



## 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

January 24, 2019

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 (NCLB), which governed State assessments through the 2016-2017 school year. The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), which governs State assessments beginning in the 2017-2018 school year, maintains the essential requirements from NCLB that each State annually administer high-quality assessments in at least reading/language arts, mathematics and science that meet nationally recognized professional and technical standards with a few additional requirements. I appreciate the efforts of the New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDE) to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in March 2018.

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

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

- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in high school (SAT): **Partially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**

The components that **partially meet requirements** do not meet a number of the requirements of the statute and regulations and/or 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.

Please note that the assessment requirements for ESEA, as amended by the NCLB, were in effect through the end of the 2016-2017 school year. The NHDE peer review was conducted under the requirements of this statute. Beginning in the 2017-2018 school year, the assessment requirements of the ESEA, as

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.*

amended by the ESSA, apply to State assessments. Given that this review began under the requirements of the ESEA as amended by the NCLB, it is important to indicate that while several of the State's assessments meet some of the peer review guidance criteria under the NCLB, the State is still responsible to ensure that these assessments also comply with the requirements of the ESSA. Department staff carefully reviewed NDHE evidence and peer review recommendations in light of the updated requirements for State assessments under the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. As a result of this additional review, I have determined that the NHDE assessments need to meet two additional requirements related to Universal Design for Learning and testing accommodations. These requirements are listed under critical elements 4.2, 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 respectively, along with the other evidence needed from the March 2018 peer review.

The specific list of items required for NHDE to submit is enclosed with this letter. Because the State has not fully satisfied the condition placed on the State's Title I, Part A grant award related to its State assessment system, the Department is continuing to place a condition on the State's Title I, Part A 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. Within 30 days of receipt of this letter, NHDE must provide to the Department a plan and timeline by which it will submit the additional documentation. If adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action. 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.

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

NHDE has advised the Department that it intended to replace the general assessments reviewed in 2016 and submit a complete set of new evidence after the 2018-2019 administration of New Hampshire's assessments. NHDE will need to submit these new assessments for peer review after their first full operational administration. NHDE should include in the plan and timeline submitted in response to this letter, a detailed description of the implementation for each of the reading/language arts, mathematics, and science general assessments.

Page 3 – The Honorable Frank Edelblut

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 Collette Roney of my staff at: [OSS.NewHampshire@ed.gov](mailto:OSS.NewHampshire@ed.gov).

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank T. Brogan  
Assistant Secretary for  
Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Julie Couch, Administrator, Division of Learner Support  
Heather Gage, Director, Division of Learner Support

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Additional Evidence Needed</b>
<b>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</b>	For all assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that explicitly indicates the State applies its formally adopted content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State; OR</li> <li>• Documentation regarding the policies and procedures New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDE) uses to ensure that a local educational agency (LEA) that does not apply the State’s academic content standards meets all of the criteria in section 1111(b)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and 34 CFR 200.1 regarding such standards and that the standards apply to all students in the LEA.</li> </ul>
<b>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</b>	For the entire assessment system in the State, NHDE must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See evidence requested under element 1.1.</li> </ul>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b>	For the SAT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A plan and a timeline to address the alignment issues identified in the existing alignment studies, particularly in mathematics.</li> </ul>
<b>2.2 – Item Development</b>	For the SAT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of 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.</li> <li>• Evidence of guidelines for item writers with respect to fairness in the development and review process.</li> </ul>
<b>2.3 – Test Administration</b>	For the SAT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the SEA has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, specifically administration with the read-aloud and scribing accommodations.</li> </ul>
<b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b>	For the SAT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of how the State monitors administration to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</li> </ul>
<b>2.5 – Test Security</b>	For the SAT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of NHDE policies and procedures for remediation following test security incidents involving the SAT assessments; and</li> <li>• Evidence of NHDE policies and procedures for prevention of assessment irregularities, specifically annual training requirements for test security policies and procedures, including how NHDE ensures that all test coordinators receive training.</li> </ul>

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Additional Evidence Needed</b>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b>	For the SAT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence requested in critical element 2.1 will satisfy this critical element.</li> </ul>
<b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b>	For the SAT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for high school as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</li> </ul>
<b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b>	For the SAT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</li> </ul>
<b>4.1 – Reliability</b>	For the SAT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documentation of adequate reliability evidence for students with disabilities, English learners, and students who received accommodations.</li> </ul>
<b>4.2 – Fairness and accessibility</b>	For the SAT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the assessment is accessible and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments, including data related to students with disabilities and English learners.</li> <li>Evidence that the State supports and enhances the accessibility of the assessments through appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities and, to the extent practicable, by incorporating principles of universal design for learning.</li> </ul>
<b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b>	For the SAT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of 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.</li> </ul>
<b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b>	For all assessments: <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> For the SAT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of the State’s process for ensuring that students with disabilities are included in the SAT, including clear guidelines for accommodations and the receipt of college-reportable scores.</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	Evidence that children with disabilities are not denied the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.
<b>5.2 – Procedures for Including ELs</b>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> <li>○ Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Evidence that English learners are not denied the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.</li> </ul>
<b>5.3 – Accommodations</b>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State 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>• As noted above in elements 5.1 and 5.2, evidence that children with disabilities and English learners are not denied the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment (evidence submitted for element 5.1 will address this concern).</li> </ul>
<b>5.4– Monitoring Testing of Special Populations</b>	<p>For all assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State monitors test administration in districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>○ Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>○ Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>○ Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s individualized education programs team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; and</li> <li>○ Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</b>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has formally adopted academic achievement standards in reading/language arts and mathematics in high school that include at least three levels of achievement, descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level, and achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b>	For the SAT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 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.</li> </ul>
<b>6.4 – Reporting</b>	For the SAT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of reporting that 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:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 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>▪ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</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; and</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ A process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## March 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

# STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

## Contents

<b>SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	4
2.2 – Item Development.....	8
2.3 – Test Administration.....	11
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration.....	14
2.5 – Test Security .....	17
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....	21
<b>SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....</b>	<b>25</b>
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	26
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	30
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure .....	34
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables.....	40
<b>SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER .....</b>	<b>42</b>
4.1 – Reliability.....	42
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	45
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	47
4.4 – Scoring .....	49
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms .....	52
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment .....	53
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance.....	55
<b>SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS .....</b>	<b>58</b>
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities .....	59
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	63
5.3 – Accommodations.....	66
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations.....	70
<b>SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .</b>	<b>72</b>
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....	73
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards .....	76
6.4 – Reporting.....	80

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

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

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results;</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills);</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.</li> </ul>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b>  <b>Evidence #2.1.1: SAT® Suite Technical Manual (October 2017)</b>            The technical manual describes the test design and test development process for the SAT assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 1 - 20 provide an overview of the assessment, including a description its purpose, test format and content, scores derived from the assessment and the intended use of results.</li> <li>• Pages 27 - 52 provide a detailed description of test development procedures.</li> <li>• Additionally, see the evidence presented in response to section 3 and 4 regarding the technical quality of the SAT.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.2: College Board + Connecticut; SAT® Suite of Assessments: Alignment to Connecticut Standards (October 2016)</b>            The College Board conducted an alignment study to determine how the SAT and its related assessment aligned to the Connecticut state standards. This document provides detailed information regarding the study findings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 16 - 101 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to the state’s standards for English Language Arts and Math in grades 11 and 12.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.3: College Board + Delaware; SAT® Suite of Assessments: Alignment to Delaware Standards (October 2016)</b>            The College Board conducted an alignment study to determine how the SAT and its related assessment aligned to the Delaware state standards. This document provides detailed information regarding the study findings.</p>	<p><b>Purposes and intended interpretations</b>  <b>Overall, peers would like to see more claims and evidence regarding how states are incorporating SAT scores into their high school accountability system. What studies or information is being collected?</b></p> <p>Pg 9 “Because it is more closely aligned to both high school instruction and post-high school requirements, the SAT serves as evidence of the hard work students have performed in high school” . Peers would like to see evidence for this claim.</p> <p><b>Test Designs and Blueprints</b>            2.1.8 Test Specs – detailed specs provided, when considered in conjunction with the individual states’ standards, does offer evidence of assessments that test whole range of standards, up to the limitations described in the “Connection to Content Standards.”</p> <p><b>Connection to Content Standards</b>            Mathematical practices described on page 43. Math content appears to be focused on linear, quadratic, and other polynomial function families. No mention of logarithmic or exponential families that are in the CCSS. Check Table A-3.11 Exponential functions listed in Table A-3.11. There does not appear to be an alignment to the state’s academic content standards in math.</p> <p>States are advised to document plans to assess the full breadth of the adopted standard, including for ELA use of technology, conducting research, speaking, and listening, which are not addressed by the SAT suite. Other standards not included in the SAT are described in the Alignment document 2.1.3 (e.g., Delaware)</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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>• Pages 16 - 106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to the state’s standards for English Language Arts/Literacy and Math in grades 11 and 12.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.4: College Board + Maine; SAT® Suite of Assessments: Alignment to Maine Standards (October 2016)</b> The College Board conducted an alignment study to determine how the SAT and its related assessment aligned to the Maine state standards. This document provides detailed information regarding the study findings.</p> <p>• Pages 16 - 106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to the state’s standards for English Language Arts/Literacy and Math in grades 11 and 12.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.5: College Board + Michigan; SAT® Suite of Assessments: Alignment to Michigan Standards (2015)</b> The College Board conducted an alignment study to determine how the SAT and its related assessment aligned to the Michigan state standards.</p> <p>This document provides detailed information regarding the study findings.</p> <p>• Pages 16 - 106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to the state’s standards for English Language Arts/Literacy and Math in grades 11 and 12.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.6: College Board + New Hampshire; SAT® Suite of Assessments: Alignment to New Hampshire Standards (October 2016)</b> The College Board conducted an alignment study to determine how the SAT and its related assessment aligned to the New Hampshire state standards. This document provides detailed information regarding</p>	<p>SAT indicated there was an independent alignment study conducted in 2016, but this study was not provided for review.</p> <p>Connecticut – non-third party alignment (conducted by College Board, Oct. 2016) study of CT’s 2010 standards: acknowledges which standards are not assessed, namely, speaking and listening, construction mathematical representations.</p> <p>Delaware - non-third party alignment (conducted by College Board, Oct. 2016) study of DE’s 2010 standards: acknowledge which standards are not assessed, namely, speaking and listening and standards related to technology use.</p> <p>Illinois – (2010) acknowledges which standards are not assessed, namely, speaking, listening, presentations, capitalization, spelling, construction mathematical representations.</p> <p>Maine: (2010) standards not addressed: speaking, listening, presentations, capitalization, spelling, constructing mathematical representations, as well as “advanced” standards, such as vectors, matrices, using probability to make decisions.</p> <p>Michigan: acknowledges which standards are not assessed, namely, speaking, listening, presentations, capitalization, spelling, construction mathematical representations.</p> <p>New Hampshire: standards not addressed: speaking, listening, capitalization, spelling, and several writing standards in history/social studies, science, and technical subjects. Mathematical modeling is covered</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 SAT Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>the study findings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 16 - 106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to the state’s standards for English Language Arts/Literacy and Math in grades 11 and 12.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.7: College Board + Illinois; SAT@ Suite of Assessments: Alignment to Illinois Standards (October 2016)</b></p> <p>The College Board conducted an alignment study to determine how the SAT and its related assessment aligned to the Illinois state standards. This document provides detailed information regarding the study findings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 16 - 106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to the state’s standards for English Language Arts/Literacy and Math in grades 11 and 12.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)</b></p> <p>This document provides details regarding how our test is constructed and includes test blueprints, evidentiary foundation, and examples of text complexity and sample questions. While we recommend that reviewers consider the entire development process.</p>	<p>differently than stated in NH standards.</p> <p><b>Item Descriptions for ELA and Mathematics</b></p> <p>The content specs and blueprint sections of Tech Manual Appendix 3 contain long lists of statements that could be used to infer what the items ask of students.</p> <p>Test specs document supplies the same descriptive information as Appendix 3, albeit with sample items. General descriptive information is given for broad swaths of item types.</p> <p>Detailed item descriptions, test development procedures and guiding principles, and sample items (2.1.8, Sections III and IV). “Important Features” details the type of skills, thinking, expected to be assessed by items.</p>
<b>Section 2.1 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>Evidence of 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>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2.2 – Item Development</b></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>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b></p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 28 – 34 describe the processes used to ensure the fairness of the assessment.</li> <li>• Pages 27 - 52 provide a detailed description of test development procedures.</li> <li>• Pages 108 - 114 describe the evidentiary foundation for the decisions made about the content included in the SAT.</li> <li>• Pages 120 - 133 describe the College Board pilot study of the predictive validity of the SAT.</li> <li>• Pages 133 - 135 describe how the SAT assesses student readiness for college.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board SAT Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire and Illinois</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 7 - 8 in each of the alignment documents contain a section called The Alignment conducted their alignment study.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please refer to the sections identified as evidence in support of Critical Element 2.2.</li> </ul>	<p>Is there information regarding the demographic characteristics of the item writers and reviewers? Do the states that use this assessment as an accountability assessment have teachers on the committees?</p> <p>Who are the “independent experts’ active in the field” and what is the set of criteria they use to judge an item?</p> <p>Where are the item writer guidelines that are described on page 41 (PDF page 50) of the technical manual? Is there diversity in the item writer pool or the review process?</p> <p>Tech Manual, Page 32 –lists typically classroom teachers. Is that enough to show representation from different ethnic and socio-economic groups to screen for sensitivity and fairness. Are there tables of the reviewers? For items, passages, forms?</p> <p>Page 32, 46. “The guidelines provided to our fairness reviewers as they review test questions and stimuli are summarized in this chapter.” The guidelines were not provided for review for verification of the process/procedures used.</p> <p>Evidence provided for cognitive complexity is minimal</p> <p>Lists 2.1.2 – 2.1.7 – state alignment documents. State alignment documents do not address cognitive processes alignment</p> <p>Lists 2.2.1 – this document discusses the predictive validity of the old test and proposed revisions to the SAT</p> <p>Lists 2.2.2 – this document is a study focused on the validity of using the SAT for college admission decisions. It does not address cognitive processes</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 SAT Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		Lists 3.2.2 – Summary of cognitive lab. More details about the methodology, content, and interpretations are needed to provide a convincing argument that the high level cognitive processes purported to be assessed are indeed drawn upon by students as they engage with the SAT.
<b>Section 2.2 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:  Evidence of 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of guidelines for item writers in fairness within the development and review process.</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 SAT Consortium

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>• Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments;</li> <li>• If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b>  <b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b>            • Pages 53 - 59 describe the standardized test administration procedures for standard administrations and for administration of the test with accommodations.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.1: The SAT School Day Supervisor Manual (Spring 2017)</b>            This manual provides instructions for supervisors who are responsible for overseeing the administration on how to prepare for test day, protocol for reporting test irregularities, and guidance on how to maintain test security.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.2: The SAT School Day Test Room Manual (Spring 2017)</b>            This manual provides instructions for associate supervisors (also referred to as test room coordinators) who will proctor the exam. This manual contains test day scripts for standard test administrations.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b>            This manual provides instructions for supervisors who will be responsible for registering students for testing accommodations and managing nonstandard test administrations.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.4: SAT School Day Test Center Supervisor Training (2016)</b>            This PowerPoint deck contains the basic information presented to all Test Center Supervisors in online and in-person training sessions and reviews policies, procedures and best</p>	<p>Documentation in the administration manuals appears to be sufficient, except for accommodation administration.            2.1.1 establishes standardized procedures and 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3, &amp; 2.3.4 communicate these procedures</p> <p>Communication procedures appear to be sufficient across the different administration manuals for assessments administered to the general population. Training webinar slides are also informative for accommodations and how to get them approved.            3.5 – Accommodations Webinar; however, this does not adequately address how to administer read aloud or scribe accommodations  <b>2.3.3:</b> detailed instructions and procedures  <b>2.3.5:</b> training for testing with accommodations</p> <p>Does College Board collect information to ensure that school officials in every state have been trained and can administer the assessment under standardized conditions?</p> <p>Rosters may be maintained at the state level. Should SAT get a copy?</p> <p>2.3.7 There is no agreement in this form that the individual has participated in any training. No evidence that training occurred.</p> <p>There was no verification of training participation.</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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>practices related to SAT test administration. This deck may have been customized for state partners based on particular local requirements. Please refer to the submissions of our state partners for additional information and evidence of test center supervisor training.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.5: SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017)</b> This PowerPoint deck contains the basic information presented to all SSD supervisors via online and in-person training sessions and reviews the policies and procedures related to nonstandard SAT administrations. This deck may have been customized for state partners based on particular local requirements. Please refer to the submissions of our state partners for additional information and evidence of accommodations training.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.7: SAT Testing Staff Agreement</b> Prior to test day, all testing staff must sign this agreement to signify that they accept the conditions and requirements of SAT administration.</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: Provide evidence to address policies and procedures for standardized test administration that</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, specifically administration with accommodations, that is, read aloud and scribe;</li> <li>• Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s assessment receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments, including verification of training.</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 SAT Consortium

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

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 style="text-align: center;"><b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b> The below information lists the resources the College Board provides to the states to support uniform standardized test administration procedures across districts and schools.</p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 55 describes the roles and responsibilities of different test administration staff, delineates the qualifications testing staff should possess, and explains the training testing staff should receive.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.1: The SAT School Day Supervisor Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 4 - 32: The College Board provides guidance on the number of staff needed to proctor and examination, how to set up test administration rooms and seating plans to facilitate implementation, and how to use the Supervisor irregularity form. The manual also includes a suggested timeline for when proctors and other test administration staff should be trained.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.2: The SAT School Day Test Room Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 3 - 12 include information on how to monitor test administration and report testing irregularities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p>	<p>The Technical Manual describes detailed requirements of test administrators (see p. 53), including qualifications, timing, test materials, and observation during testing. Specifications provided for accommodations and handling of materials. security procedures provided. Irregularity reports must be completed by administrators.</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 SAT Consortium**

<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>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 13 - 23 include information on how to monitor the test administration and report testing irregularities that may take place during a nonstandard test administration.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.4: SAT School Day Test Center Supervisor Training (2016)</b>                      This PowerPoint deck contains the basic information presented to all Test Center Supervisors in online and in-person training sessions and reviews policies, procedures and best practices related to SAT test administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 9 - 36 review all of the actions that should take place before, during, and after the test administration. This section of the presentation clearly delineates the responsibilities of test center supervisors, proctors, monitors, and other staff.</li> </ul>	
<b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</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 SAT Consortium

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2.5 – Test Security</b></p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> </ul>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b>  <b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 58 - 59 describe the procedures the College Board has designed to maintain test security at all times.</li> <li>• Pages 66 - 68 describe the College Board’s post-test analysis, which is conducted as a component of the company’s test security procedures.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.1: The SAT School Day Supervisor Manual (Spring 2017)</b>  This manual provides guidance for supervisors who are responsible for overseeing the administration on how to maintain test security:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 8 – 9 describe the information supervisors should communicate to staff in order to maintain test security. Seating policies, devised to reduce the possibility of cheating, are described in this section.</li> <li>• Pages 12 – 13 describe how supervisors should prepare student for test day and includes information on items and behaviors that are not allowed in the test area.</li> <li>• Pages 14 - 26 provide instructions on how to receive and securely store materials until test day, and how to report on test administration irregularities.</li> <li>• Pages 39 - 40 include a sample irregularities report that supervisors use to begin investigation of test administration issues.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.2: The SAT School Day Test Room Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 1 - 12 provide instruction on standardized</li> </ul>	<p><b>Prevention of assessment irregularities</b>  Manuals provide sufficient documentation of recommended procedures. States should supply evidence that proctors have been trained. Perhaps local policies for checking in on test rooms that procedures have been implemented according to the documentation.</p> <p><b>Detection of irregularities</b>  2.3.1 pp. 39-40: form to report irregularities  2.1.1 pp. 66-68: statistical analysis for irregularities  2.3.4 pp. 23-30</p> <p>Unclear how states participate in monitoring, auditing, and evaluating these procedures,</p> <p><b>Investigations of irregularities</b>  SAT internal processes are described in 2.5.2 and 2.5.3; however, 2.5.3 is very high level and points to confidential procedures for investigating suspect scores.  2.5.3 - 2.5.2: How and Why ETS Questions Scores (College Board Program) in cases not due to test irregularities  Unclear how states participate in monitoring, auditing, and evaluating these procedures</p> <p>Should the state documentation also contain procedures for how local incidents are investigated and remediated?  Generally, scores are canceled with the student’s knowledge, and there are various options offered to the student to remedy their records. See 2.5.2 for many details.  2.5.3 –no specifics for remediation are provided.  Unclear how states participate in monitoring, auditing, and evaluating these 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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>testing procedures devised to maintain security during test administration. Information in this section includes how to maintain security in the testing room and report administration irregularities.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b>                      • Pages 13 - 23 provide instruction on standardized testing procedures devised to maintain security during nonstandard test administrations. Information in this section includes how to maintain security in the testing room and report administration irregularities.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.4: SAT School Day Test Center Supervisor Training (2016)</b>                      • Pages 23 - 30: The College Board trains test administration staff (including supervisors, coordinators, and administrators) on how to report and address irregularities they may encounter on test day.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.5.1: SAT School Day Registration and Questionnaire Guide (2017)</b>                      This brochure provides important information for students so that they may prepare for test day.                      • Pages 15 – 21 provide information on test security procedures, what will be allowed into testing rooms, and how to report suspicious behavior.                      • Pages 25 – 26 and 27 - 30 describe processes that may take place in order to conserve test integrity and maintain test security.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.5.2: Why and How ETS Questions Scores (College Board Programs) (2016)</b></p>	<p>2.5.2 &amp; 2.5.3 – ETS procedures for handling irregularities</p> <p>Does SAT conduct any analysis on the irregularity reports or conduct any statistical analysis on potential irregularity issues? This evidence was not provided. Substantial evidence provided illustrated proactive steps to prevent issues but not much about post-irregularity issues. The ETS report indicates it does review individual student level cheating issues. Peers are unclear about how College Board reviews potential school-wide, district-wide, or state-level issues? Are there any reports or analysis done for the state at a school/district level?</p> <p>SAT did not provide specifics on remediation- what does the state do and how does SAT inform the SEA?</p> <p>The state documentation will need to include procedures on how local incidents are investigated and remediated?</p> <p>Individual states should provide evidence that these procedures are implemented and how they deal with detected irregularities (whether detected at test time or during post-test analysis at ETS).</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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>This document describes the ways that ETS, our testing subcontractor, investigates cases that may affect the validity of test scores.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.5.3: Investigation and Remediation of SAT Irregularities (2018)</b></p> <p>This document provides a high level overview of the procedures the College Board undertakes to investigate irregularities and remediate any recurring issues.</p>	
<p><b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:                      Evidence 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 with documentation of training.</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities but no specific data was provided to verify this process.</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>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

