are well-grounded to support flexibility and equity of use, along with multiple means of engagement, representation, action and expression (pp. 130-132). Other key principles include student use of normal response mode and familiar, individualized manipulatives as required.</p> <p>One commendable feature is use of released testlets on which students can practice, in order to determine which accommodations will be most useful for him/her (KITE User Guide, pp. 150-151).</p> <p>Submission indicates plans (and rationales) for continuing research to improve use and effectiveness of accommodations; please note that rather than this detail appearing in File 06, pp. 217-18 as noted under DLM evidence, it actually appears on p. 150.</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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Exceptional accommodations requests:</b></p> <p><b>THIS PORTION OF THE CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</b></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b></p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Accommodations and participation decisions are consistent with state policy</b></p> <p>File 01: pp. 11-12, 15-18</p> <p>File 07: Appendix C.16</p> <p><b>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC PROCEDURES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</b></p>	<p>DLM provides guidelines through which state consortium members can monitor participation and accommodation assignment.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Appropriateness of accommodations and participation decisions for addressing student needs</b></p> <p>File 01: pp. 11-12, 15-18</p> <p><b>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC PROCEDURES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</b></p>	<p>Similarly, DLM provides guidance on the selection of accommodations based on student needs and preferences (Accessibility Manual pp. 11-2 and 15-18).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Consistent with accommodations during instruction and/or practice</b></p> <p>File 01: pp. 11 – 12, 19-22</p> <p>File 06: pp. 136-150, 283-284</p> <p><b>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC PROCEDURES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</b></p>	<p>DLM recommends that accommodations for use during assessment be consistent with those implemented in instructional contexts, but this must be monitored by each state. However, the consortium does collect indirect evidence of consistency between accommodations for assessment and instruction via a survey (Technical Manual p. 150).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team</li> </ul>	<p><b>Consistent with accommodations identified by team</b></p>	<p>DLM offers, via the KITE Educator Portal, the means by which state and local educators may</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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner;	File 02: pp. 44-46  <b>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC PROCEDURES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</b>	produce lists of students' accommodations on their PNP profile. States may use this information for monitoring.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul>	<b>Administered with fidelity to procedures</b>  File 06: p.p. 124, 225-229  <b>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC PROCEDURES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</b>	Along with SEA and LEA staff, DLM staff participates in monitoring the use of accommodations (Technical Manual p. 124).
<b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b>		
_X_ No additional evidence is required.		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

**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><b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</b></p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities;</li> </ul>	<p><b>THIS CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</b></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply;</li> </ul>	<p><b>THIS CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</b></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</li> </ul>	<p><b>THIS CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</b></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>x_ No additional evidence is required from DLM consortium-state specific.</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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As 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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b></p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p><b>Technically Sound Method</b></p> <p>File 14: pp. 19-20, 23- 24, 26-27, 31-32, 38-39, 33-34, 34-35, 34, 41, 53-57, 57-58, 44-49, 60-64, Appendix G, Appendix B, 62063</p> <p>File 06: pp. 203-204</p>	<p>Submission provides a clear explanation of application of well-established standard setting procedures to the unique features of the DLM assessment (FILE 14, pp. 19-20)</p>
	<p><b>Panelist experience and expertise</b></p> <p>File 14: pp.28, 30-31, 70-74, 51, Appendix L (201)</p>	<p>Standard-setting involved a range of participants, including TAC and state partners, and SEA staff, who reviewed and approved cuts. Panelist characteristics are well-defined in terms of professional role, experience with SWSCD, race, gender, geographic representation (FILE 14, pp. 30-31)</p> <p>Peer reviewers noticed, however, that representation was skewed toward females and Caucasians. While that may reflect the population that participants were drawn from, it would have been useful to make this clear. DLM should make an effort to better balance participation in the future.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p><b>Challenging Alternate Academic Achievement Standards</b></p> <p>File 06: pp.17-19, 26-27, 38-41</p> <p>File 15: pp. 23-24</p> <p>File 18: pp. 63-67</p> <p>File 06: pp. 163-164, 179- 180, 165</p>	<p>Evidence demonstrates that EEs (extended content standards) were developed based on CCSS and later aligned with CETE learning maps. Performance level descriptors were developed through a process informed by research and professional judgment.</p>
	<p><b>Differentiated content across grades</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 10-13, 26-27, 179-180</p>	<p>PLDs are clearly based on grade level content (FILE 06, pp. 179-80) and are aligned across grades to ensure increasing complexity.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Reporting Results</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 165, 93-195, 282-283</p> <p>File 07: Appendix E.7</p> <p><b>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE- SPECIFIC REPORTING IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</b></p>	<p>States are provided with detailed data files and resources to SEA staff on how they can be used (FILE 07, Appendix E7).</p> <p>It might be useful to peer reviewers to be able to access examples of the additional resources mentioned in Appendix E7 that are available to states on their website—even if limited to including static documents. Peers noted that the screenshot provided on p. 192 of FILE 07 gives some idea of a wide array of resources available to member states.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Assessment results reported to support appropriate uses of results</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 161- 162, 190- 193, 238-239, 244- 246</p> <p>File 07: Appendix E.2, E1</p> <p><b>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE- SPECIFIC REPORTING IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</b></p>	<p>Submission notes indicate “preliminary evidence indicates that teachers are able to use ISRs to guide instructional planning” and reference FILE 06 pp. 244-246. Some indication of plans to obtain follow-up information would be useful.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Interpretive Guides</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 191-192</p> <p>File 07: Appendices E.3, E.9, E.10, E.4, E.5</p> <p>File 20</p> <p><b>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE- SPECIFIC INTERPRETIVE GUIDES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</b></p>	<p>The last page of FILE 20 provides screenshot of a list of scoring and reporting resources available to states on the DLM website; access to these documents would enhance this submission.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State provides for the production and</li> </ul>	<p><b>Delivery of Student Reports</b></p>	<p>Overall, DLM provides ample evidence to address</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 DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS-YEAR END MODEL

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;</li> <li>○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;</li> <li>○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</li> </ul>	<p>File 06: pp. 203-209, 238-239, 191-192, 265-274</p> <p>File 07: Appendix E3</p> <p><b>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE- SPECIFIC INTERPRETIVE GUIDES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</b></p>	<p>most aspects of this factor.</p> <p>Peer reviewers noted how detailed the score report is and wonder whether reliability evidence supports this much detail in score reporting.</p> <p>Peer reviewers ask DLM to consider conveying to parents that there <u>is</u> some error in scores (to address the reliability of information regarding a student’s achievement).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration</li> </ul>	<p><b>Process and Timeline</b></p> <p>File 06: pp. 190-193, 267</p> <p>File 07: Appendix E6</p> <p><b>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE- SPECIFIC INTERPRETIVE GUIDES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</b></p>	<p>Evidence from DLM is sufficient for this section.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required from the consortium.</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.