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>general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:  <b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 58 - 59 describe the procedures the College Board has designed to maintain test</li> </ul> <b>Evidence #2.3.1: The SAT School Day Supervisor Manual (Spring 2017)</b>                      This manual provides guidance for supervisors who are responsible for overseeing the administration on how to maintain test security:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 12 – 13 describe how supervisors should prepare student for test day and includes information on items and behaviors that are not allowed in the test area.</li> <li>Pages 14 - 26 provide instructions on how to receive and securely store materials until test day, and report on test administration irregularities.</li> <li>Pages 39 - 40 include a sample irregularities report that supervisors use to begin investigation of test administration issues.</li> </ul> <b>Evidence #2.3.2: The SAT School Day Test Room Manual (Spring 2017)</b>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 1 - 12 provide instruction on standardized testing procedures devised to maintain security during test administration. Information in this section includes how to maintain security in the testing room and report administration irregularities.</li> </ul> <b>Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 13 - 23 provide instruction on standardized testing procedures devised to maintain security during nonstandard test administration. Information</li> </ul> </p>	<p><i>College Board Information Security Policy (2014)</i> is a confidential document. It is in the process of being updated.  <i>College Board Guidelines for the Release of Data (2009)</i> is in the process of being updated.                      In the 2009 College Board guidelines for the release of data, it states the College Board owns the data. Is this still true for states that administer the SAT statewide?</p> <p>More information is needed to describe the process used if a data breach occurs and what steps are taken.</p> <p>Updated guides for the security policy and release of data would be useful and are needed.</p> <p>How does the SAP protect the integrity of its test materials in development, administration, and storage and use of results?</p> <p>No evidence was provided regarding the security measures used to protect the item bank or test bank.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence related to test security before and during test administration is submitted</li> <li>Two documents, not submitted, are in process of being updated: College Board Information Security Policy and College Board Guidelines for the Release of Data. These should be submitted for review when updated.</li> </ul> <p>2.1.1, pp. 58-59</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Peers had difficulty understanding evidence 2.6.2 – high level, vendor-developed overview of Axway products. How are these applicable to and used within the SAT program?</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>in this section includes how to maintain security in the testing room and report administration irregularities.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.4: SAT School Day Test Center Supervisor Training (2016)</b>            • Pages 23 - 30: The College Board trains test coordinators, and administrators) on how to report and address irregularities they may encounter on test day.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.5.1: SAT School Day Registration and Questionnaire Guide (2017)</b>            This brochure provides to students information about how the College Board secures their data and personally identifiable information.            • Pages 26 – 36 describe the College Board privacy policy as it relates to students. This section also provides information regarding instances where scores may be canceled due to testing irregularities or misconduct, and how students may securely send their scores to colleges and university systems.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.6.1: Description of Test Management and Reporting System (2017)</b>            This document provides an overview of the security of the College Board online test management and reporting system.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.6.2: Axway Secure Transport Data Sheet (2017)</b>            The College Board provides data files to the state using an SFTP ad-hoc file transfer process provide by Tumbleweed, a secure managed file transfer (MFT) site managed by Axway. This data sheet, created by Axway, provides a high-level overview of all of their Secure Transport products, including</p>	<p>SAT did not address the Minimum N.            Each state has individual reporting requirements.</p> <p>Note: some of the suggested documents relate to cheating, not securing student data.</p> <p>Information on paper storage and retrieval secure handling was not discussed sufficiently. How is security handled as tests are transported from SAT to the schools? Printing, shipping to 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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>their web-based SFTP service.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.6.3: Description of Confidential College Board Information Security Policy (2017)</b> The College Board has created a high level policy document that describes the processes in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of student level data. The policy is confidential, so this summary provides high level information regarding what the policy contains.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.6.4: College Board Privacy Policy (January 15, 2016)</b> This policy is currently accessible at <a href="http://www.collegeboard.org/privacy-policy">www.collegeboard.org/privacy-policy</a>. The document, as it appeared on this site on August 31, 2017, is submitted as evidence. It describes the College Board Data Privacy policy and privacy statements.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.6.5: College Board Guidelines for the Release of Data (2009)</b> This white paper describes the guidelines for the release of data obtained from test results to third party research institutions. Page 14 lists no releasable data elements for the SAT.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.6.6: ETS Legal Privacy and Security Notice</b> ETS manages the online test rostering system for the SAT. This document provides ETS' legal privacy and security notice.</p>	
<b>Section 2.6 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: 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 during test development, administration, and storage and use of results;</li> <li>• To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow</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 SAT Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
reporting of scores for all students and student groups.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• College Board Information Security Policy and College Board Guidelines for the Release of Data should be submitted for review when updated.</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 SAT Consortium

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

<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> <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><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math, no evidence will be provided related to a specific state’s alternate assessment.</b></p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 1 - 20 provide an overview of the assessment, including a description its purpose, test format and content, scores derived from the assessment and the intended use of results.</li> <li>• Pages 107 - 139 examine the validity of the SAT and includes information on the evidentiary foundations behind the test content, concordance between the current and previous version of the SAT, and the relationship between SAT scores and first-year grade point average, as well as the relationship between SAT scores and college and career readiness benchmarks.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tables A-3.1 – A-3.15 in Appendix 3 (pages 11-35) provide test content specifications and content domains and descriptions.</li> <li>• Appendix 5 (pages 37 – 65) provides additional detail regarding how statistical indices were computed.</li> <li>• Appendix 6 (pages 66 – 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> <li>• Appendix 7 (pages 321 - 396) displays the results of analyses performed to evaluate the validity of the SAT.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.1: An SAT Validity Primer (January 2015)</b></p>	<p>What studies has or will College Board conduct regarding the results of the assessment about high school instruction? Or how states will be using the results in their accountability system? Predictive validity of college readiness is one thing but for the purposes of states, the question is also “how do we get students to be college career ready?” What inferences are states making about schools and school instruction if they have many students who are college ready or few students who are college ready and what evidence will be collected around these claims?</p> <p><b>Documentation of Independent Alignment</b></p> <p>Alignment studies indicated that the standards were not completely aligned, Please provide additional evidence as requested for in critical element 2.1. Pg. 11 in the Delaware study states, “the redesigned assessments are not mysterious or tricky. They are completely transparent.” They focus on the knowledge and skills that are worthy of practice.” Again, there is little evidence to support this claim without an independent alignment study or access to a test form or test items.</p> <p>SAT does not assess Speaking and Listening. Thus states should supply plans for how those domains are or will be assessed if Speaking and Listening is part of the state standards. Also, since the essay is optional, what evidence does the state supply to show that the full breadth of the writing standards are assessed?</p> <p>Per 2.1.2 – 2.1.7 introduction note, an independent review of alignment of the SAT to the CT standards was proposed for 2016; document 2.1.2 indicates a revision in January 2018, but this revised document was not included.</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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>This paper provides validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores and important college outcomes. The evidence provided in this paper is based on a previous version of the SAT. Pages 131 – 135 of the <i>SAT Suite Technical Manual</i> describe how the new version of the SAT correlates with the previous version of the assessment.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.2: The Redesigned SAT® Pilot Predictive Validity Study: A First Look (2016)</b>            This white paper provides preliminary validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores resulting for the redesigned SAT and important college outcomes. The College Board is in the process of completing a validity study to replicate the findings of this white paper with a large, nationally representative sample. The study will examine students in the entering college class of fall 2017, the first full cohort to be admitted to college with the new SAT. For more information regarding this planned study, please refer to page 152 of the SAT Technical Manual.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire and Illinois</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 7 - 9 of each document describe how alignment between the standards and the assessment is determined.</li> <li>• Pages 16 - 106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to each respective state’s English Language Arts/Literacy and Math standards for grades 11 and 12.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.1.1: SAT Practice Test 8 (2017)</b>            This practice test is a version of a form that was used for a 2016 SAT test administration. The sample test includes the optional essay, answer key, answer sheet</p>	<p>The third party independent alignment review mentioned in the documentation as planned for 2016 was not provided.</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 SAT Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	and instructions on how to score the test	
<b>Section 3.1 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>• 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. An independent alignment review is needed.</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 SAT Consortium

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math: Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 1 - 20 provide an overview of the assessment, including a description its purpose, test format and content, scores derived from the assessment and the intended use of results.</li> <li>• Pages 107 - 139 examine the validity of the SAT and includes information on the evidentiary foundations behind the test content, concordance between the current and previous version of the SAT, and the relationship between SAT scores and first-year grade point average, as well as the relationship between SAT scores and college and career readiness benchmarks.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tables A-3.1 – A-3.15 in Appendix 3 (pages 11 – 35) provide test content specifications and content domains and descriptions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)</b></p> <p>This document provides information on the evidentiary foundations of the English Language Arts and Math domains of the SAT, the test specifications that describe how the SAT measures those content domains and a description of our test development processes.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.1: An SAT Validity Primer (January 2015)</b></p> <p>This paper provides validity evidence on the</p>	<p>Lists 2.1.2 – 2.1.7 – state alignment documents. The DE doc does not address cognitive processes alignment</p> <p>Lists 2.2.1 – this document discusses the predictive validity of the old test and proposed revisions to the SAT</p> <p>Lists 2.2.2 – this document is a study focused on the validity of using the SAT for college admission decisions. It does not address cognitive processes</p> <p>Lists 3.2.2 – Summary of cognitive lab study – why is this document marked as a draft? It is very short, does not give the items used in the study, nor does it name the cognitive processes each item was intended to evoke. It does not make explicit what evidence led to which conclusions. Plus, the number of items used in this study is very small (i.e., 10 math and 13 ELA). More details about the methodology, content, and interpretations are needed to provide a convincing argument that the high level cognitive processes purported to be assessed are indeed drawn upon by students as they engage with the SAT. This statement seems to contradict the summary.</p> <p>Cognitive study seemed like a summary of the study without any analysis. What were the specific interview questions? Besides vocabulary and wording being difficult, how did the students perform on the items they thought were hard or easy? How did the students perform? How did this research influence item development? Any ELL or special education students included? How does this study validate the intended and appropriate cognitive processes based on the states’ academic content standards?</p> <p>3.2.2, p. 4, cog lab study: <b>Conclusion</b> states, “The cognitive processes lab study conducted using TAPs provided important feedback to College Board content experts during the development of questions</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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>relationship between SAT scores and important college outcomes. The evidence provided in this paper is based on a previous version of the SAT. Pages 131 – 135 of the <i>SAT Suite Technical Manual</i> describe how the new version of the SAT correlates with the previous version of the assessment.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.2: The Redesigned SAT® Pilot Predictive Validity Study: A First Look (2016)</b> This white paper provides preliminary validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores resulting for the redesigned SAT and important college outcomes. The College Board is in the process of completing a validity study to replicate the findings of this white paper with a large, nationally representative sample. The study will examine students in the entering college class of fall 2017, the first full cohort to be admitted to college with the new SAT. For more information regarding this planned study, please refer to page 152 of the SAT Technical Manual.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire and Illinois</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 7 - 9 of each document describe how alignment between the standards and the assessment is determined.</li> <li>• Pages 16 - 106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to each respective state’s English Language Arts/Literacy and Math standards for grades 11 and 12.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.2.1: Summary of Validity Evidence for Cognitive Processes (2018)</b> This document provides an overview of how the</p>	<p>for the SAT. Since the newly-designed question types presented in the study were ultimately incorporated into the Redesigned SAT, the study also provides important validation of the cognitive processes students use when approaching these and other questions now on the test.” However, data and analysis in support of this statement was not provided.</p> <p>2.2.1-Tech Manual, pp. 132-3: “the results of this pilot study showed that new SAT scores remain as predictive of college success as old SAT scores. This is important to note as the redesign of the SAT was first and foremost focused on more closely aligning the content and skills tested on the SAT with those content and skills that research indicates are critical for college success. In making these important changes to the test, that the strong predictive validity was also maintained is an important accomplishment of the redesign.” However, there was no evidence that the development and selection of 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 provided.</p> <p>3.2.1 – lists much of the alignment evidence provided by ETS, however, it’s not clear that these were conducted by external content experts to align with cognitive processes.</p> <p>3.2.2 (Revised) – Report provides some evidence that test-takers are not using intended cognitive processes, especially in mathematics, for some items. Limited number of items.</p> <p>More evidence needed to indicate that the items are really tapping into the cognitive processes as</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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>evidence listed above is pertinent to the claim that the SAT assesses the intended cognitive processes related to English Language Arts/ Literacy and Math in grades 11 and 12</p> <p><b>Evidence #3.2.2: CONFIDENTIAL Summary of Cognitive Laboratory Study for the Redesigned SAT Conducted on March 16, 2013 (2018)</b></p> <p>This white paper summarizes the results of a study using Think-aloud Protocols conducted during the design process for the Redesigned SAT. The study provided evidence for how students were approaching and interpreting items in English Language Arts, Literacy, and Math.</p>	<p>indicated by the states' content standards.</p> <p>Cognitive processes study was conducted in 2013; updated study addressing more of the items, should be conducted to address alignment with state standards</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>• 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.</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 SAT Consortium

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>3.3 – 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>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b></p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 39 - 45 describe how test items are created and reviewed. This section describes the statistical indices computed to determine the appropriateness of items for use in operational forms of the SAT (i.e. equated p-values, r-biserials, and Mantel-Haenszel DIF.</li> <li>• Pages 47 - 49 describe how the College Board develops the optional SAT Essay test, which is administered by some of our state clients to assess student writing skills.</li> <li>• Pages 75 - 106 describe various psychometric analysis and their results. These procedures include scaling procedures, equating, analysis of normative information, reliability analysis and additional psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> <li>• Pages 107 - 139 examine the validity of the SAT, including the relationship between SAT scores and first-year grade point average as well as the relationship between SAT scores and college and career readiness benchmarks.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 5 (pages 37 – 65) provides additional detail regarding how statistical indices were computed.</li> <li>• Appendix 6 (pages 66 – 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> <li>• Appendix 7 (pages 321 – 396) displays the results of analyses performed to evaluate the validity of the</li> </ul>	<p>Benchmarks for Math and ERW were established using the previous version of the SAT. (page 144 of the technical manual). These Benchmarks are purported to indicate 75% probabilities of earning a C or better in an introductory college level course</p> <p>The sample score report, Evidence 5.1.4, was the evidence used to provide an overview of how scores and sub scores are reported. How does this relate back to the state standards and how can teachers use it? The sub score names on the score report do not match the sub domains of the content standards</p> <p>There are also studies linking the old SAT scores to the new SAT scores (concordance studies, p. 124 of the technical manual), but this text states explicitly that the scores are not interchangeable – likely due to different underlying structures of the old and new tests (e.g., relative weights of different content, etc.). With this in mind, the evidence of the use of SAT scores to predict college success seems adequate. But this does not indicate how the internal structure aligns to the state standards.</p> <p>3.3.2-3.37. Analyses of internal structure-item correlations and dimensionality of assessment are not consistent with standards and interpretation of results. The intercorrelations reveal a very large, but not perfect, correlation among sub scores of items. This is not strong evidence that the sub scores are measuring different underlying factors.</p> <p><b>2.1.1:</b> pp. 44, 45: description of DIF Analyses, with results in the appendix. <b>2.1.1.a,</b> pp. 50-63: results of DIF analyses indicate low or no DIF and does not include students with disabilities.</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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>SAT.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)</b>            This document provides details regarding how our test is constructed and includes test blueprints, evidentiary foundation, and examples of text complexity and sample questions. While we recommend that reviewers consider the entire document as evidence in support of this critical element, the following sections should be of particular interest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 41 – 69 provide test specifications and blueprints for the SAT Evidence-Based Reading and Writing test including scores and sub-scores consistent with the sub-domain structures of the academic content standards on which the interpretations and uses of results are based.</li> <li>• Pages 70 - 81 provide test specifications for the optional SAT Essay test.</li> <li>• Pages 132 – 158 provide test specifications and blueprints for the SAT Math test including scores and sub-scores consistent with the sub-domain structures of the academic content standards on which the interpretations and uses of results are based.</li> <li>• Pages 198 – 206 provide an overview of SAT development process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.1: Scaling for the SAT Suite of Assessments (2017)</b>            • Pages 66 – 74 describe the characteristics of SAT sub-score scaling</p> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.2: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report- Connecticut (April</b></p>	<p>DE, ME, and MI included correlations among sub scores on correlations between the Reading Test Score, the Writing and Language Test Score, the Evidence-Based Reading and Writing (ERW) Section Score, and the Dimension Scores on Essay. This provides evidence that these scores are only moderately correlated and measuring somewhat different constructs.</p> <p>However, no evidence was provided of a dimensionality (or factor) analysis of the SAT. There was no evidence provided that the sub scores are based on analyses.</p> <p>As states use the SAT as their accountability measure, the interpretations of the scores may be different than the originally intended use of SAT scores. Will College Board be studying this and produce research that is useful for states if they begin making claims that have not been previously studied on the SAT?</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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>2017)</b>            This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 Connecticut SAT school day administration. The report includes a variety of test analysis based on the data gathered from the test administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 15 - 28 provide Scale Score Moments, Intercorrelations and Reliability for the two SAT Forms administered on test day. The tables in this section provided information for by form and disaggregated by various subgroups.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.3: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report- Delaware (April 2017)</b>            This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 SAT school day administration. The report includes a variety of test analysis based on the data gathered from the test administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 15 – 22 provide Scale Score Moments, Intercorrelations and Reliability for the two SAT Forms administered on test day. The tables in this section provided information for by form and disaggregated by various subgroups.</li> <li>• Page 60 provide tables demonstrating correlations of three essay dimension scores and correlations between the Reading Test</li> </ul> <p>Score, the Writing and Language Test Score, the Evidence-Based Reading and Writing (ERW) Section Score, and the Dimension Scores on Essay.</p> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.4: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report – Maine (April 2017)</b>            This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 SAT school</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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>day administration. The report includes a variety of test analysis based on the data gathered from the test administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 15 – 21 provide Scale Score Moments, Intercorrelations and Reliability for the two SAT Forms administered on test day. The tables in this section provided information for by form and disaggregated by various subgroups.</li> <li>• Page 60 provide tables demonstrating correlations of three essay dimension scores and correlations between the Reading Test Score, the Writing and Language Test Score, the Evidence-Based Reading and Writing (ERW) Section Score, and the Dimension Scores on Essay.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.5: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report – Michigan (April 2017)</b>            This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 SAT school day administration. The report includes a variety of test analysis based on the data gathered from the test administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 15 – 29 provide Scale Score Moments, Intercorrelations and Reliability for the two SAT Forms administered on test day. The tables in this section provided information for by form and disaggregated by various subgroups.</li> </ul> <p>Page 75 provide tables demonstrating correlations of three essay dimension scores and correlations between the Reading Test Score, the Writing and Language Test Score, the Evidence-Based Reading and Writing (ERW) Section Score, and the Dimension Scores on Essay.</p> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.6: SAT Suite of Assessments</b></p>	

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>Administration Report – New Hampshire (April 2017)</b>                      This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 SAT school day administration. The report includes a variety of test analysis based on the data gathered from the test administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 15 – 21 provide Scale Score Moments, Intercorrelations and Reliability for the two SAT Forms administered on test day. The tables in this section provided information for by form and disaggregated by various subgroups.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.7: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report – Illinois (April 2017)</b>                      This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 SAT school day administration. The report includes a variety of test analysis based on the data gathered from the test administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 18 – 26 provide Scale Score Moments, Intercorrelations and Reliability for the two SAT Forms administered on test day. The tables in this section provided information for by form and disaggregated by various subgroups.</li> </ul>	
<b>Section 3.3 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>• Provide 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.</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 SAT Consortium

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b>  <b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b>                      • Pages 114 - 135 include information on concordance between the current and previous version of the SAT, the relationship between SAT scores and first-year grade point average, and the relationship between SAT scores and college and career readiness benchmarks.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.1: An SAT Validity Primer (January 2015)</b>                      This paper provides validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores and important college outcomes. The evidence provided in this paper is based on a previous version of the SAT. Pages 131 – 135 of the <i>SAT Suite Technical Manual</i> describe how the new version of the SAT correlates with the previous version of the assessment.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.2: The Redesigned SAT® Pilot Predictive Validity Study: A First Look (2016)</b>                      This white paper provides preliminary validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores resulting for the redesigned SAT and important college outcomes. The College Board is in the process of completing a validity study to replicate the findings of this white paper with a large, nationally representative sample. The study will examine students in the entering college class of fall 2017, the first full cohort to be admitted to college with the new SAT. For more information regarding this planned study, please refer to page 152 of the SAT Technical Manual.</p> <p><b>Evidence #4.7.1: Excerpt from TAC</b></p>	<p>The documentation showing the predictive relationships between the SAT and college success is adequate, particularly when taken with the evidence for the concordance studies between the old and new versions of the SAT.</p> <p><b>2.2.1:</b> Validity Primer provides strong predictive validity evidence, for a previous version of the SAT. Must rely on how well the old and new version correlate. <b>2.2.2:</b> Predictive validity study on new SAT provides evidence that new SAT has similar predictive validity, as claimed.</p> <p>College Board should consider conducting studies comparing other assessment programs like NAEP, SBAC or PARCC.</p> <p>SAT may wish to consider high school teacher grades and GPA as part of the evidence for this element to address career ready students and not just college bound students.</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 SAT Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>presentation regarding Validity Research</b>                      The College Board presents validity evidence to the Technical Advisory Committees of our state partners. These slides are an excerpt from these presentations and covers information regarding College Board past, current and future validity studies.</p>	
<b>Section 3.4 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>• Provide adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables , not necessarily associated with college success only.</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 SAT Consortium**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4.1 – Reliability</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and SWD, EL, and forms administered with accommodations. 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><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b>  <b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 75 - 106 describe various psychometric analysis and their results. These procedures include scaling procedures, equating, analysis of normative information, reliability analysis and additional psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 6 (pages 66 - 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #4.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report Table of Contents</b>  This document displays the contents of a typical post-administration Test Analysis Report for the national administration of the SAT. The College Board provides state level administration reports to its state partners.  Please refer to evidence #3.3.2 – 3.3.7 for the state specific administration reports.</p>	<p>There was very little analysis, interpretation of the data, lack of data for EL and SWD provided for this critical element.</p> <p>Tables were available for all demographic groups , but did not provide any information on students with disabilities, EL, or tests administered with accommodations.</p> <p><b>Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population-</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was no information provided for EL and SWD.</li> </ul> <p><b>Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments</b>  Average CSEMs are reasonable to slightly large: most are 6 to 8% of score range.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.1 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population for students with disability, EL, and students who received accommodations.</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 SAT 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 SAT Consortium

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

<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>4.2 – 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>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 21 - 26 provide an overview of College Board test development processes related to fairness.</li> <li>• Pages 27 - 52 provide a detailed description of test development procedures, including a description of item content and fairness reviews, item pre-testing and analysis, and information on the types of accommodations that are available to students.</li> <li>• Pages 60 - 74 describe the scoring procedures for the SAT, a description of how results are reported, and the item analysis that is performed on the operational items, including Differential Item Functioning (DIF) and Key Validation. The required qualifications for human scorers are also included in this section.</li> <li>• Pages 75 - 106 describe various psychometric analyses which are performed to identify any possible bias or inconsistent interpretations of assessment results across student groups.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 6 (pages 66 - 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <p>This manual provides instructions for supervisors who will be responsible for registering students for testing accommodations and managing nonstandard test administrations.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.5: SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017)</b></p>	<p>2.3.3 and 2.3.5 relate to fairness with respect to test administration, but not design, development, or analysis.</p> <p>Peers could not evaluate the criteria for fairness since the College Board did not provide the guidelines used for training experts. No items or training materials were provided.</p> <p>Design and Development</p> <p>2.1.1, page 22 “all questions are reviewed by external, independent reviewers who are asked to evaluate each question according to a set of criteria for content accuracy and fairness.” Who are the experts and what are the demographics of the reviewers?</p> <p>2.1.1, pp. 27-43: listed the test design procedures to ensure fairness, including item review for bias. The writers were instructed to read and use the white paper. It wasn’t evident that this was included in training.</p> <p>4.2.1: Universal Design was listed, but nothing was provided to verify its use. SAT provided comment in its listing that “College Board assessment writers are instructed to reference this paper regarding Universally Designed Assessment when creating assessment items for the SAT.” However, the peers noted there is no indication of this as part of the training and no verification this process was followed. Are items rejected during item review process that may indicate these practices are not implemented?</p> <p><b>Analysis</b></p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>This PowerPoint deck is presented to SSD supervisors via online training sessions and reviews the policies and procedures related to nonstandard SAT administrations.</p> <p><b>Evidence #4.2.1: Creating Better Tests for Everyone Through Universally Designed Assessments (2004)</b></p> <p>College Board assessment writers are instructed to reference this paper regarding Universally Designed Assessment when creating assessment items for the SAT.</p>	<p>2.1.1.a, pp. 50-63: results of DIF analyses indicate low or no DIF, however, no DIF evidence was provided for SWD, El and no interpretation provided.</p>
<b>Section 4.2 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>• Evidence for the 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, including the lack of any data related to students with disabilities and ELs.</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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4.3 – 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>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math:</b></p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 75 - 106 describe various psychometric analyses to study how the SAT assesses student performance across the full performance continuum.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 6 (pages 66 - 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #4.3.1: SAT Effectiveness at Representing Test Taker Achievement across the Performance Spectrum (2017)</b></p> <p>This document provides data regarding the SAT’s effectiveness at representing test taker achievement.</p>	<p>The graphs of different score distributions indicate that scores were earned across the continuum. Stated in 4.3.1, p. 3: “The normal curve with the corresponding mean and standard deviation is superimposed on each graph for comparison. The histograms show a reasonable spread of scores across the entire scale score range. The results reflect tests that well match the test taking population.”</p> <p>2.1.1.a: pp. 216 – 221 &amp; 4.3.1: CSEMs are almost identical across the score range, indicating similar precision across the spectrum (for low-, medium-, and high-achieving students).</p> <p>2.1.1a. Who is in the test taking population? Are all students who took the test represented, including students with disabilities and Els? Are students who received the SAA accommodation included in this test taking population?</p>
<p><b>Section 4.3 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</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 SAT Consortium

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 2 - 4 describe the scores derived from the assessment and the intended use of results.</li> <li>• Page 48 - 49 describes the inter-rater reliability statistics related to the essay portion of the assessment.</li> <li>• Pages 60 - 74 describe the scoring procedures for the SAT, a description of how results are reported, and the item analysis that is performed on the operational items, including Differential Item Functioning (DIF) and Key Validation. The required qualifications for human scorers are also included in this section.</li> <li>• Pages 75 - 106 describe scaling procedures, equating, analysis of normative information to support appropriate interpretations of the common score scales, reliability analysis and additional psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> <li>• Pages 133 - 135 describe the processes that were used to develop and validate the SAT benchmarks for college and career readiness.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 5 (pages 37 - 65) provides the essay scoring rubric and data to support the item analysis findings summarized in the technical manual.</li> <li>• Appendix 6 (pages 66 – 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.1: Scaling for the SAT Suite of Assessments (2017)</b></p> <p>This document describes the methodology and</p>	<p>The sample score report, Evidence 5.1.4, was the evidence used to get an overview of how scores and sub scores are reported.</p> <p>The subdivisions of the SAT do not map easily onto the Domains and Strands of the content standards.</p> <p>The state-specific alignment documents show how the standards fall into the different reported sections of the SAT</p> <p>Documentation provides evidence of scoring procedures and scoring involving human judgment; however, 3.3.3, 3.3.4, 3.3.5 do not provide I-RR; 3.3.7 does – how is this I-RR interpreted by states and ETS?</p> <p>The low IRR brings into question the validity of the scores for the essay test. What are SAT plans to address this issue?</p> <p>States that use the essay test should review and consider improvements in this section.</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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>scale development process for the SAT Suite of Assessments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 8 - 11 provide a description of the scores derived from the SAT and an overview of how the scores were developed.</li> <li>• Pages 16 – 24 describe how the scaling study was designed.</li> <li>• Pages 25 – 40 describe the characteristics of SAT scaling.</li> <li>• Pages 66 – 74 describe the characteristics of SAT subscore scaling.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.3: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report – Delaware (April 2017)</b>                      This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 SAT school day administration, and includes information on the inter-rater reliability of the essay test included in the SAT. Please refer to pages 51 of 68 – 63 of 68 for information on inter-rater (single rater) reliability, percentages of agreement, correlation coefficient, and kappa statistics.</p> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.4: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report – Maine (April 2017)</b>                      This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 SAT school day administration, and includes information on the inter-rater reliability of the essay test included in the SAT. Please refer to pages 51 of 68 – 63 of 68 for information on inter-rater (single rater) reliability, percentages of agreement, correlation coefficient, and kappa statistics.</p> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.5: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report – Michigan (April 2017)</b>                      This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the April 2017 SAT school</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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	day administration, and includes information on the inter-rater reliability of the essay test included in the SAT. Please refer to pages 65 of 84 – 79 of 84 for information on inter-rater (single rater) reliability, percentages of agreement, correlation coefficient, and kappa statistics.	
<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>• Provide evidence of established and documented standardized essay scoring procedures and protocols that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of adequate inter-rater reliability.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.5 – 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>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 39 - 49 describe how the test is constructed to ensure multiple forms of the assessment are comparable</li> <li>• Pages 82 - 90 describe equating procedures and results for the SAT.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 6; Tables A-6.3.2 through A-6.3.5 (pages 72 - 78) show data and sample sets related to the equating procedures described in pages 82 - 90 of evidence 2.1.1.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.2: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report- Connecticut (April 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 2 provides an executive summary which describes the number of forms used in the April 2017 administration of SAT SD in Connecticut.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.3.5: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report- Michigan (April 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 2 provides an executive summary which describes the number of forms used in the April 2017 administration of SAT SD in Michigan.</li> </ul>	<p>Documentation adequately provided for this critical element</p> <p>Peers noted it would have been helpful for an opportunity to review the forms or an independent audit of the multiple test forms.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.5 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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.6 – 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><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math. The SAT has been administered in English and as a pencil and paper assessment.</b></p>	<p>This critical element does not apply to this review.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.6 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</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 SAT Consortium

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.7 – 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>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 1 - 20 provide an overview of the assessment, including a description its purpose, test format and content, scores derived from the assessment and the intended use of results.</li> <li>• Pages 107 – 135 examine the validity of the SAT and includes information on the evidentiary foundations behind the test content, concordance between the current and previous version of the SAT, and the relationship between SAT scores and first-year grade point average, as well as the relationship between SAT scores and college and career readiness benchmarks.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.1.a: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tables A-3.1 – A-3.15 in Appendix 3 (pages 11 - 35) provide test content specifications and content domains and descriptions.</li> <li>• Appendix 5 (pages 37 - 65) provides additional detail regarding how statistical indices were computed.</li> <li>• Appendix 6 (pages 66 – 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> <li>• Appendix 7 (pages 321 – 396) displays the results of analyses performed to evaluate the validity of the SAT.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 198 – 206 provide an overview of SAT development process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.1: An SAT Validity Primer</b></p>	<p>4.7.1: “Initial findings from this large-scale study will be available in 2019.”</p> <p>No evidence of independent studies of alignment</p> <p>No evidence of states’ systems for monitoring and improving related to examples of evidence related to critical element</p> <p>Since states are using SAT as an accountability measure, evidence and claims will result in different needs which results in different studies to support this use.</p> <p>The College Board should plan to study the use of the SAT for state accountability vs. a predictive test for college admission.</p> <p>Evidence from the 2019 study and TAC recommendations may provide some information in meeting this 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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>(January 2015)</b>                      This paper provides validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores and important college outcomes. The evidence provided in this paper is based on a previous version of the SAT. Pages 131 – 135 of the <i>SAT Suite Technical Manual</i> describe how the new version of the SAT correlates with the previous version of the assessment.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.2: The Redesigned SAT® Pilot Predictive Validity Study: A First Look (2016)</b>                      This white paper provides preliminary validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores resulting for the redesigned SAT and important college outcomes. The College Board is in the process of completing a validity study to replicate the findings of this white paper with a large, nationally representative sample. The study will examine students in the entering college class of fall 2017, the first full cohort to be admitted to college with the new SAT. For more information regarding this planned study, please refer to page 152 of the SAT Technical Manual.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire and Illinois (2015 - 2018)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 7 - 9 of each document describe how alignment between the standards and the assessment is determined.</li> <li>• Pages 16 - 106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to each respective state’s English Language Arts/Literacy and Math standards for grades 11 and 12.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #3.1.1: SAT Practice Test 8 (2017)</b>                      This practice test is a version of a form that was used for a 2016 SAT test administration. 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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>sample test includes the optional essay, answer key, answer sheet and instructions on how to score the test.</p> <p><b>Evidence #4.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report Table of Contents</b>                      This document displays the contents of a typical post-administration Test Analysis Report for the national administration of the SAT. The College Board provides state level administration reports to its state partners. Please refer to evidence #3.3.2 – 3.3.7 for the state specific administration reports.</p> <p><b>Evidence #4.7.1: Excerpt from TAC presentation regarding Validity Research (February 2017)</b>                      The College Board presents validity evidence to the Technical Advisory Committees of our state partners. These slides are an excerpt from these presentations and covers information regarding College Board past, current and future validity studies.</p>	

**Section 4.7 Summary Statement**

No additional evidence is required or

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Evidence of 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

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

### **SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards;</li> <li>• States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs;</li> <li>• Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment;</li> <li>• Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities;</li> <li>• Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;</li> <li>• Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic</li> </ul>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math, so no evidence will be provided related to a specific state’s alternate assessment. The state will determine which students take the general or the alternate assessment. Below we provide documentation regarding the accommodations that the College Board provides for administrations of the general assessment.</b></p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 49 – 52 describe the types of available allowable accommodations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <p>This manual provides instructions for supervisors who will be responsible for registering students for testing accommodations, and managing the test administration for students who require testing accommodations.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.5: SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017)</b></p> <p>This PowerPoint deck is presented to SSD supervisors via an online training session and reviews the policies and procedures related to SAT administrations for students who require testing accommodations.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.1: Pages from the College Board Students with Disabilities website. (accessed September 1, 2017)</b></p> <p>This document provides images of the College Board web pages regarding the accommodations request and approval process. This information is available through the College Board website -</p>	<p><b>Participation Requirements for Students with Disabilities</b></p> <p>There is an online request system for accommodations for students with disabilities listed on page 58 of the technical manual.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All evidence is specific to the SAT; evidence required by states is not provided in this document.</li> </ul> <p>The evidence of the process used by the states lacks clarity, such as does the state upload a file detailing accommodations for efficient and effective data reporting? It is unclear based on the screen shots in the PowerPoint (2.3.5 webinar) whether this process is used.</p> <p><b>Decisions by IEP team based on individual need</b></p> <p>Since 1/1/2017, students receive the same accommodations on the SAT as they do routinely use in assessment situations based on the accommodations provided on the IEP. The request must still be submitted on the SAT online system as a simplified request.</p> <p>Some accommodations are listed on page 59(2.1.1) but a complete list and instructions for administering the accommodations are not provided.</p> <p>5.1.1 and 5.1.2 contains screens from the webpages, where more instructions are listed in detail for each type of accommodation and how to request it. The College Board stated that the accommodation list is not complete. A complete list of the approved accommodations should be provided.</p> <p>Clarity needs to be provided with respect to 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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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><a href="https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities">https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities</a></p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.2: College Board Typical Accommodations (accessed October 2, 2017)</b> This document provides information regarding typical testing accommodations available for SAT test administrations. This information is available through the College Board website - <a href="https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities/typical-accommodations">https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities/typical-accommodations</a>.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.3: Support for Students with Temporary Physical/ Medical Conditions</b> This form is used to request testing support for students with temporary impairments (caused by injury, accident, etc) who cannot postpone their tests.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.4: Reports for Students who Test with State Allowed Accommodations</b> Students who test using state allowed accommodations will receive test results that are marked with an “SAA” label. These screen shots show how the designation appears on their reports.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.5: Parent Consent Form Templates</b> The College Board provides a template that district and school administrators may use to attain parental consent to administer the SAT with testing accommodations to particular students. This resource is optionally used by our state partners.</p>	<p>flow of information between ETS and the SAT about requesting accommodations, particularly when these are not on an IEP and if the request is denied. How is this information provided to the state?</p> <p><b>Guidelines for IEP Team Decision-making, including accommodations</b> The SAT did not provide any evidence on the IEP team decision-making process for selection of accommodations.</p> <p><b>Accessibility Features and Selection of Appropriate Accommodations</b> Evidence appears to be adequate for this piece of the critical element.</p> <p><b>Parent Notification</b> Evidence 5.1.5 is the parent notification form for requesting accommodations that are not SAT identified. SAT has a form to request accommodations that will exclude the student’s score for college. Is SAT providing any guidance to states/IEP team use on score reporting for state approved accommodations and its impact on use of non-reportable scores for college admission purposes?</p> <p>Peers were not provided information about what information parents receive about SAT accommodations. There is a statement on the request form that the score may be non reportable, but there is no detail to explain to parents on the accommodation use. The student score report indicates that the score is non reportable due to SAA accommodations</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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>What do states share with parents about accommodations and possible implications on score reporting to colleges?</p> <p>States may provide this information but SAT did not provide information for the parent.</p> <p>States will need to provide information on accommodations if SAT does not provide. An accommodation manual detailing the selection, use, and reporting of test accommodations and implications would be beneficial for parents and teachers.</p>

<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> <p>Provide evidence of 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 guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;</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 SAT Consortium

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> <li>○ Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;</li> <li>○ Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>	<p>The College Board's policies and procedures are designed to ensure that appropriate testing accommodations are made available to students with disabilities, including English learners with a diagnosed disability. Students who are approved for and using testing accommodations at their school through a current Individualized Education Program (IEP) 504 Plan, or Formal Written Plan will have those same accommodations automatically approved for taking the SAT®, PSAT™10, PSAT/NMSQT®, SAT Subject Tests™, and AP® Exams. Please refer to the evidence provided in response to critical elements 5.1 and 5.3 for additional information regarding College Board accommodations processes.</p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 50 - 51 describe the types of accommodations available to English learners.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b></p> <p>This manual provides instructions on how to administer the SAT to English Learner students who are required to test with additional supports such as glossaries or translated instructions. Refer to pages iv, vi, and 30 for those instructions.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.2.1: College Board-Approved Word-to-Word Glossaries for the SAT® Suite of Assessments (2017)</b></p> <p>This document lists the word-to-word glossaries that the College Board has approved for use with the SAT by English Learner students. The state education agency decides which students can use these language supports. These supports do not require an accommodations request and provide</p>	<p>There was no guidance provided on the selection process for the two accommodations provided. The test directions may be read, but are the questions also read for the mathematics?</p> <p>Directions for administration of the two accommodations all EL may use (2.3.3, pp iv, vi, 30) and (5.2.2). There is a separate request for additional time for EL under 5.2.2.</p> <p><b>Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s)</b></p> <p>States are advised to produce the evidence on accommodations. SAT supplies options for ELs, but LEAs decide which students receive these accommodations.</p> <p>Although all ELs may use word-word dictionaries and translated directions (2.1.1, pp. 50-51), there are no procedures provided to determine whether an EL should be assessed with these accommodations.</p> <p>Accessibility tools and features are not addressed, but accommodations are listed on page 60. 1/1/2017 – state-funded daytime administrations – instructions in several native languages provided; glossaries available too.</p> <p>SAT appears to delegate this to the state by stating only two questions to be answered: Is the requested accommodation(s) in the student’s plan? Has the student used the accommodation(s) for school testing? (see Evidence 5.1.1) It is not clear if there is a different system for EL or SWD?</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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>college reportable scores to students.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.2.2: College Board translated instructions for the SAT (2017)</b></p> <p>The College Board provides translated test instructions to English language learners in the following languages: (a) English, (b) Arabic, (c) Chinese, (d) Haitian Creole, (e) Polish, (f) Russian, (g) Portuguese, (h) Spanish, and (i) Vietnamese. The state education agency decides which students can use these language supports. These supports do not require an accommodations request and provide college reportable scores to students.</p>	<p>The evidence (2.3.5 webinar) suggests that extended time for ELs is a state accommodation only which has implications for score reporting and perhaps unintended consequence for the student because the score may not be reported for college admission.</p> <p>What is the decision-making process, how is this communicated to the EL team, how is this reported back to the state?</p> <p>It should be clear if this is used for a state test, which accommodations are provided and reported, who makes the selection decision, and how this is reported back to the state?</p> <p>Clarity between SAT and State guidance is needed for this element.</p> <p>Please provide the report regarding the effectiveness of the extended time accommodation for ELs.</p> <p>More evidence regarding the inclusion of ELs and accommodations is needed.</p>
<b>Section 5.2 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:                      Evidence of communicating this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>5.3 – Accommodations</b></p> <p>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><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math, so no evidence will be provided related to a specific state’s alternate assessment. The state will determine which students take the general or the alternate assessment. Below we provide documentation regarding the accommodations that the College Board provides for administrations of the general assessment. The processes described below apply to students with disabilities who are native English speakers and those who are English language learners.</b></p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 49 – 51 describe the types of available allowable accommodations, including a description of the supports available for English learners.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.5: SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017)</b></p> <p>This PowerPoint deck is presented to SSD supervisors via an online training session and reviews the policies and procedures related to SAT administrations for students who require testing accommodations. All students with documented disabilities, including English learners, can request and are approved for disability accommodations.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.1: Pages from the College Board Students with Disabilities website. (accessed September 1, 2017)</b></p> <p>This document provides images of the College</p>	<p>SAT did not provide any information to ensure that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL)</p> <p>SSD and State Allowed Accommodations are treated differently by the College Board but it is not clear how this impacts state accountability requirements that ensure access for all students.</p> <p>No evidence of any College Board studies on their accommodations and the impact on student scores to validate the accommodations. Although the College Board indicated a study on extended time will be conducted, no evidence of a plan and timeline was provided to verify this statement.</p> <p>There was no data provided on the types and frequency of accommodation approval requests.</p> <p>Pg. 25. Technical manual: “the vast majority of students who are approved for and using testing accommodations at their school through a current IEP or 504 plan have those same accommodations automatically approved for taking the College Board assessment.” How many students automatically qualify and get approved? How many students do not qualify automatically and get approved or not approved? How is the decision made?</p> <p><b>Ensures Availability/Appropriateness/Selection for SWD and EL</b></p> <p>States should supply evidence of how LEAs select accommodations for SWD and EL.</p> <p>There was no evidence provided to address whether the accommodations do not alter the construct being assessed, and allow meaningful</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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Board web pages regarding the accommodations request and approval process. All students with documented disabilities, including English learners, can request and are approved for disability accommodations. This information is available through the College Board website - <a href="https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities">https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities</a></p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.2: College Board Typical Accommodations (accessed October 2, 2017)</b> This document provides information regarding typical testing accommodations available for SAT test administrations. This information is available through the College Board website - <a href="https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities/typical-accommodations">https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities/typical-accommodations</a>.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.3: Support for Students with Temporary Physical/ Medical Conditions</b> This form is used to request testing support for students with temporary impairments (caused by injury, accident, etc.) who cannot postpone their tests.</p> <p><b>Evidence #5.1.4: Reports for Students who Test with State Allowed Accommodations</b> <b>Student who test with State Allowed Accommodations receive a non-college reportable score. This document shows the online and paper-based score report that these students obtain. In adherence to applicable state and federal accessibility laws, College</b></p> <p>Board reports and resources are designed to meet accessibility standards including Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.</p>	<p>interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who</p> <p>Is the read-aloud test format available for the Reading test? How is this not interfering with the tested construct?</p> <p>Per the sample score report for tests given with State Allowed Accommodations (5.1.4), scores may not be used for college admission or scholarship purposes, indicating they are not valid for these decisions. Where are the studies providing evidence that accommodated forms scores are valid for other uses such as tracking college and career readiness?</p> <p><b>Process for exceptional accommodation request</b> Special cases addressed in 2.3.5 include changes to previously requested accommodations and transfer students. Slide 4, 2.3.5 indicates that SAT reviews requests for other accommodations. SAT has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed but data was not provided on the impact such accommodations may have on score</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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>Evidence #5.1.5: Parent Consent Forms Templates</b></p> <p><b>The College Board provides to its state clients templates that they may use to obtain parental consent for students to test with College Board approved accommodations or State Allowed Accommodations. The template is included here as evidence of supports the College Board provides to the state.</b></p>	<p>reportability for state accountability vs. SAT college reporting.</p> <p>The SAT did not provide evidence that the accommodations 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.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.3 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</p> <p>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 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 but data was not provided and/or does this impact the score as reportable or non reportable.</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 SAT Consortium

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b></p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math, so no evidence will be provided related to a specific state’s alternate assessment. The state will determine which students take the general or the alternate assessment. Below we provide documentation regarding the accommodations that the College Board provides for administrations of the general assessment. Evidence #2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</b>            This manual provides instructions for supervisors who will be responsible for registering students for testing accommodations and managing the test administration for students who require testing accommodations.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.3.5: SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017)</b>            This PowerPoint deck is presented to SSD supervisors via an online training session and reviews the policies and procedures related to SAT administrations for students who require testing accommodations.</p>	<p><b>State Policies Consistency</b>            What are state allowed accommodations that may not be accepted by SAT?</p> <p>Does College Board collect any information from states to ensure students receive the appropriate accommodations on the assessment?            Is there any information on how many students do not receive or are denied accommodations via College Board’s process that should receive accommodations per state policy? Any studies?</p> <p><b>Consistent with instruction and IEP team process</b>            There is no evidence that SAT communicates about the accommodations use with IEP teams or the state.</p> <p><b>Administered with fidelity to TA procedures</b>            Is there any data to show that SAT has collected information from local test administrators regarding faithful implementation for special populations? The irregularities forms and procedures were included, but they seem to apply to the general population more than the special populations and accommodations.            What training is provided to scribes and readers? This is critical training; slide 41 says training must be provided, but there is no further information.</p> <p><b>Process used to monitor compliance by districts with data to verify</b>            No State or SAT monitoring information is provided-either before, during, or post administration.</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 SAT Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><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> <p>Evidence 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>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

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

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>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>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math, so no evidence will be provided related to a specific state’s alternate assessment.</b></p> <p><b>The College Board provides the below documentation to our state partners as support resources to be used during their standard setting process.</b></p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 120 - 133 describe how the benchmarks were determined and how they are related to college outcomes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board SAT Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire, and Illinois</b></p> <p>Each of these College Board produced documents contains a detailed alignment between the state standards and the SAT. Please refer to Critical Element 2.1 for the relevant sections. These documents were provided to each panelist as a reference that could be used during the Achievement standards setting process.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)</b></p> <p>Panelists were provided with this document as a reference that could be used during the standards setting process.</p> <p><b>Evidence #6.2.1: Final Report on the 2016 SAT Multi-State Standard Setting.</b></p> <p>This report summarizes the procedures used to obtain recommended cut scores from the standard setting panels, as well as the final cut</p>	<p><b>Method and Process</b></p> <p>Standard setting panels were rather small and lacked diversity, particularly in math. There was no EL representation on either standard setting panel.</p> <p>Process for setting achievement levels and descriptors appears to be sufficiently documented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6.2.1 references 4 states –does not include IL and MI.</li> <li>• Used Modified Angoff, p. 5</li> <li>• Description of Essay standard setting process is not included; only DE and ME did this standard-setting. What will other states do? P.73, Appendix J</li> <li>• P. 36 indicates that Math is aligned to CCSS; does not state the same for ERW</li> <li>• ALDs written by SME in 4 states – but no process described (p.4)</li> </ul> <p>2.1.1 pp, 120-135: setting benchmarks</p> <p>6.2.1, for CT, DE, ME, NH: standards setting procedures for the four states were documented. .</p> <p>Will the College Board be conducting any validity evidence on the achievement standards since states are using different points on the scale to make similar inferences (i.e., the group of states vs. Illinois)?</p> <p>IL and MI need to provide evidence of the standards setting process used.</p> <p>Is SAT going to provide evidence of validity of the different cut scores for IL. There was no information on the IL process for standard setting. The peers located the cut score for proficient but there was no process or ALD development provided. Page 10-11. 3.3.7.How is the different cut scores</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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence									
	scores that were agreed upon by the four states: Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, and New Hampshire. First, an overview of the standard setting meeting is presented, followed by a detailed description of the procedures and results.	addressed with 4 state participation in the standard setting? <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>State</th> <th>EWR</th> <th>MSS</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>IL</td> <td>540</td> <td>540</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DE</td> <td>480</td> <td>530</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	State	EWR	MSS	IL	540	540	DE	480	530
State	EWR	MSS									
IL	540	540									
DE	480	530									
<b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b>											
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards for IL and MI.</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 SAT Consortium

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium

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>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts/Literacy and Math, so no evidence will be provided related to a specific state’s alternate assessment. The College Board provides the below documentation to our state partners as support resources to be used during their standard setting process.</b></p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 21 - 26 describe the processes used to ensure the fairness of the assessment.</li> <li>• Pages 27 - 52 provide a detailed description of test development procedures.</li> <li>• Pages 108 - 114 describe the evidentiary foundation for the decisions made about the content included in the SAT.</li> <li>• Pages 120 - 133 describe how the benchmarks were determined and how they are related to college outcomes.</li> <li>• Pages 133 - 135 describe how the SAT assesses student readiness for college.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board SAT Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire, and Illinois</b></p> <p>Each of these College Board produced documents contains a detailed alignment between the state standards and the SAT. Please refer to Critical Element 2.1 for the relevant sections. These documents were provided to each panelist as a reference that could be used during the Achievement standards setting process.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.1.8: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)</b></p> <p>Panelists were provided with this document as a reference that could be used during the standards setting process.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.1: An SAT Validity Primer (January 2015)</b></p> <p>This paper provides validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores and important college outcomes. The</p>	<p><b>Challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards</b></p> <p>The description of process to develop ALDs is lacking in 6.2.1. The process is not described.</p> <p>Evidence that academic achievement standards are challenging was not provided.</p> <p>Will the College Board be conducting any validity evidence on the achievement standards since states are using different points on the scale to make similar inferences (i.e., the group of states vs. Illinois)?</p> <p>It is not clear how the ALDs represent the State’s academic content standards, the evidence shows alignment with the SAT benchmarks.</p> <p>Page 36. Appendix C. SAT states there is alignment with the state academic standards but there is no evidence or documentation provided to verify the statement.</p> <p>Page 45. 6.2.1. ALDs designed to describe SAT performance but not the state academic achievement standards or the depth of the coverage. An independent alignment study may address this 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 SAT Consortium**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence	
	<p>evidence provided in this paper is based on a previous version of the SAT. Pages 131 – 135 of the SAT Suite Technical Manual describe how the new version of the SAT correlates with the previous version of the assessment.</p> <p><b>Evidence #2.2.2: The Redesigned SAT® Pilot Predictive Validity Study: A First Look (2016)</b></p> <p>This white paper provides preliminary validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores resulting for the redesigned SAT and important college outcomes. The College Board is in the process of completing a validity study to replicate the findings of this white paper with a large, nationally representative sample. The study will examine students in the entering college class of fall 2017, the first full cohort to be admitted to college with the new SAT. For more information regarding this planned study, please refer to page 152 of the SAT Technical Manual.</p> <p><b>Evidence #6.2.1: Final Report on the 2016 SAT Multi-State Standard Setting.</b></p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td> <p>This report summarizes the procedures used to obtain recommended cut scores from the standard setting panels, as well as the final cut scores that were agreed upon by the four states: Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, and New Hampshire. First, an overview of the standard setting meeting is presented, followed by a detailed description of the procedures and results.</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p>This report summarizes the procedures used to obtain recommended cut scores from the standard setting panels, as well as the final cut scores that were agreed upon by the four states: Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, and New Hampshire. First, an overview of the standard setting meeting is presented, followed by a detailed description of the procedures and results.</p>	
<p>This report summarizes the procedures used to obtain recommended cut scores from the standard setting panels, as well as the final cut scores that were agreed upon by the four states: Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, and New Hampshire. First, an overview of the standard setting meeting is presented, followed by a detailed description of the procedures and results.</p>			
<p><b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b></p>			
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of how the 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.</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 SAT 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 SAT Consortium

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;</li> <li>• The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;</li> <li>• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;</li> <li>○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;</li> <li>○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The following documents are reference materials provided by the College Board to educators to support their use of the College Board reporting platform.</p> <p>In adherence to applicable state and federal accessibility laws, College Board reports and resources are designed to meet accessibility standards including Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.</p> <p><b>Evidence #6.4.1: K–12 Educator Brief: The College and Career Readiness Benchmarks for the SAT® Suite of Assessments (April 2016)</b> This brochure explains how the SAT benchmarks were derived and how to interpret SAT test results. It also provides a set of frequently asked questions regarding the assessment reporting.</p> <p><b>Evidence #6.4.2: K-12 Educator Brief: The SAT® Suite of Assessments: Using Scores and Reporting to Inform Instruction (2015)</b> This educator brief provides an overview of the different reports available to teachers, and how these reports can be used for curricular and intervention purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 23 - 41 display and explain the uses for sample reports available through the College Board reporting portal.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence #6.4.3: SAT Understanding Scores 2017 (2017)</b> This brochure provides information to educators regarding scoring benchmarks, how the assessment is scored and how to access score reports on the College Board reporting portal. It also provides a guide on how to interpret student score reports.</p> <p><b>Evidence #6.4.4: Professional Development</b></p>	<p>The College Board indicated it is developing a Spanish Language version of Evidence #6.4.3 for the 2018-19 school year but the peers did not receive any evidence to support the statement.</p> <p>SAT supplies the tools for reporting including assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address needs based on the SAT framework but not the state standards.</p> <p>States should supply evidence of such reports as generated and published.</p> <p>For the individual student reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No State evidence for each of these criteria is provided. Not clear if there is state material that accompanies the SAT score reports. What reports are delivered to parents – same as student reports?</li> <li>• SAT information is provided, but not connected to requirements for States.</li> <li>• How are achievement standards (PLDs )reflected on SAT reports??</li> <li>• If SAT is given in grade 11 for these states, all the SAT material only indicates that the SAT is grade 11 and grade 12 – how do states address grade 11 vs. 12 for reporting purposes?</li> <li>• An individual score report was not provided for review to address the reporting requirements.</li> </ul> <p>When do parents receive the reports with a guide to interpret the test results? Do teachers receive reports in time and with resources to help guide instruction? There is no information on the timeline for parent 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 SAT Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Module #6: Using Scores and Reporting to Inform Instruction (2015)</b>                      This PowerPoint presentation can be used to train educators on how to access, interpret and apply score report results to inform classroom instruction.</p> <p><b>Evidence #6.4.5: Facilitator Guide to Professional Development Module #6: Using Scores and Reporting to Inform Instruction (2015)</b>                      This guide is a companion to the PowerPoint presentation and is intended as a support resource for administrators or district trainers who will be training their educators on how score reporting.</p> <p><b>Evidence #6.4.6: Educator Online Reporting Screen Shot Demo (February 2017)</b>                      This PowerPoint shows the different reports that available through the College Board online reporting system.</p>	<p>Educators also have a dashboard for requesting a variety of reports.</p> <p>There is no process and timeline for delivery to parents for individual reports.</p> <p>There is no information on availability of alternate formats of the reports available upon request.</p>

**Section 6.4 Summary Statement**

No additional evidence is required or

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

Evidence of reporting that 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:

- The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that:
  - Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;
  - Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);
  - Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;
  - Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;

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.

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

## March 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes for SAT (State 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 New Hampshire SAT Submission

## Contents

<b>SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS .</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students ....	5
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards .....	7
1.3 – Required Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only).....	14
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only).....	17
1.5 – Participation Data (reviewed by Department staff only).....	19
<b>SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS .....</b>	<b>20</b>
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	21
2.2 – Item Development.....	24
2.3 – Test Administration .....	27
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)31	
2.5 – Test Security .....	34
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....	38
<b>SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....</b>	<b>43</b>
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	44
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	48
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure .....	51
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables .....	55
<b>SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER .....</b>	<b>57</b>
4.1 – Reliability.....	58
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	61
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	63
4.4 – Scoring .....	66
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms .....	68
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment .....	69
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance.....	71
<b>SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS .....</b>	<b>74</b>
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities .....	75
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	79
5.3 – Accommodations.....	83
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations .....	87
<b>SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .</b>	<b>89</b>
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students .....	89
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....	92
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards .....	95
6.4 – Reporting.....	98

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

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAT Submission

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

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><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>State-specific evidence.</p> <p>New Hampshire sets minimum standards subject to adoption and enhancement by local school districts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">R1 Chapter 193-E (11-E30) Adequate Public Education pp.1-2</a></li> <li><a href="#">R2 Section 193-C3 Program Established Goals pp.1</a></li> <li><a href="#">R3 Section 193-E2-a Subsuming Educational Content of an Adequate Education</a></li> <li><a href="#">R10 Section 1868 Rulemaking Authority Standards</a></li> </ul> <p>State Board of Education minutes regarding adoption of Minimum Standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">SB27 State Board Minutes Section 2, Adoption of Minimum Standards for Public School Approval Pg. 2</a></li> <li><a href="#">NH227 NH Minimum Standards pp. 26</a></li> </ul> <p>Assessment; pg. 29 Curriculum; pg. 31 Curriculum; pg. 33 High School Curriculum; pg. 61 ELA Standards; pg. 79 Mathematics Standards; pg. 82 Mathematics Standards;</p> <p>Formal adoption of content Standards in math and ELA is documented in the following places:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">W4 NH DOE ESEA Flexibility Waiver Updated 2013 pp. 23-24</a> "The State has adopted college- and career-ready standards in at least reading/language arts and mathematics that are common to a significant number of States, consistent with part (1) of the definition of college- and career-ready standards."</li> <li><a href="#">W2 NH DOE ESEA Flexibility Waiver Attachments: NH State Board Meeting Minutes pp. 29-29, Item V: Special Presentation: Public Hearing on Common Core State Standards for New Hampshire. Official vote 4-1 to adopt standards.</a></li> </ul> <p>New Hampshire's academic content standards apply to all public elementary and secondary schools and all public elementary and secondary school students in the NH include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">NH227 NH Minimum Standards</a></li> </ul> <p>Statements asserting that adopted NH College and Career Standards apply to all students found in the following places:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">W4 NH DOE ESEA Flexibility Waiver Concept Paper 2013 pp. 3</a></li> <li><a href="#">W3 NH DOE ESEA Flexibility Waiver Concept Paper Presentation 2013 pp. 10, 11, 14</a></li> <li><a href="#">W6 NH DOE ESEA Flexibility Waiver Updated 2013 pp. 23-24</a></li> </ul> <p>Policy memo referring to contents standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">C32 NH Transition to CCSS Memo</a></li> </ul> <p>State presentations on NH CCRS adoption, including the Commissioners presentation to NH School Administrators Association about ELA and math standards and expectations for all students are evidenced in the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">C49 Presentation: CCSS NH Concept</a></li> <li><a href="#">C50 Presentation: Implementing CCSS in NH</a></li> <li><a href="#">C51 Presentation: CCSS NH</a></li> <li><a href="#">C52 Presentation on NH CCSS ELA</a></li> <li><a href="#">C53 Presentation on NH CCSS Math</a></li> <li><a href="#">C43 Presentation Standards to NISAA Regional Groups</a></li> </ul> <p>Public announcements regarding the adopting of New Hampshire standards are evidenced in previous examples and in the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">C40 Common Core State Standards Press Release</a></li> <li><a href="#">KMR July 13 Waiver Announcement, pg. 2</a></li> </ul> <p>State documents and publications pertaining to NH College and Career Ready Standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">C44 NH FAQ Adoption of NH CCRS</a></li> <li><a href="#">C46 Common Core State Standards Press Release NH Department of Education</a></li> <li><a href="#">C48 Criteria for Curriculum Materials CCRS</a></li> </ul> <p>The New Hampshire Content Standards in math and ELA are contained in the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">C1 CCSS ELA Standards</a></li> <li><a href="#">C2 CCSS ELA Standards, Appendix A Literacy in History, Social Studies, Science, and Tech Science</a></li> </ul>	<p>New Hampshire sets minimum standards subject to adoption and enhancement by local school districts.</p> <p>There is no ambiguity in our statutes. <a href="#">RSA 193-C3</a> relies on "state-established standards." And <a href="#">RSA 1868</a> tells the state board that we must adopt rules that set "Minimum curriculum and educational standards for all grades of the public schools."</p> <p>The New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE) is committed to setting high expectations for what students must know and be able to do. Through its involvement and leadership in the Council of Chief State School Officers' Innovation Lab Network (ILN), the state is focused on student-centered and competency-based approaches to learning. This focus emphasizes attainment of world-class knowledge and skills through multiple pathways, based on acquiring and applying knowledge in novel situations and building a repertoire of experience.</p> <p>The New Hampshire State Board of Education adopted college- and career-ready standards in mathematics and English language arts (ELA)/literacy (based on the Common Core State Standards) in July 2010 (see evidence in Attachment 4). These standards along with other content standards and New Hampshire's focus on competencies (skills and dispositions) make up the New Hampshire College- and Career-Ready Standards (NH CCRS) Since the adoption of the new mathematics and ELA/literacy standards, the NHDOE has conducted many meetings across the state to raise awareness, provided multiple professional development opportunities for educators to further expand understanding of the standards and engaged educators in the work of implementation.</p> <p>On July 8, 2010, in an open public hearing, the State of New Hampshire voted 4-1 to adopt the Common Core State Standards. Daphne Kenyon made the motion, seconded by Tom Raffia, that the State Board of Education adopt in principle the final draft of the Common Core State Standards, and that the Department of Education commit to a thoughtful, orderly transition process for implementation and assessment to ensure that all New Hampshire students experience a successful and productive future. The State Board of Education will expect regular reports from the Department on the progress of implementation as we move forward. VOTE: The motion was adopted by a 4 – 1 vote with the Chairman [J.yons] voting in the negative.</p> <p>New Hampshire believes that all students must be college and career ready by the time they complete high school. This means not only meeting the content knowledge expectations of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in English Language Arts and Math, but also demonstrating necessary college- and career-ready knowledge, skills and dispositions. Our system must show that students are advancing not just by demonstrating growth in learning, but by demonstrating competency.</p> <p>The state will adopt a balanced system of assessments (formative, interim, and summative) to assess student competency along learning progressions.</p> <p>The New Hampshire State Board of Education adopted the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in July 2010. Since its adoption, the state has provided multiple awareness meetings and professional development opportunities for educator engagement.</p> <p>"In the context of the CCSS, and New Hampshire's dimension of college- and career readiness, the state needs ways to measure whether students are meeting expectations and reaching academic achievement goals. By 2015, the NHDOE is committed to creating a balanced and robust system of assessments (formative, interim and summative) focused on personalized learning that will evaluate students' competencies over rigorous academic content, adaptive skills, and critical dispositions.</p> <p>In the ESEA Flexibility Waiver New Hampshire pledged support to founding principles including:</p> <p>Principle 1: College- and career-ready expectations for all students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensuring all students have access to high quality academic content standards</li> <li>Implementing next generation assessment systems focused on understanding student mastery of skills and knowledge</li> </ul> <p>and</p> <p>Principle 2: Identifying, recognizing, and supporting New Hampshire schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focusing on moving from improvement to innovation and through a NH Networked Strategy</li> <li>Setting school-based annual learning targets</li> <li>Focusing efforts on improving achievement for all students including subgroup achievement and graduation rates</li> <li>Concentrating resources on schools that have academic challenges</li> <li>Recognizing schools that are high performing and making the most progress (NH DOE ESEA Flexibility Waiver Request Overview pg. 2)</li> </ul>

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">C3 CCSS ELA Standards Appendix B Literacy in History/Social Studies/Science and Tech. Science Exemplars and Performance Tasks</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C4 CCSS ELA Standards Appendix B Literacy in History/Social Studies/Science and Tech. Science Student Writing</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C5 NH ELA Competencies</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C6 CCSS ELA Math</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C16 CCSS NH Language: 9 and 10</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C17 CCSS NH Language: 11 and 12</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C18 CCSS Math Standards</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C19 CCSS Math Appendix A Designing HS Math Courses</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C20 NH Math Competencies</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C21 CCSS Math Frame Areas</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C31 CCSS NH Math High School</a></li> </ul> <p><b>Theory of Action and Shared Vision for All Students found in the following places:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">W4 NH DOE ESEA Flexibility Waiver Concept Paper, Pp. 4-5</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">W6 NH DOE ESEA Flexibility Waiver Updated June 2013, Pp. 19-22</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">W6 NH DOE ESEA Flexibility Waiver Updated June 2013 Pg. 23</a>, With a commitment and focus on transition to CCSS NH. Including collaboration and support team networks. Pg. 23-41</li> </ul> <p><b>College and Career-Ready Expectations for all students documented in the following places:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">W4 NH DOE ESEA Flexibility Waiver Concept Paper, Pp. 6-7</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">W3 NH DOE ESEA Flexibility Waiver Concept Paper Presentation 2013, Slide 14</a></li> </ul> <p><b>NH ESEA Flexibility Waiver Documents.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">W1 NH DOE ESEA Flexibility Waiver Announcement from Governor 2013</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">W2 NH DOE ESEA Flexibility Waiver Attachments 2013</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">W3 NH DOE ESEA Flexibility Waiver Concept Paper Presentation 2013</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">W4 NH DOE ESEA Flexibility Waiver Concept Paper</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">W6 NH DOE ESEA Flexibility Waiver Provisions 2013</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">W7 NH DOE ESEA Flexibility Waiver Request Overview 2013</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">W6 NH DOE ESEA Flexibility Waiver Updated June 2013</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">W5 NH DOE ESEA Waiver AC49 Approval Letter June 2013</a></li> </ul> <p><b>New Hampshire Competencies Aligned to CCSS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">C5 NH ELA Competencies</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C20 NH Math Competencies</a></li> </ul>	<p>New Hampshire transition to full implementation of the CCSS between 2011 and 2013.</p> <p><b>New Hampshire ESEA Flexibility Waiver</b> New Hampshire believes that all students must be college and career ready by the time they complete high school. This means not only meeting the content knowledge expectations of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in English Language Arts and Math, but also demonstrating necessary college- and career-ready knowledge, skills and dispositions. Based on these beliefs, New Hampshire developed a Theory of Action and applied for (and received) an ESEA Flexibility Waiver.</p> <p><b>New Hampshire Competencies Aligned to CCSS</b> On February 20, 2013, the NH State Board of Education approved competencies in mathematics and English language arts aligned to the Common Core College and Career Ready Standards for statewide use. These competencies were developed by teams of New Hampshire educators under the guidance of the National Center for Improvement of Educational Assessment (NCEA).</p>
<p><b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b>  <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 New Hampshire SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</b></p> <p>The State’s academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science specify what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school to succeed in college and the workforce; contain content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.</p>	<p>State-specific evidence.</p> <p>Standard crosswalk documents for ELA and math are below; science standards were previously approved through the peer review process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">C0 NH College and Career Ready Standards</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C1 CCSS ELA Standards</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C2 CCSS ELA Standards Appendix A Literacy in History Social Studies Science and Tech Science</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C3 CCSS ELA Standards Appendix B Literacy in History Social Studies Science and Tech Science Exemplars and Performance Tasks</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C4 CCSS ELA Standards Appendix B Literacy in History Social Studies Science and Tech Science Student Writing</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C5 NH ELA Competencies</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C6 CCSS ELA Matrix</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C16 CCSS NH Language 9 and 10</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C17 CCSS NH Language 11 and 12</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C18 CCSS Math Standards</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C19 CCSS Math Appendix A Designing HS Math Courses</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C20 NH Math Competencies</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C21 CCSS Math Focus Areas</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C31 CCSS NH Math High School</a></li> </ul> <p><b>Presentations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">C43 Presentation Standards to NHSAA Regional Groups</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C48 Presentation Implementing CCSS in NH</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C49 Presentation CCSS NH Concept</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C50 Presentation Implementing CCSS in NH</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C51 Presentation CCSS NH</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C52 Presentation on NH CCSS ELA</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C53 Presentation on NH CCSS Math</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C54 Presentation CCSS Concept Transition</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C56 Presentation NH Shifts to CCSS</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C57 Presentation CCSS Concept Transition Implementation 2</a></li> </ul> <p><b>Frequently Asked Questions Documents:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">F1 FAQ Adoption of NH CCSS</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">F2 FAQ on NH Standards</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">F4 FAQ NH CCRS</a></li> </ul> <p><b>Guiding Documents:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">C32 NH Transition to CCSS Memo</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C34 Template for Implementation CCSS</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">KM8 November 13 Pathways to CCSS</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">NHG55 NH Talking Points about the CCSS</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">NHG68 Response to RTI and CCSS</a></li> </ul> <p><b>Stakeholder involvement:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">W2 NH DOE ESSA Flexibility Waiver</a> Attachments: New Hampshire Common Core Implementation Team. Pg. 38 New Hampshire Common Core Guiding Coalition. Pg. 39</li> </ul>	<p>In 2009, the former New Hampshire Commissioner of Education, Virginia M. Barry, Ph.D., formed cross-departmental committees and planning teams to create an innovative comprehensive educational reform plan designed to address: 1) rigorous standards and accompanying assessments; 2) a comprehensive data support system; 3) teacher and leader systems of support; and 4) support to the lowest-achieving schools. Teams included leaders from a state teachers union (NEA-NH), principals’ and superintendents’ associations, representatives from the Governor’s Office, and the Chairs of the Education Committees of both legislative branches. Teams were led by members of the Commissioner’s cabinet. The Governor and members of the legislature, in particular the leaders of education committees in both chambers supplied strong leadership for the goals of the State plan. Planning meetings were held monthly at the state level with regular conference calls between the directors and external partners.</p> <p>NH’s educational culture is one of collaboration. Promising practices are currently shared through the Commissioner’s monthly meetings with all superintendents, the regional superintendents’ Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Groups, and professional conferences and meetings. The Governor’s P-16 Council has committed to aligning the Comprehensive</p> <p>The NH P-16 Council adopted the overarching goal of ensuring that every high school student graduates prepared for success in college, careers and community life, through the achievement of core objectives for graduation and reduced dropout rates, college enrollment, college preparation, and college success.</p> <p>The NHD OE, along with 50 other states and territories participated in the joint effort by the National Governors Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO in partnership with Achieve, ACT, and the College Board to develop the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in English language arts and mathematics for grades K-12. The standards are research- and evidence-based, internationally benchmarked, aligned with college and work expectations, and include rigorous content and skills. The New Hampshire State Board of Education formally adopted the CCSS on July 8, 2010. (NH DOE ESSA Flexibility Waiver Attachments: NH State Board Meeting Minutes pp. 28-29.)</p> <p>As part of the work to adopt the new CCSS, NH actively participated in the review and adoption process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drafts 1 and 2: NHD OE reviewed with NH Teachers of Mathematics (NHTM) and literacy specialists and submitted comments and resource documents on text complexity.</li> <li>• Drafts 3 and 4: NHD OE organized 14 two-hour feedback sessions in six locations around the state where over 200 teachers and curriculum leaders, representing more than half of the NH districts, and higher education faculty provided feedback to the writing group.</li> </ul> <p>The documents and index narrative provided by NH show that the State has met this critical element.</p> <p>Broad stakeholder involvement is evidenced by the fact that prior to the adoption of the CCSS, the state engaged a diverse array of stakeholders, including key decision makers and constituents.</p> <p>The reviewers would have liked to see New Hampshire Evidence Page (evidence documents provided) organized under headings reflecting the language of the CE.</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 SAT Submission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">W6 NH DOE/ESEA Flexibility Waiver Updated</a> 2013. Pg. 12-13 2013. Dates of Stakeholder Meetings. Pg. 15 Dates of Taskforce and Work Team meetings. Pg. 15 Dates of Outreach outside organizations. Pp. 15-17</li> <li>• <a href="#">W6 NH DOE/ESEA Flexibility Waiver Updated 2013 pp. 14, 27-28, 32</a></li> </ul> <p><b>Minutes from public input sessions on standards:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">W2 NH DOE ESSA Flexibility Waiver</a> Attachments: pp. 23-24 Excerpt from Title I Committee of Practitioners Meeting, Title I Committee of Practitioners Meeting Minutes pp.16-25 Announcement of Waiver Application, posting of draft and statement of support. P. 26 NH State Board Meeting Minutes. P. 27. Item IV: Open Board Discussion: Common Core State Standards for New Hampshire. Comments about feedback p. 28. NH State Board Meeting Minutes. Pp. 28-29. Item V: Special Presentation: Public Hearing on Common Core State Standards for New Hampshire. Official vote 4-1 to adopt standards. New Hampshire Common Core Implementation Team. Pg. 38</li> </ul> <p><b>New Hampshire values collaborative relationships with business and education partners throughout the state.</b> <b>Partnerships include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">NH Business and Industry Association (NHG50 BIA Supports CCSS);</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">P-16 Council of New Hampshire (NHG28 NH Network Initiatives Support Standards and P-20 Partnerships);</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">ESOL alignment to NH Standards (C39);</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">W2 NH DOE ESSA Flexibility Waiver</a> Attachments: Support Letters from the following institutions can be found on pp. 3-15.</li> </ul> <p><b>Stakeholder Feedback</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">W6 NH DOE ESEA Flexibility Waiver Updated</a> June 2013. Pg. 28-35</li> </ul> <p><b>NH CCRS Aligned for Students with Disabilities.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">W6 NH DOE/ESEA Flexibility Waiver Updated</a> 2013 pp. 31-32</li> </ul> <p><b>The New Hampshire ESEA Flexibility Waiver</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">W3 NH DOE ESEA Flexibility Waiver Concept Paper Presentation 2013. Slides 21-25</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">W4 NH DOE ESEA Flexibility Waiver Concept Paper. Pp. 10-11</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">W6 NH DOE/ESEA Flexibility Waiver Updated</a> 2013 pg. 20</li> </ul> <p><b>All New Hampshire students will graduate from high school prepared to persist in college and or pursue a financially sustaining career.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">C37 New School Approval Standards Assessments Competencies</a>, NH Definition of Competency, pg. 20; NH Competency Learning Blocks, pg. 23; ED 306 Rules, pg. 27; Local Policies, pp. 28-30; Instructional Standards, Credits, Competencies, pp. 31-39; NH Theory of Action and Instructional Core related to NH CCSS, pp. 39-77.</li> </ul> <p><b>Theory of Action for all students.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">W4 NH DOE ESEA Flexibility Waiver Concept Paper. Pp. 4-5</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">W6 NH DOE/ESEA Flexibility Waiver Updated</a> 2013 pg. 21</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subsequent drafts: NH continued to review and provide feedback to fine tune CCSS.</li> <li>• On June 1, 2010, a policy roundtable took place regarding CCSS with key legislators and education officials in NH. This roundtable was supported by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and facilitated by the Council of State Governments</li> <li>• On July 8, 2010 the State Board, which had been briefed monthly, held a public hearing on CCSS adoption. Key constituencies, including educators, higher education, unions, community groups, business, and parents were invited to comment in public forums and online.</li> </ul> <p>In 2011, New Hampshire conducted an analysis study of the state's Grade-Level Expectations (GLE)/Grade-Span Expectations (GSE) and the CCSS (English language arts/literacy and mathematics). The study included the evaluation of content, skill and rigor, and a gap analysis alignment study.</p> <p>The results confirmed that the CCSS New Hampshire academic content standards for reading/language arts and mathematics contain rigorous content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) that encourage the teaching of advanced skills and that clearly define 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. The completed crosswalk between CCSS and NECAP standards became the foundational document in New Hampshire's transition to the new standards.</p> <p>Communication and stakeholder involvement remained top priorities for the New Hampshire during the transition to CCSS. A web presence was established with links to presentations, Frequently Asked Questions, videos, talking points, timelines, and other relevant information.</p> <p>Stakeholders have been actively engaged in the development of, and transition to New Hampshire's Innovation and Improvement Plan. Input from public sessions, peer support and endorsements related to the development and adoption of the New Hampshire academic content standards are documented in the following pieces of evidence:</p> <p>New Hampshire is actively involved in partnerships and collaborative teams designed to transform teaching and learning in the state leading to college and career readiness for all students. P-20 partnerships like P-12 schools with Institutes of Higher Education (IHE) to provide seamless transitions for students as they move through the education continuum, and to allow students studying to become tomorrow's teachers the authentic opportunities to prepare in a role of shared responsibility for all students.</p> <p>The <b>NH CEEDAR</b> steering committee has established the goal to "Develop mutually beneficial partnerships between preparation programs and elementary, middle, and high schools". CEEDAR (Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability</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 SAT Submission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>College and Career-Ready Expectations for all Students</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">W4 NH DOE ESEA Flexibility Waiver Concept Paper, Pp. 6-7</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">W6 NH DOE ESEA Flexibility Waiver Updated</a> 2013 pg. 21</li> </ul> <p><b>Adopted Standards apply to all students with P-20 alignment.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">W3 NH DOE ESEA Flexibility Waiver Concept</a> Paper Presentation 2013, Slide 11</li> </ul> <p><b>Documentation of expected content and skill and learning trajectories.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">C5 NH ELA Competencies</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C20 NH Math Competencies</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">E2 FAQ on NH Standards</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">W2 NH DOE ESSA Flexibility Waiver</a> Attachments: Trajectory and Implementation Plan. Pp. 49</li> <li>• <a href="#">W2 NH DOE ESSA Flexibility Waiver</a> Attachments: Competency Validation Rubric. Pg. 50</li> <li>• <a href="#">W2 NH DOE ESSA Flexibility Waiver</a> Attachments: Application to Students with Disabilities. Pp. 54-55</li> <li>• <a href="#">W6 NH DOE ESEA Flexibility Waiver Updated</a> 2013 pg. 22</li> </ul> <p><b>Benchmarking studies, external reviews, post-secondary alignment studies, and evaluation and feedback provide avenues of continuous engagement and partnership.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">W3 NH DOE ESEA Flexibility Waiver Concept Paper Presentation 2013, Slide 12</a></li> </ul> <p><b>Alignment to post-secondary expectations.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">C41 Career and Technical Education Aligned to Standards</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">NHG46 Dual Enrollment Programs</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">NHG3 State Innovation Plan</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">NHG56 Bridging the Gap Pathways Planning Tool</a></li> </ul> <p><b>External review documentation for ELA and math standards.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">NHG58 NH Network Initiative Support Standards and P-20 Partnerships Position</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">NHG59 NH Network Initiatives Support Standards and P-20 Partnerships</a></li> </ul> <p><b>Evaluation and Feedback:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">W2 NH DOE ESSA Flexibility Waiver</a> Attachments: Feedback Solicitation Form. Pp. 56-57</li> <li>• <a href="#">W2 NH DOE ESSA Flexibility Waiver</a> Attachments: Feedback Survey. Pp. 58-59</li> <li>• <a href="#">C36 District Common Core Capacity Rubric</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">C38 Survey Feedback on Minimum Standards</a></li> </ul>	<p>and Reform) is providing technical assistance to improve the preparation of educators to teach diverse learners (students with disabilities).</p> <p><b>P-20 Partnerships and Dual Enrollment Opportunities:</b> Project Running Start is the dual enrollment/dual credit/concurrent enrollment program offered by the Community College System of NH (CCSNH). This is a design/tool used by the system to offer high school students transcribed college credit for courses offered by their local school district. For a course to be considered for this dual credit option certain conditions must apply. For example: The teacher must meet or exceed the hiring qualifications for CCSNH faculty, the course work and materials must meet the college level content standards, etc. As for the Student, for \$100.00 per course, the student receives all the benefits and resources of any other CCSNH student. At the successful completion of the class they will have both a high school credit and a college transcribed credit. The transcript from the college does not indicate that the student took the course at a high school. It will indicate that the student successfully completed the college course indicated on the transcript. The term Running Start is best thought of as a vehicle through which students can take college courses at their high school at a reduced tuition cost.</p> <p>Southern New Hampshire University's "SNHU in the High School" Program offers qualified sophomores, juniors and seniors the opportunity to earn college credit prior to high school graduation. For more information about the program, its requirements for both students and instructors, and its available courses, visit the Southern</p> <p><b>Next Steps NH</b> College and career readiness is not only an academic endeavor. Schools, students, and families must plan and work together to ensure successful transition. The outcomes of the grant will remove the state from a compliance focus to a deeper, more comprehensive evidence-based approach to transition planning. These activities will be conducted collaboratively with our partners at New Hampshire Parent Information Centers, New Hampshire Vocational Rehabilitation, regional intermediaries and other established professional development providers so that the activities are sustained over time.</p> <p><b>Next Steps NH Goals and Objectives</b> The overall goal of Next Steps NH is to increase the number of students with disabilities and/or those at risk of dropping out of school who are college and career ready in New Hampshire through implementation of evidence based transition practices. Next Steps NH will focus on four strategies to achieve this goal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increasing student competency through increased use of Extended Learning Opportunities (ELOs),</li> <li>• Enhancing transition planning, activities and opportunities,</li> <li>• Greater family-school engagement</li> <li>• Sustaining practices through our state institutions of</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 SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>Higher Education (IHEs), regional professional development intermediaries, a transition Community of Practice, and the use of technology.</p> <p>This Next Steps project offers seven objectives designed to support these strategies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To develop the capacity of those providing professional development on Extended Learning Opportunities (ELOs), transition planning, and parent engagement, and to define the expectations and commitment of those receiving professional development.</li> <li>2. To increase and expand the use of ELOs in all regions of New Hampshire, by increasing the knowledge and skills of NH special and general educators, related service personnel, and in the design, implementation with fidelity, and sustainability of evidence based ELOs.</li> <li>3. To increase the use of best practice, evidence-based transition planning, including enhanced family engagement strategies.</li> <li>4. To sustain the use of ELO, transition planning, and parent engagement strategies, through evidence-based and quality coaching.</li> <li>5. To increase the use of implementation, intervention, and outcome data to support decision making at the school, LEA, and state level.</li> <li>6. To ensure LEA administrators are trained to support their staff and initiatives to implement and sustain the use of ELOs, transition planning and family engagement strategies.</li> <li>7. To enhance the inclusion of evidence-based training materials on ELOs, transition planning, and parent/family engagement in IHE pre-service training programs to sustain delivery of grant services throughout the state.</li> </ol> <p><b>Next Step NH Partners:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vocational Rehabilitation <a href="http://education.nh.gov/career/vocational/">education.nh.gov/career/vocational/</a></li> <li>• Granite State Independent Living <a href="http://www.gsil.org/">www.gsil.org/</a></li> <li>• North Country Educational Services <a href="http://www.ncedservices.org/">www.ncedservices.org/</a></li> <li>• Monadnock Center for Successful Transitions <a href="http://www.mcsst-nh.org/">www.mcsst-nh.org/</a></li> <li>• Keene State College <a href="http://www.keene.edu/">www.keene.edu/</a></li> <li>• Strafford Learning Center <a href="http://www.straffordlearningcenter.org/">www.straffordlearningcenter.org/</a></li> <li>• Parent Information Center <a href="http://www.picnh.org/">www.picnh.org/</a></li> <li>• Q.E.D. Foundation <a href="http://qedfoundation.org/">qedfoundation.org/</a></li> <li>• Institute on Disability at the University of New Hampshire <a href="http://iod.unh.edu/Home.aspx">iod.unh.edu/Home.aspx</a></li> <li>• Evergreen Evaluation &amp; Consulting <a href="http://www.evergreenevaluation.net/index.php">www.evergreenevaluation.net/index.php</a></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 SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="http://archive.sharedwork.org/community/16529">New Hampshire Transition Community of Practice archive.sharedwork.org/community/16529</a></li> </ul> <p><b>English Language Learners</b>                      New Hampshire is an active member of the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Consortium. WIDA is dedicated to the design and implementation of high standards and equitable educational opportunities for English Learners (ELs). To this end, the WIDA Consortium developed English language proficiency (ELP) standards and an English language proficiency test aligned with those standards (ACCESS for ELLs®). Over 4,600 EL students in New Hampshire public schools currently take part in the ACCESS for ELLs®.</p> <p>In 2012, the NHDoe, in partnership with the University of New Hampshire, convened professional learning community of experienced New Hampshire ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) teachers to align the new mathematics and ELA standards and the New Hampshire GLE/GSE's with the English Language Development Standards.</p> <p>The NHDoe Title III Director held a phone conference in November 2012, with experienced ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) teachers and administrators from the Title III districts with the highest number of enrolled ELs. Participants offered strong recommendations for addressing the professional development needs of mainstream teachers of ELs, specifically in the area of college- and career-ready standards. This conversation led to the sponsorship of two trainings in December 2012 and March 2013 with Dr. Joy McLaughlin, a WIDA (World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment) consultant, for teachers of ELs to provide in-depth knowledge of the amplified WIDA English Language Development Standards and their alignment with college- and career-ready standards. A second set of training opportunities (April 2013, led by Don Bouchard, Senior WIDA Consultant) included district teams of EL and mainstream teachers. These follow-up workshops addressed the implementation of instructional strategies that are aligned with the NH CCRS. Similar workshops will be scheduled in fall 2013 for identified Priority and Focus Schools.</p> <p><b>NH CCRS Aligned for Students with Disabilities.</b>                      Students with disabilities receive specially designed instruction, related services and accommodations based on their IEPs that adhere to the higher, clearer and fewer standards of NH CCRS. To that end, teachers of special education students have been a part of the New Hampshire NH CCRS implementation audience from the start as they are critical members of the instructional team.</p> <p>The NHDoe NH CCRS Steering Committee is a small team led by the NH CCRS state lead for implementation. The committee is comprised of content specialists, cross curricular educators, administrators, higher education representatives, communication specialists, charter school administrators, school improvement leadership and accountability staff. It convenes to create, prioritize and modify NH CCRS tools for districts to use and/or tailor to their local needs and priorities. Part of their work is to review</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 SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>national tools and make recommendations for use in New Hampshire. The NH CCRS Steering Committee serves to structure timelines and participate in professional development opportunities around the state in order to disseminate national tools, enhance internal and external communication about NH CCRS and conduct gap analyses when necessary.</p> <p><b>The New Hampshire ESEA Flexibility Waiver</b> Dedicated leaders, teachers and education partners have developed a long history of education excellence in New Hampshire. These educational partners recognize that continuous improvement is essential. The state must continually improve its system to ensure a better educational experience for all learners in a rapidly changing world – one that will result in more students reaching higher levels of learning, and being better equipped to succeed beyond high school.</p> <p>The goal of the State's proposed innovations is to increase student learning and achievement to meet the demands of the 21st century, while narrowing the achievement gap for identified subgroups of students, including those who are traditionally underserved. The goals are now more specific, with plans to get us there, and more visionary, at the same time. The large numbers of stakeholders who have participated in this process have articulated far reaching goals for students—All New Hampshire students will graduate from high school prepared to persist in college and or pursue a financially sustaining career.</p> <p><b>All Students</b> New Hampshire believes that the state will be able to move toward a system that is better for all students, including students with disabilities and English learners (EL) – a system that is premised on supporting districts and schools in achieving excellence realized through a network of supports, rather than a system based solely on compliance.</p> <p>New Hampshire believes all students must be college- and career-ready by the time they complete high school. This means not only meeting the content knowledge expectations of the NH CCRS in English language arts/literacy and mathematics, but also demonstrating necessary college- and career-ready skills and dispositions. New Hampshire's system shows that students are advancing not just by demonstrating growth in learning, but by demonstrating competency in the understanding and application of content knowledge.</p> <p>A competency education system starts with college- and career-ready standards. These standards are implemented through a comprehensive Networked Strategy which connects and uses educator, school and district development and supports. The New Hampshire networked system is comprised of stakeholders – teachers, leaders and the community – engaged and sharing the intention and desire to help every student reach proficiency – a theory of positive intent.</p>	
<b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAT Submission

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAT Submission**

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>1.3 – 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>State-specific evidence.</p> <p><a href="#">Assessment Calendar</a></p> <p>NH SAS ELA, Math (3-8)</p> <p>NH SAS Science (5, 8, 11)</p> <p>DLM ELA, Math (3-8)</p> <p>DLM Science (5, 8, 11)</p> <p>College Board SAT ELA Math (11)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">NH DOE and College Board Contract</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">R2 Section 193-C3 Program Established Goals</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">R5 Section 193-H School Performance and Accountability</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">E1 NH Consolidated State Application for Title III Accountability Procedures pg. 2</a></li> </ul> <p>The following document show correspondences between the WIDA (World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment) English Language Development Standards and the Common Core State Standards in English language arts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">C39 ESOL alignment to NH Standards</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">E2 ESOL ACCESS for K-1</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">E3 ESOL Guidance for Placement and Assessment</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">E4 ACCESS Accommodation Guidelines</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">E5 ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Acc Checklist</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">E6 ACCESS for ELLs 20 QA</a></li> </ul>	<p>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 Grades 3-8 ELA/Writing &amp; Math, Grades 5, 8 &amp; 11 Science; SAT in grade 11 ERW &amp; Math; Performance Assessment of Competency Education (PACE) ELA, Math &amp; Science in grades 3-11; Dynamic Learning Maps® (DLM) ELA &amp; Math grades 3-8 &amp; 11, Science grades 5, 8 &amp; 11; ESOL K–Grade 12 English Language Proficiency.</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 SAT Submission**

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">E8 ACCESS Alignment to NH Standards</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">E9 ACCESS Accommodation Descriptions</a></li> </ul>	
<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 SAT Submission**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAT Submission**

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>	<p>State-specific evidence.</p> <p><b>Documents, memos, letters and communication with schools and districts, noting non-opt out policies are below:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">E1 NH Consolidated State Application for Title III Accountability Procedures</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">KM7 September 13 Assessment pg. 2</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">NHG21 Alternative Assessment Decision Making Worksheet</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">NHG63 State Approved Special Consideration Forms and Guide</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">NHG64 Statewide Assessment Required Student Participation</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">NHG66 Statewide Assessment Memo 2014-2015</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">R6 Title XV Chapter 193-C Statewide Education Improvement and Assessment Program</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">TA2 No Assessment Exemptions</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">TA3 Technical Advisory No Assessment Opt-out</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">TA5 Technical Advisory Required Participation 2014</a></li> </ul> <p><b>Documentation summarizes the number of consecutive years students have taken a native language assessment with guidelines regarding becoming proficient language learner.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">E3 ESOL Guidance for Placement and Assessment pg. 3.</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">E1 NH Consolidated State Application for</a></li> </ul>	<p>New Hampshire is a non-opt out state; all students in grade 3-8, and 11 must participate in the ELA and math 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 New Hampshire SAT Submission**

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 href="#">Title III Accountability Procedures pg. 7</a>  <a href="#">Criteria for Determining Sufficiency of Individual Student Progress. Pg. 12 Starting Points and Targets for Academic Proficiency for LEP Students</a></p> <p>For students with disabilities, Instructions for Individualized Education Program (IEP) teams and/or other key documents;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">NHG3 State Innovation Plan Pg. A-36</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">NHG64 Statewide Assessment Required Student Participation</a></li> </ul>	
<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 SAT Submission**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p align="center"><b>1.5 – 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>State-specific evidence.</p> <p><a href="#">NH SAT Participation Rates</a></p> <p><a href="#">Participation Criteria</a></p> <p><a href="#">State Special Considerations</a></p> <p><a href="#">State Release of Preliminary Data</a></p> <p><a href="#">State Participation Guidelines</a></p> <p><a href="#">State NH School Day FAQ</a></p>	<p>Do not see any evidence of this in State submission. However, this information was submitted in the CSPR. In the 2016-17 CSPR New Hampshire reported:</p> <p>All students            Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment 92,810/96,514=96.2%            Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment 92,813/96,505=96.2%            Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment 38,596/39,975=96.6%            Children with disabilities (IDEA)</p> <p>Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment 13,831/15,059=91.9%            Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment 13,821/15,059=91.8%            Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment 6,049/6,402=94.5%            Plus all other subgroups as required            For AA-AAAS:            Participation of Students with Disabilities(IDEA)in Mathematics Assessment 9676 or 1.15% of all assessments            Participation of Students with Disabilities(IDEA)in Reading/Language Arts Assessment 9923 or 1.15% of all assessments            Participation of Students with Disabilities(IDEA)in Science Assessment 3141 or 1.01% of all assessments</p>
<b>Section 1.5 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 SAT Submission

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><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>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts and Math:</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT@ Suite Technical Manual (October 2017).</a> The technical manual describes the test design and test development process for the SAT assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 1- 20 provide an overview of the assessment, including a description its purpose, test format and content, scores derived from the assessment and the intended use of results.</li> <li>• Pages 27-52 provide a detailed description of test development procedures.</li> <li>• Additionally, see the evidence presented in response to section 3 and 4 regarding the technical quality of the SAT. <a href="#">Appendix 2.1.1.a</a></li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.1.6– College Board + New Hampshire; SAT@ Suite of Assessments: Alignment to New Hampshire Standards (October 2016)</a> The College Board conducted an alignment study to determine how the SAT and its related assessment aligned to the New Hampshire state standards. This document provides detailed information regarding the study findings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 16-106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to the state’s standards for English Language Arts and Math in grades 11 and 12.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence #2.1.8 - Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)</a> This document provides details regarding how our test is constructed and includes test blueprints, evidentiary foundation, and examples of text complexity and sample questions. While we recommend that reviewers consider the entire document as evidence in support of this critical element, the following sections should be of particular</p> <p>Many of the publications created by the College Board refer to the SAT Suite of assessments, which includes the SAT, PSAT/NMSQT, PSAT 10, and PSAT 8/9. In your review of the submitted evidence, please focus on the information that refers to the SAT assessments.</p> <p>Consistent with the <i>U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015</i>, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States, the College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for C.E. 2.1, related to test design and development of the New Hampshire School Day SAT for students in grade 11. Refer to College Board response for item 2.1.</p> <p>The New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE) stipulates that The College Board response to C.E. 2.1 constitutes the complete presentation of the New Hampshire State Assessment’s test design and development criteria. The NHDOE provides no further narrative or supportive evidence related to the proprietary components of the School Day SAT beyond that of the College Board submission. The NHDOE further stipulates that the State complies fully with all elements of the College Board submission, without exception, as demonstrated in the following narrative. Throughout the state’s peer review submission, in each section where the state stipulates to its adherence to the College Board assessment system’s proprietary specifications, the state will cross-reference the grounding authority for the state’s compliance to the School Day SAT assessment, presented in NH 2.1.</p> <p>The NHDOE provides no further narrative or supportive evidence related to the proprietary components of the College Board School Day SAT beyond that of the</p>	<p><b>Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p> <p>The process by which the SAT assessment was developed does not “[align] the assessment to the full range of the State’s academic content standards.”</p> <p>As Evidence # 2.1.6 demonstrates, the SAT assessment does not include content pertaining to the “full range” of the State’s academic content standards.</p> <p>The specific NH ELA and Math academic content standards not addressed by the SAT are detailed in Evidence # 2.1.6, including those standards only partially addressed.</p> <p>Peers interpret the CE 2.1 requirement of “full range” to mean that the assessment must not systematically exclude any portion of the state’s academic content standards.</p> <p>2.1.1: Covered in Evidence # 2.1.1, pp 1-20. Peers note that the SAT <u>does not include</u>, among its intended uses, the documentation or reporting of student achievement with respect to <i>any</i> state’s academic content standards.</p> <p>2.1.2: Test blueprints are conveyed in Evidence #2.1.8. These “describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound” and “support the intended interpretations and uses of the results.” However, the blueprints do not</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 SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>interest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Pages 41 – 69 provide test specifications and blueprints for the SAT Evidence-Based Reading and Writing test.</li> <li>● Pages 70- 81 provide test specifications for the optional SAT Essay test.</li> <li>● Pages 132 – 158 provide test specifications and blueprints for the SAT Math test.</li> <li>● Pages 198 – 206 provide an overview of SAT development process.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Multi-State Standard Setting Report</a></p> <p><a href="#">NH Standards Setting Confirmation</a></p>	<p>College Board submission, as presented in NH 2.1. The NHDOE further stipulates that the State complies fully with all elements of the College Board submission, without exception, as demonstrated in the presentation of NH 2.1. Throughout the state's peer review submission, in each section where the state stipulates to its adherence to the College Board School Day SAT proprietary specifications, the state will cross-reference the grounding authority for the state's compliance to the College Board School Day SAT, presented in NH 2.1. <b><u>New Hampshire SAT Assertions</u></b></p> <p>NH2.1.2 New Hampshire adheres to the College Board SAT test blueprint as submitted by the College Board.</p> <p>NH2.1.3 New Hampshire adheres to the College Board SAT test blueprint and content, stimulus, and items specifications as submitted by the College Board.</p> <p>NH2.1.4 The College Board SAT is administered in New Hampshire using only paper and pencil tests. NH.2.1.1, NH 2.1.2, NH 2.1.3, NH 2.1.4: The New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE) stipulates that the College Board response to CE 2.1.1, CE 2.1.2, CE 2.1.3, CE 2.1.4 constitutes the complete presentation for the New Hampshire State Assessment.</p>	<p>“measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards.”</p> <p>2.1.3: This aspect of CE 2.1 is not met because there is no process by which the SAT assessment is “tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards.”</p> <p>2.1.4: This aspect of CE 2.1 is not relevant to NH because it administers its high school ELA / Math assessments in paper and pencil format only.</p> <p>Note regarding page number references in evidence: There was not a consistent system of page references (some were pdf-referenced, others were page-number references) across evidence documents, leading to confusion/difficulty in pinpointing where the intended reference was located. When specific pages are being references, some means of identifying the system being used would be helpful in the future.</p>
<b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b>			
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence, for NH’s chosen high school ELA/Math assessments, that the design and test development process is well-suited for the content and aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A statement of purpose for the assessments that includes, among its intended uses, the documentation or reporting of student achievement with respect to the State’s academic content standards</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> </ul> </li> </ul>			

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAT Submission

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 SAT Submission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><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>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts and Math:</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017).</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 28 – 34 describe the processes used to ensure the fairness of the assessment.</li> <li>Pages 27 - 52 provide a detailed description of test development procedures.</li> <li>Pages 108 - 114 describe the evidentiary foundation for the decisions made about the content included in the SAT.</li> <li>Pages 120 - 133 describe the College Board pilot study of the predictive validity of the SAT.</li> <li>Pages 133-135 describe how the SAT assesses student readiness for college.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board SAT Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire and Illinois</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 7-8 in each of the alignment documents contain a section called The Alignment Approach describing how the College Board conducted their alignment study.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence #2.1.8: - Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please refer to the sections identified as evidence in support of Critical Element 2.2.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.2.1: An SAT Validity Primer (January 2015)</a></p> <p>This paper provides validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores and important college outcomes. The evidence provided in this paper is based on a previous version of the SAT. Pages 131 – 135 of the <i>SAT Suite Technical Manual</i> describe how the new version of the SAT correlates with the previous version of the assessment.</p>	<p>Many of the publications created by the College Board refer to the SAT Suite of assessments, which includes the SAT, PSAT/NMSQT, PSAT 10, and PSAT 8/9. In your review of the submitted evidence, please focus on the information that refers to the SAT assessments.</p> <p>The College Board is in the process of planning and implementing a special data collection to understand the effectiveness of the extended time accommodation for ELL students.</p> <p>Consistent with the U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States, the College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for C.E. 2.2, related to item development of the New Hampshire School Day SAT for students in grade 11. Refer to College Board response for item 2.2.</p> <p><b>New Hampshire College Board Assertions</b></p> <p>The NHDOE provides no further narrative or supportive evidence related to the proprietary components of the College Board School Day SAT beyond that of the College Board submission, as presented in NH 2.2. The NHDOE further stipulates that the State complies fully with all elements of the College Board submission, without exception, as demonstrated in the presentation of NH 2.2. Throughout the state’s peer review submission, in each section where the state stipulates to its adherence to the College Board School Day SAT proprietary specifications, the state will cross-reference the grounding authority for the state’s compliance to the College Board School Day SAT, presented in NH 2.2.</p> <p>The New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE) stipulates that the College Board submission to CE 2.2 constitutes the complete presentation for the item development criteria. The NHDOE provides no further narrative or supportive evidence related to the proprietary</p>	<p><b>Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p> <p>Evidence documents show that “the State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement,” but not that the development and selection is “based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process.”</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 SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>Evidence #2.2.2: The Redesigned SAT® Pilot Predictive Validity Study: A First Look (2016)</b>                      This white paper provides preliminary validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores resulting for the redesigned SAT and important college outcomes. The College Board is in the process of completing a validity study to replicate the findings of this white paper with a large, nationally representative sample. The study will examine students in the entering college class of fall 2017, the first full cohort to be admitted to college with the new SAT. For more information regarding this planned study, please refer to page 152 of the SAT Technical Manual.</p> <p><b>Evidence # 2.2.3: Resumes of College Board Executive staff</b>                      Resumes of executive leadership for the divisions responsible for assessment development (Sheryl Miller), accessibility compliance (Steven Pereira), and psychometric research (Kevin Sweeney).</p>	<p>components of the College Board submission. The NHDOE further stipulates that the State complies fully with all elements of the College Board 2.2 submission, without exception, as presented in 2.2, regarding the state's adherence to the College Board School Day SAT specifications. Throughout the state's peer review submission, in each section where the state stipulates to its adherence to the College Board School Day SAT proprietary specifications, the state will cross-reference the grounding authority for the state's compliance to the College Board School Day SAT, presented in NH 2.2.</p>	
<p><b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p>			
<p><u>  </u>X No additional evidence is required from the State; however:</p> <p><u>  </u>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that, for NH's chosen high school ELA/Math assessments, reasonable and technically sound procedures are used to develop and select items to assess student achievement</li> <li>• Evidence that these procedures are based on the State's academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills</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 SAT Submission**

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>2.3 – 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>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts and Math:</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017).</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 53-59 describe the standardized test administration procedures for standard administrations and for administration of the test with accommodations.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.3.1: The SAT School Day Supervisor Manual (Spring 2017)</a></p> <p>This manual provides instructions for supervisors who are responsible for overseeing the administration on how to prepare for test day, protocol for reporting test irregularities, and guidance on how to maintain test security.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.3.2: The SAT School Day Test Room Manual (Spring 2017)</a></p> <p>This manual provides instructions for associate supervisors (also referred to as test room coordinators) who will proctor the exam. This manual contains test day scripts for standard test administrations.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</a></p> <p>This manual provides instructions for supervisors who will be</p>	<p>Many of the publications created by the College Board refer to the SAT Suite of assessments, which includes the SAT, PSAT/NMSQT, PSAT 10, and PSAT 8/9. In your review of the submitted evidence, please focus on the information that refers to the SAT assessments.</p> <p>The below listed documents are updated annually to reflect best practices from the previous year’s implementation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SAT School Day Supervisor Manual</li> <li>The SAT School Day Test Room Manual</li> <li>The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual</li> <li>SAT School Day training resources</li> </ul> <p>Consistent with the U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States, the College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for C.E. 2.3, related to the policies and procedures for standardized test administration of the New Hampshire School Day SAT for students in grade 11. Refer to College Board response for item 2.3.</p> <p>New Hampshire College Board Assertions The NHD OE provides no further narrative or supportive evidence related to the proprietary components of the College Board School Day SAT beyond that of the College Board submission, as presented in NH 2.3.1 and 2.3.2. The NHD OE further stipulates that the State complies fully with all elements of the College Board submission, without exception, as demonstrated in the presentation of NH 2.3.1 and 2.3.2. Throughout the state’s peer review submission, in each section where the state stipulates to its adherence to the College Board School Day SAT proprietary specifications, the state will cross-reference the grounding authority for</p>	<p><b>Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p> <p>Several of the evidence documents indicate “state provided” (see Evidence #s 2.3.1, 2.3.2., 2.3.3). Peers believe that this submission should include documentation from the State to make clear how, when, and to whom these resources were distributed, and steps taken to ensure timely receipt. There should also be some documentation that training did indeed take place, beyond simply providing the training resources as evidence.</p> <p>2.3.1: At present, there is insufficient evidence that this factor has been met.</p> <p>2.3.2: Evidence # 2.3.4 documents training materials, but evidence is absent that training occurred.</p> <p>Given that the description of Evidence # 2.3.4 indicates that the PowerPoint deck may have been customized for state partners, it would be appropriate for NH to indicate whether this was done for the state.</p> <p>NH should provide evidence that all testing staff in the State signed the Testing Staff Agreement and that this was monitored and confirmed.</p> <p>2.3.3: This aspect of CE 2.3 is not relevant to NH high school ELA / Math 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.

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>responsible for registering students for testing accommodations and managing nonstandard test administrations.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence #2.3.4 SAT School Day Test Center Supervisor Training (2016)</a></p> <p>This PowerPoint deck contains the basic information presented to all Test Center Supervisors in online and in-person training sessions and reviews policies, procedures and best practices related to SAT test administration. This deck may have been customized for state partners based on particular local requirements. Please refer to the submissions of our state partners for additional information and evidence of test center supervisor training.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence #2.3.5: SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017)</a></p> <p>This PowerPoint deck contains the basic information presented to all SSD supervisors via online and in-person training sessions and reviews the policies and procedures related to nonstandard SAT administrations. This deck may have been customized for state partners based on particular local requirements. Please refer to the submissions of our state partners for</p>	<p>the state's compliance to the College Board School Day SAT, presented in NH 2.3.</p> <p>The New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE) stipulates that the College Board submission to CE 2.3 constitutes the complete presentation for the test administration criteria. The NHDOE provides no further narrative or supportive evidence related to the proprietary components of the College Board submission. The NHDOE further stipulates that the State complies fully with all elements of the College Board 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 submission, without exception, as presented in 2.3.1 and 2.3.2, regarding the state's adherence to the College Board School Day SAT specifications. Throughout the state's peer review submission, in each section where the state stipulates to its adherence to the College Board School Day SAT proprietary specifications, the state will cross-reference the grounding authority for the state's compliance to the College Board School Day SAT, presented in NH 2.3.</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 New Hampshire SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>additional information and evidence of accommodations training.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence #2.3.6: SAT School Day Important Dates</a></p> <p>This is a sample schedule of important dates that provides to test administrators a way to track deadlines related to action items that must occur prior to and after test day.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence #2.3.7: SAT Testing Staff Agreement</a></p> <p>Prior to test day, all testing staff must sign this agreement to signify that they accept the conditions and requirements of SAT administration.</p>		
<p><b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p>			
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically that the State: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Has demonstrated that it has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodation, by including documentation to make clear how, when, and to whom these resources were distributed, and steps taken to ensure timely receipt</li> <li>○ Has demonstrated that it 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, by including documentation that training did indeed take place, beyond simply providing the training resources as evidence</li> </ul> </li> </ul>			

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAT Submission**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAT Submission**

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p align="center"><b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts and Math:</b></p> <p>The below information lists the resources the College Board provides to the states to support uniform standardized test administration procedures across districts and schools.</p> <p><u><a href="#">Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017).</a></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 55 describes the roles and responsibilities of different test administration staff, delineates the qualifications testing staff should possess, and explains the training testing staff should receive.</li> </ul> <p><u><a href="#">Evidence # 2.3.1: The SAT School Day Supervisor Manual (Spring 2017)</a></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 4- 32: The College Board provides guidance on the number of staff needed to proctor and examination, how to set up test administration rooms and seating plans to facilitate implementation, and how to use the Supervisor irregularity form. The manual also includes a suggested timeline for when proctors and other test administration staff should be trained.</li> </ul> <p><u><a href="#">Evidence # 2.3.2: The SAT School Day Test Room Manual (Spring 2017)</a></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 3-12 include information on how to monitor test administration and report testing irregularities.</li> </ul>	<p>The New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE) stipulates that the College Board response to this criteria 2.4 constitutes the complete presentation for the New Hampshire State Assessment, regarding the College Board School Day SAT proprietary system.</p> <p>The NHDOE does provide additional narrative and supporting evidence for criteria 2.4, representing unique state-provided products and services, supportive to the administration of the state’s assessments. The NHDOE further stipulates that the State complies fully with all elements of the College Board.</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 SAT Submission**

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 href="#">Evidence # 2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 11-21 include information on how to monitor the test administration and report testing irregularities that may take place during a nonstandard test administration.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence #2.3.4 SAT School Day Test Center Supervisor Training (2016)</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 23-30 The College Board trains test administration staff (including supervisors, coordinators, and administrators) on how to report and address irregularities they may encounter on test day.</li> </ul> <p><b>Additional New Hampshire Evidence:</b> Pursuant to Ed. 306.24:C (2) “Procedures for test security</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">R7Ed 306.24 Assessment</a></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><a href="#">R8 Ed511 Grounds for Revocation</a></li> <li><a href="#">R9 Ed510 Duty to Report</a></li> </ul>	
<b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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>		

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

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 SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>2.5 – 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>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts and Math:</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017).</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 58 - 59 describe the procedures the College Board has designed to maintain test security at all times.</li> <li>Pages 66 - 68 describe the College Board’s post-test analysis, which is conducted as a component of the company’s test security procedures.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.3.1: The SAT School Day Supervisor Manual (Spring 2017)</a></p> <p>This manual provides guidance for supervisors who are responsible for overseeing the administration on how to maintain test security:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 8 – 9 describe the information supervisors should communicate to staff in order to maintain test security. Seating policies, devised to reduce the possibility of cheating, are described in this section.</li> <li>Pages 12 – 13 describe how supervisors should prepare student for test day and includes information on items and behaviors that are not allowed in the test area.</li> <li>Pages 14 - 26 provide instructions on how to receive and securely store materials until test day, and report on test administration irregularities.</li> <li>Pages 39-40 include a sample irregularities report that supervisors use to begin investigation of test administration issues.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.3.2: The SAT School Day Test Room Manual (Spring</a></p>	<p>Many of the publications created by the College Board refer to the SAT Suite of assessments, which includes the SAT, PSAT/NMSQT, PSAT 10, and PSAT 8/9. In your review of the submitted evidence, please focus on the information that refers to the SAT assessments.</p> <p>The below listed documents are updated annually to reflect best practices from the previous year’s implementation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SAT School Day Supervisor Manual</li> <li>The SAT School Day Test Room Manual</li> <li>The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual</li> <li>SAT School Day training resources</li> <li>SAT School Day Registration and Questionnaire Guide</li> </ul> <p>Consistent with the U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States, the College Board test security guidelines submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for C.E. 2.5.</p> <p><b>New Hampshire Additional Evidence:</b> 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 the College Board SAT. 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</p>	<p><b>Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p> <p>2.5.1: Policies and procedures for prevention of test irregularities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintaining security of test materials (# 2.3.1, pp 14-26)</li> <li>Proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures (# 2.5.1)</li> <li>Incident-reporting procedures (# 2.3.2)</li> <li>Consequences for confirmed violations of test security (Not found)</li> <li>Requirements for annual training (Not found)</li> </ul> <p>It remains unclear who does the test administration / test security training, and how NH ensures that all individuals requiring this training have received it.</p> <p>The reviewers were unable to find information on if, when, and how information about incidents and violations are returned to the CB since it is ultimately responsible for the validity of SAT data.</p> <p>2.5.2: Policies and procedures for detection of test irregularities: # 2.3.2, p. 4.</p> <p>Test administrators are provided with a useful chart in which the most commonly occurring irregularities are compiled along with the procedures and actions to then be followed. Covered in the testing irregularity chart reproduced in # 2.3.2 and other documents.</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 SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><a href="#">2017</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 1 - 12 provide instruction on standardized testing procedures devised to maintain security during test administration. Information in this section includes how to maintain security in the testing room and report administration irregularities.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 11-21 include information on how to monitor the test administration and report testing irregularities that may take place during a nonstandard test administration.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence #2.3.4 SAT School Day Test Center Supervisor Training (2016)</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 23-30: The College Board trains test administration staff (including supervisors, coordinators, and administrators) on how to report and address irregularities they may encounter on test day.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.5.1: SAT School Day Registration and Questionnaire Guide (2017)</a></p> <p>This brochure provides important information for students so that they may prepare for test day.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 15 – 21 provides information on test security procedures, what will be allowed into testing rooms, and how to report suspicious behavior.</li> <li>Pages 25 – 26 and 27- 30 describe processes that may take place in order to conserve test integrity and maintain test security.</li> </ul>	<p>sheet and reported to the New Hampshire Department of Education.</p> <p>Schools and districts are held accountable with a duty to report. Failure to report may result in revocation of educator credentials.</p>	<p>Reviewers were interested to see mention of the expectation that “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.” This seems an important step in ensuring test security, but the reviewers could not find any further information on this matter (either description(s) of such process(es) or follow-up as it relates to the CB and other states participating in the consortium).</p> <p>Peers note that the post-test analyses referenced in # 2.1.1, pp 66-68 apply only to students who had already taken an SAT or other test from the SAT suite. What is done to check for test irregularities / cheating when a test is taken only once (as most State tests are)?</p> <p>2.5.3: Reviewers could find little information about remediation following test security incidents (beyond the invalidation of student scores under certain circumstances).</p> <p>2.5.4: Policies and procedures for investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities: Evidence # 2.5.2 explicitly notes, “The procedures and options described in this booklet apply to score validity cases only and do not apply to testing irregularities involving administrative or procedural irregularities, discrepancies in test taker identification or test taker misconduct.” What appears to be missing from the New Hampshire submission, therefore, is what happens in the case of all other testing irregularities besides validity cases.</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 SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><a href="#">Evidence #2.5.2 Why and How ETS Questions Scores (College Board Programs) 2016</a> This document describes the ways that ETS, our testing subcontractor, investigates cases that may affect the validity of test scores.</p> <p>NH Specific Requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">R7Ed 306.24 Assessment</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">R8 Ed511 Grounds for Revocation</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">R9 Ed510 Duty to Report</a></li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p>			
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Documentation of prevention of any assessment irregularities, by including information on consequences for confirmed violations of test security and requirements for annual training</li> <li>○ Documentation of who conducts and participates in test administration / test security training, including evidence documenting that all individuals requiring this training have received it</li> <li>○ Information on if, when, and how information about incidents and violations are returned to the College Board</li> <li>○ Information to clarify what is done to check for test irregularities / cheating when a test is taken only once (as most State tests are)</li> <li>○ Additional information about remediation following test security incidents (beyond the invalidation of student scores under certain circumstances)</li> <li>○ Information on what investigation and remediation processes occur in cases involving administrative or procedural irregularities, discrepancies in test-taker identification, or test-taker misconduct</li> </ul> </li> </ul>			

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAT Submission

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 SAT Submission

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>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts and Math:</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017).</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 58-59 describe the procedures the College Board has designed to maintain test security at all times.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.3.1: The SAT School Day Supervisor Manual (Spring 2017)</a></p> <p>This manual provides guidance for supervisors who are responsible for overseeing the administration on how to maintain test security:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 12 – 13 describe how supervisors should prepare student for test day and includes information on items and behaviors that are not allowed in the test area.</li> <li>Pages 14 - 26 provide instructions on how to receive and securely store materials until test day, and report on test administration irregularities.</li> <li>Pages 39-40 include a sample irregularities report that supervisors use to begin investigation of test administration issues.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.3.2: The SAT School Day Test Room Manual (Spring 2017)</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 1 - 12 provide instruction on standardized testing procedures devised to maintain security during test administration. Information in this section includes how to maintain security in the testing room and report administration irregularities.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</a></p>	<p>Many of the publications created by the College Board refer to the SAT Suite of assessments, which includes the SAT, PSAT/NMSQT, PSAT 10, and PSAT 8/9. In your review of the submitted evidence, please focus on the information that refers to the SAT assessments.</p> <p><i>College Board Information Security Policy (2014)</i> is a confidential document. It is in the process of being updated.</p> <p><i>College Board Guidelines for the Release of Data (2009)</i> is in the process of being updated.</p> <p>Consistent with the U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States, the College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for C.E. 2.6.</p> <p><b>NH.2.6.1, 2.6.2, 2.6.3: New Hampshire asserts adherence with procedures described in College Board 2.6.1, 2.6.2 and 2.6.3</b></p> <p>As set forth within NH 2.1, the College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for CE 2.6.1, 2.6.2 and 2.6.3 related to protecting the integrity of test materials, data, and the proper use of results for the New Hampshire School Day SAT administration. Refer to response 2.6.1, 2.6.2, 2.6.3 within the College Board common submission.</p> <p>The NHDOE further stipulates that the State complies fully with all elements of the College Board submission, without exception, as demonstrated in the</p>	<p><b>Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p> <p>The documents presented by the State support the first two factors of this CE (i.e., "...To protect the integrity of its test materials....", "To secure student-level assessment data...").</p> <p>In the Index notes, New Hampshire indicates that for the purposes of issuing student achievement reports generated within the New Hampshire School Day SAT, the State has established a minimum n-size of 11 to ensure against any unintended identification of students in smaller reported categories. This minimum n-size must be adhered to in all school, district, and State reports. New Hampshire provides additional useful information in this section of the Index document.</p> <p>Based on evidence provided, College Board has adequate systems in place to protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting.</p> <p>What is not clear to the reviewers is whether there exist any State-level avenues by which data security could possibly be breached, and if so, what is being done by New Hampshire to address this matter proactively. Much of the considerable State-specific evidence provided deals only with policies related to protection of personally identifiable information.</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 SAT Submission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 11-21 include information on how to monitor the test administration and report testing irregularities that may take place during a nonstandard test administration.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence #2.3.4 SAT School Day Test Center Supervisor Training (2016)</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 23-30: The College Board trains test administration staff (including supervisors, coordinators, and administrators) on how to report and address irregularities they may encounter on test day.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.5.1: SAT School Day Registration and Questionnaire Guide (2017)</a></p> <p>This brochure provides to students information about how the College Board secures their data and personally identifiable information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 26 – 36 describe the College Board privacy policy as it relates to students. This section also provides information regarding instances where scores may be canceled due to testing irregularities or misconduct, and how students may securely send their scores to colleges and university systems.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.6.1: Description of Test Management and Reporting System</a></p> <p>This document provides an overview of the security of the College Board online test management and reporting system.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence #2.6.2: Axway Secure Transport Data Sheet (2017)</a></p> <p>The College Board provides data files to</p>	<p>presentation of NH 2.1.</p> <p>For the purposes of issuing student achievement reports generated within the New Hampshire School Day SAT, the NHDOE has established a minimum n size of 11 students to ensure against any unintended identification of students in smaller reported categories. All school, district, and state reports must adhere to this minimum of 11 students per category rule before these reports can be generated and publicly disseminated.</p> <p><b>NH Statute on Student Privacy</b> New Hampshire has three laws specifically intended to protect student privacy: <b>RSA Section 193-C:11, 193-E:5 and 189:67. 189:67 Limits on Disclosure of Information.</b></p> <p><b>Individual student level data is not reported to the public.</b> NH DOE must report aggregate student achievement data based on the state’s English language arts, mathematics, and science assessments, including data for students with disabilities who take an alternate assessment based on grade-level, modified or alternate academic achievement standards (ESEA section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i)). In reporting achievement data, the NH DOE must report achievement data at each proficiency level for the “all students” group and must disaggregate those data by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, status as economically disadvantaged and all “combined subgroups” as defined in its ESEA Flexibility Waiver. NHDOE need not report disaggregated achievement data if the number of students in a category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student (ESEA section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i)). In New Hampshire, that number is 11</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 SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>the state using an SFTP ad-hoc file transfer process provide by Tumbleweed, a secure managed file transfer (MFT) site managed by Axway. This data sheet, created by Axway, provides a high-level overview of all of their Secure Transport products, including their web-based SFTP service.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.6.3: Description of Confidential College Board Information Security Policy</a></p> <p>The College Board has created a high level policy document that describes the processes in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of student level data. The policy is confidential, so this summary provides high level information regarding what the policy contains.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.6.4: College Board Privacy Policy (January 15, 2016)</a></p> <p>This policy is currently accessible at <a href="http://www.collegeboard.org/privacy-policy">www.collegeboard.org/privacy-policy</a>. The document, as it appeared on this site on August 31, 2017, is submitted as evidence. It describes the College Board Data Privacy policy and privacy statements.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.6.5: College Board Guidelines for the Release of Data (2009)</a></p> <p>This white paper describes the guidelines for the release of data</p>	<p>students.</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 SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>obtained from test results to third party research institutions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 14 lists nonreleasable data elements for the SAT.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence #2.6.6: ETS Legal Privacy and Security Notice</a></p> <p>ETS manages the online test rostering system for the SAT. This document provides ETS' legal privacy and security notice.</p> <p><b>New Hampshire Additional Evidence: Test Security Information and Procedures for NH</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">E3 FAQ NH Privacy and Security of Data</a></li> <li><a href="#">E6 Privacy NH DOE FAQ on Privacy and Security of</a></li> <li><a href="#">NHG16 Presentation on Student Privacy</a></li> <li><a href="#">NHG32 myNHDOE PerformancePlus Security Roles</a></li> <li><a href="#">TA4 Student Privacy</a></li> </ul> <p><b>Security Breach Consequences in NH</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">R8 Ed. 511 Grounds for Revocation</a></li> <li><a href="#">R9 Ed. 510 Duty to Report</a></li> <li><a href="#">NH Records Management</a></li> <li><a href="#">NH Information Analysis Policy</a></li> <li><a href="#">NH Policy Student Data</a></li> <li><a href="#">NH Section 189:66</a></li> <li><a href="#">NH Data Use Policy</a></li> <li><a href="#">NH DoIT Council</a></li> <li><a href="#">NH FERPA</a></li> <li><a href="#">NH HB 322 Protection of Personally Identifiable Data</a></li> <li><a href="#">NH HB 520 Protection of Student Data</a></li> <li><a href="#">NH 189:67 Student and Teacher Information Protection and Privacy</a></li> <li><a href="#">NH 193C:11 Anonymity of Pupil Assessment Results</a></li> <li><a href="#">NH 193E:4 Unique Pupil Identifier Definition</a></li> <li><a href="#">NH 193E:5 Unique Pupil Identifier</a></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 SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">NH Student Assessment Privacy and Security</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">NH TA Student Data Privacy</a></li> </ul> <p>NH Statute on Student Privacy New Hampshire has three laws specifically intended to protect student privacy: RSA Section 193-C:11, 193-E:5 and 189:67.</p> <p>189:67 Limits on Disclosure of Information.</p> <p>189:68 Student Privacy.</p> <p>1</p>		
<p><b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p>			
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence describing State-level avenues by which data security could possibly be breached, and what is being done by New Hampshire to address this matter proactively</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 SAT Submission

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><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>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts and Math.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017)</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 1 - 20 provide an overview of the assessment, including a description its purpose, test format and content, scores derived from the assessment and the intended use of results.</li> <li>• Pages 107 - 139 examine the validity of the SAT and includes information on the evidentiary foundations behind the test content, concordance between the current and previous version of the SAT, and the relationship between SAT scores and first-year grade point average, as well as the relationship between SAT scores and college and career readiness benchmarks.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence #2.1.1.a SAT@ Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tables A-3.1 – A-3.15 in Appendix 3 (pages 11-35) provide test content specifications and content domains and descriptions.</li> <li>• Appendix 5 (pages 37 – 65) provides additional detail regarding how statistical indices were computed.</li> <li>• Appendix 6 (pages 66 – 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> <li>• Appendix 7 (pages 321- 396) displays the results of analyses performed to evaluate the validity of the SAT.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.2.1: An SAT Validity Primer (January 2015)</a></p> <p>This paper provides validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores and important college outcomes. The</p>	<p>Many of the publications created by the College Board refer to the SAT Suite of assessments, which includes the SAT, PSAT/NMSQT, PSAT 10, and PSAT 8/9. In your review of the submitted evidence, please focus on the information that refers to the SAT assessments.</p> <p>Consistent with the <i>U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015</i>, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States The College Board, has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for C.E. 3.1.</p> <p><b><u>New Hampshire School Day SAT Assertions:</u></b></p> <p><b>New Hampshire asserts adherence to the use of SAT test blueprints and test items as aligned to the New Hampshire state standards.</b></p> <p>Consistent with the <i>U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015</i>, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States, The College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for CE 3.1, related to the overall content validity of the New Hampshire State Assessment School Day SAT. Refer to response within The College Board common submission, which has been independently peer reviewed and from which final committee resolved notes were drafted, for a complete presentation.</p> <p>The New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE) stipulates that The College Board response on CE 3.1 constitutes the complete presentation of the New Hampshire State Assessment’s content validity criteria. The NHDOE provides no further narrative or supportive evidence related to the proprietary components of The College Board School Day SAT, beyond that of The College Board submission. The</p>	<p><b>Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p> <p>The SAT was not “designed to measure” the State’s academic content standards. Thus, the relevance of Evidence # 2.1.6, and the interpretation of its findings for these critical elements, are unclear.</p> <p>Reviewers acknowledge that NH refers to an alignment study conducted by the College Board. For this study to satisfy that requirement in the Department’s Assessment Peer Review Guidance for an “independent” alignment study (p. 34), reviewers would expect a full and satisfactory rationale for the “independence” of a study conducted by the same agency responsible for managing / maintaining the assessment.</p> <p>3.1.2: Not relevant to this submission.</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 SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>evidence provided in this paper is based on a previous version of the SAT. Pages 131 – 135 of the <i>SAT Suite Technical Manual</i> describe how the new version of the SAT correlates with the previous version of the assessment.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence #2.2.2: The Redesigned SAT® Pilot Predictive Validity Study: A First Look (2016)</a> This white paper provides preliminary validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores resulting for the redesigned SAT and important college outcomes. The College Board is in the process of completing a validity study to replicate the findings of this white paper with a large, nationally representative sample. The study will examine students in the entering college class of fall 2017, the first full cohort to be admitted to college with the new SAT. For more information regarding this planned study, please refer to page 152 of the SAT Technical Manual.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire and Illinois</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 7-9 of each document describe how alignment between the standards and the assessment is determined.</li> <li>• Pages 16-106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to each respective state's English Language Arts and Math standards for grades 11 and 12.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 3.1.1: SAT Practice Test 8 (2017)</a> This practice test is a version of a form that was used for a 2016 SAT test administration. The sample test includes the optional essay, answer key, answer sheet and instructions on how to score the test.</p>	<p>NHDOE further stipulates that the State complies fully with all elements of the presentation, without exception.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An explanation of the rationale for the relevance, to this CE, of alignment studies comparing the assessments to standards which were not the basis for the test's</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 SAT Submission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
design and development • An explanation of the rationale for the independence of an alignment study conducted by the test provider, who presumably has a strong stake in a positive finding of alignment		

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

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 SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><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>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts and Math:</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017).</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 1 - 20 provide an overview of the assessment, including a description its purpose, test format and content, scores derived from the assessment and the intended use of results.</li> <li>Pages 107 - 139 examine the validity of the SAT and includes information on the evidentiary foundations behind the test content, concordance between the current and previous version of the SAT, and the relationship between SAT scores and first-year grade point average, as well as the relationship between SAT scores and college and career readiness benchmarks.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence #2.1.1.a SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tables A-3.1 – A-3.15 in Appendix 3 (pages 11 – 35) provide test content specifications and content domains and descriptions.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.2.1: An SAT Validity Primer (January 2015)</a> This paper provides validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores and important college outcomes. The evidence provided in this paper is based on a previous version of the SAT. Pages 131 – 135 of the <i>SAT Suite Technical Manual</i> describe how the new version of the SAT correlates with the previous version of the assessment.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence #2.2.2: The Redesigned SAT® Pilot Predictive Validity Study: A First Look (2016)</a> This white paper provides preliminary</p> <p>Many of the publications created by the College Board refer to the SAT Suite of assessments, which includes the SAT, PSAT/NMSQT, PSAT 10, and PSAT 8/9. In your review of the submitted evidence, please focus on the information that refers to the SAT assessments.</p> <p>Consistent with the U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States The College Board, has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for C.E. 3.2.</p> <p><b><u>New Hampshire School Day SAT Assertions:</u></b></p> <p><b>New Hampshire asserts adherence to the use of SAT test blueprints and SAT item pools.</b> Consistent with the U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States, The College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for CE 3.2, related to the overall content validity of the New Hampshire State Assessment School Day SAT. Refer to response within The College Board common submission, which has been independently peer reviewed and from which final committee resolved notes were drafted, for a complete presentation.</p> <p>The New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE) stipulates that The College Board response on CE 3.2 constitutes the complete presentation of the New Hampshire State Assessment’s content validity criteria. The NHDOE provides no further narrative or supportive evidence related to the proprietary components of The College Board School Day SAT, beyond that of The College Board submission. The NHDOE further stipulates that the</p>	<p><b>Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p> <p>This critical element is not met. NH has not presented evidence that the SAT taps the intended cognitive processes appropriate to the State’s academic content standards for high school ELA / Math.</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 SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores resulting from the redesigned SAT and important college outcomes. The College Board is in the process of completing a validity study to replicate the findings of this white paper with a large, nationally representative sample. The study will examine students in the entering college class of fall 2017, the first full cohort to be admitted to college with the new SAT. For more information regarding this planned study, please refer to page 152 of the SAT Technical Manual.</p> <p><u><a href="#">Evidence # 2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire and Illinois</a></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 7-9 of each document describe how alignment between the standards and the assessment is determined.</li> <li>• Pages 16-106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to each respective state's English Language Arts and Math standards for grades 11 and 12.</li> </ul>	<p>State complies fully with all elements of the presentation, without exception.</p>	
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p>			
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate validity evidence that the State's chosen high school ELA/Math assessments tap the intended cognitive processes as represented in the State's academic content standards</li> </ul>			

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAT Submission**

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><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>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts and Math:</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017).</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 39-45 describe how test items are created and reviewed. This section describes the statistical indices computed to determine the appropriateness of items for use in operational forms of the SAT (i.e. equated p-values, r-biserials, and Mantel-Haenszel DIF.</li> <li>Pages 47-49 describe how the College Board develops the optional SAT Essay test, which is administered by some of our state clients to assess student writing skills.</li> <li>Pages 75-106 describe various psychometric analysis and their results. These procedures include scaling procedures, equating, analysis of normative information, reliability analysis and additional psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> <li>Pages 107-139 examine the validity of the SAT, including the relationship between SAT scores and first-year grade point average as well as the relationship between SAT scores and college and career readiness benchmarks.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence #2.1.1.a SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appendix 5 (pages 37 – 65) provides additional detail regarding how statistical indices were computed.</li> <li>Appendix 6 (pages 66 – 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> <li>Appendix 7 (pages 321 – 396) displays the results of analyses performed to evaluate the validity of the SAT.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence #2.1.8 - Test</a></p>	<p>Many of the publications created by the College Board refer to the SAT Suite of assessments, which includes the SAT, PSAT/NMSQT, PSAT 10, and PSAT 8/9. In your review of the submitted evidence, please focus on the information that refers to the SAT assessments.</p> <p>Consistent with the U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States The College Board, has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for C.E. 3.3.</p> <p><b>New Hampshire School Day SAT Assertions:</b></p> <p><b>New Hampshire asserts adherence to the use of SAT scoring and reporting structures.</b> Consistent with the U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States, The College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for CE 3.3, related to the overall content validity of the New Hampshire State Assessment School Day SAT. Refer to response within The College Board common submission, which has been independently peer reviewed and from which final committee resolved notes were drafted, for a complete presentation.</p> <p>The New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE) stipulates that The College Board response on CE 3.3 constitutes the complete presentation of the New Hampshire State Assessment’s content validity criteria. The NHDOE provides no further narrative or supportive evidence related to the proprietary components of The College Board</p>	<p><b>Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p> <p>The documentation provided does not support this CE because it does not relate the scoring and reporting structures of the SAT to the sub-domain structures of NH’s academic content standards for high school ELA / Mathematics.</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 SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><a href="#">Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)</a>                      This document provides details regarding how our test is constructed and includes test blueprints, evidentiary foundation, and examples of text complexity and sample questions. While we recommend that reviewers consider the entire document as evidence in support of this critical element, the following sections should be of particular interest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 41 – 69 provide test specifications and blueprints for the SAT Evidence-Based Reading and Writing test including scores and sub-scores consistent with the sub-domain structures of the academic content standards on which the interpretations and uses of results are based.</li> <li>• Pages 70- 81 provide test specifications for the optional SAT Essay test.</li> <li>• Pages 132 – 158 provide test specifications and blueprints for the SAT Math test including scores and sub-scores consistent with the sub-domain structures of the academic content standards on which the interpretations and uses of results are based.</li> <li>• Pages 198 – 206 provide an overview of SAT development process.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence #3.3.1: Scaling for the SAT Suite of Assessments (2017)</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 66 – 74 describe the characteristics of SAT sub-score scaling</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence #3.3.6: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report – New Hampshire (April 2017)</a>                      This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade</p>	<p>School Day SAT, beyond that of The College Board submission. The NHDOE further stipulates that the State complies fully with all elements of the presentation, without exception.</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 SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>students who took the April 2017 SAT school day administration. The report includes a variety of test analysis based on the data gathered from the test administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 15 – 21 provide Scale Score Moments, Intercorrelations and Reliability for the two SAT Forms administered on test day. The tables in this section provided information for by form and disaggregated by various subgroups.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p>			
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documentation of adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of the State’s chosen high school ELA/Math 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</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 SAT Submission

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 SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts and Math:</b></p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017).</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 114-135 include information on concordance between the current and previous version of the SAT, the relationship between SAT scores and first-year grade point average, and the relationship between SAT scores and college and career readiness benchmarks.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.2.1: An SAT Validity Primer (January 2015)</a> This paper provides validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores and important college outcomes. The evidence provided in this paper is based on a previous version of the SAT. Pages 131 – 135 of the <i>SAT Suite Technical Manual</i> describe how the new version of the SAT correlates with the previous version of the assessment.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence #2.2.2: The Redesigned SAT® Pilot Predictive Validity Study: A First Look (2016)</a> This white paper provides preliminary validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores resulting for the redesigned SAT and important college outcomes. The College Board is in the process of completing a validity study to replicate the findings of this white paper with a large, nationally representative sample. The study will examine students in the entering college class of fall 2017, the first full cohort to be admitted to college with the new SAT. For more information regarding this planned study, please refer to page 152 of the SAT Technical Manual.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence #4.7.1: Excerpt from TAC presentation regarding Validity Research</a> The College Board presents validity evidence to the Technical Advisory Committees of our state partners. These slides are an</p>	<p>Many of the publications created by the College Board refer to the SAT Suite of assessments, which includes the SAT, PSAT/NMSQT, PSAT 10, and PSAT 8/9. In your review of the submitted evidence, please focus on the information that refers to the SAT assessments.</p> <p>Consistent with the <i>U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015</i>, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States, The College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for C.E. 3.4.</p> <p><b><u>New Hampshire School Day SAT Assertions:</u></b></p> <p><b>New Hampshire asserts adherence to The College Board’s test blueprints, item pools, cut scores and score reporting.</b> Consistent with the <i>U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015</i>, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States The College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for CE 3.4, related to test validity based on relationships with other variables of the New Hampshire State Assessment’s School Day SAT.</p> <p>The New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE) stipulates that The College Board response to CE 3.4 constitutes the complete presentation of the New Hampshire State Assessment’s content validity criteria. The NHDOE provides no further narrative or supportive evidence related to the proprietary components of The College Board School Day SAT, beyond that of The College Board submission. The NHDOE further stipulates that the State complies fully with all elements of The College Board’s C.E. 3.4 presentation, without exception.</p>	<p><b>Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p> <p>The submission includes various documents studying the relationship between SAT scores and college-related outcomes.</p> <p>However, the Guidance (p. 38) states “Validity evidence that shows the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with criterion <i>and</i> other variables for all student groups” [emphasis ours]. Thus, this critical element has not been met.</p> <p>Moreover, the State’s response to CE 3.4 raises concern on the part of the peer reviewers that all evidence is common to the states participating in the School Day SAT. No evidence is provided to document the relationship between New Hampshire’s SAT scores and other variables (e.g., positive correlations between State results and external measure such as NAEP or TIMSS and/or performance criteria such as college enrollment, college credit-bearing courses, number of advanced courses taken).</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 SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	excerpt from these presentations and covers information regarding College Board past, current and future validity studies.		
<b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b>			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of State-specific evidence supporting the relationship between the state’s assessment scores and other variables</li> </ul>			

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAT Submission

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.1 – Reliability</b></p> <p>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>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts and Math:</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017).</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 75-106 describe various psychometric analysis and their results. These procedures include scaling procedures, equating, analysis of normative information, reliability analysis and additional psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence #2.1.1.a SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendix (October 2017)</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 6 (pages 66-320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence #4.1.1: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report Table of Contents</a> This document displays the contents of a typical post-administration Test Analysis Report for the national administration of the SAT. The College Board provides state level administration reports to its state partners. Please refer to critical evidence #3.3.2 – 3.3.7 for the state specific administration reports.</p>	<p>Many of the publications created by the College Board refer to the SAT Suite of assessments, which includes the SAT, PSAT/NMSQT, PSAT 10, and PSAT 8/9. In your review of the submitted evidence, please focus on the information that refers to the SAT assessments.</p> <p>Consistent with the <i>U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015</i>, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States, The College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for C.E. 4.1.</p> <p><b><u>New Hampshire College Board School Day SAT Assertions:</u></b></p> <p>Consistent with the <i>U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015</i>, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States, The College Board has submitted, on behalf of the state of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for CE 4.1, related to test reliability of the New Hampshire State Assessment’s School Day SAT. Refer to C.E. 4.1 within The College Board common submission, which has been independently peer reviewed and from which final committee resolved notes were drafted, for a complete presentation.</p> <p>The New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE) stipulates that The College Board response to CE 4.1 constitutes the complete presentation of the New Hampshire School Day SAT reliability criteria. The NHDOE provides no further narrative or supportive evidence related to the proprietary components of The College Board School Day SAT, beyond that of The College Board submission. The NHDOE further stipulates that the State complies fully with all elements of C.E. 4.1 presentation,</p>	<p><b>Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p> <p>From the Index, under CE 2.6, NH indicates that “In reporting achievement data, the NH DOE must report achievement data at each proficiency level for the ‘all students’ group and must disaggregate those data by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, status as economically disadvantaged and all ‘combined subgroups’ as defined in its ESEA Flexibility Waiver.”</p> <p>4.1.1: Reliabilities are reported in Evidence # 2.1.1.a for all students, by race, ethnicity, and gender. However, reliabilities are not reported by disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, status as economically disadvantaged, or all “combined subgroups”.</p> <p>4.1.2: Overall and conditional SEMs are reported in Evidence # 2.1.1.a, but not by any student group.</p> <p>4.1.3: Peer reviewers could not locate “consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results” for the SAT and in reference to NH’s achievement levels.</p> <p>4.1.4: Not relevant.</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 SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	without exception.	
<p><b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reliabilities reported by disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, status as economically disadvantaged, and all “combined subgroups”</li> <li>• Overall and conditional SEMs by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, status as economically disadvantaged and all “combined subgroups”</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results, overall and for all student groups</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAT Submission**

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

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

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>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts and Math:</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017).</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 21-26 provide an overview of College Board test development processes related to fairness.</li> <li>Pages 27 - 52 provide a detailed description of test development procedures, including a description of item content and fairness reviews, item pre-testing and analysis, and information on the types of accommodations that are available to students.</li> <li>Pages 60 - 74 describe the scoring procedures for the SAT, a description of how results are reported, and the item analysis that is performed on the operational items, including Differential Item Functioning (DIF) and Key Validation. The required qualifications for human scorers are also included in this section.</li> <li>Pages 75 - 106 describe various psychometric analyses which are performed to identify any possible bias or inconsistent interpretations of assessment results across student groups.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence #2.1.1.a SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appendix 6 (pages 66-320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence # 2.2.3: Resumes of College Board staff</b> Resumes of executive leadership for the divisions responsible for assessment development (Sheryl Miller), accessibility compliance (Steven Pereira), and psychometric research (Kevin Sweeney).</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.3.3: The SAT</a></p>	<p>Many of the publications created by the College Board refer to the SAT Suite of assessments, which includes the SAT, PSAT/NMSQT, PSAT 10, and PSAT 8/9. In your review of the submitted evidence, please focus on the information that refers to the SAT assessments.</p> <p>The College Board is in the process of formalizing and documenting the procedures used to train its assessment writers. Currently, employees are instructed to reference the white paper included as evidence #4.2.1.</p>	<p><b>Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p> <p>For this CE (4.2) NHDOE <u>does not</u> stipulate (in contrast to many other CEs) that the College Board common submission constitutes the complete presentation for fairness and accessibility. Instead, New Hampshire notes that, “The College Board is in the process of formalizing and documenting the procedures used to train its assessment writers.” Currently, those individuals reference a white paper on Universally Designed Assessments (4.2.1).</p> <p>There is no indication of whether empirical analyses conducted by College Board (e.g., DIF) address student groups characteristic of New Hampshire specifically or only across all states participating in the School Day SAT.</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 SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><a href="#">School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</a></p> <p>This manual provides instructions for supervisors who will be responsible for registering students for testing accommodations and managing nonstandard test administrations.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence #2.3.5: SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017)</a></p> <p>This PowerPoint deck is presented to SSD supervisors via online training sessions and reviews the policies and procedures related to nonstandard SAT administrations.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence #4.2.1: Creating Better Tests for Everyone Through Universally Designed Assessments (2004)</a></p> <p>College Board assessment writers are instructed to reference this paper regarding Universally Designed Assessment when creating assessment items for the SAT.</p>		
<p><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p>			
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of procedures used to train assessment writers</li> <li>• Documentation that empirical analyses address student groups characteristic of NH specifically</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 SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.3 – 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>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts and Math:</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017).</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 75 - 106 describe various psychometric analyses to study how the SAT assesses student performance across the full performance continuum.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence #2.1.1.a SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017).</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appendix 6 (pages 66-320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> </ul> <p>Evidence # 4.3.1: SAT Effectiveness at Representing Test Taker Achievement across the Performance Spectrum (2017) <a href="#">This document provides data regarding the SAT's effectiveness at representing test taker achievement.</a></p> <p>Many of the publications created by the College Board refer to the SAT Suite of assessments, which includes the SAT, PSAT/NMSQT, PSAT 10, and PSAT 8/9. In your review of the submitted evidence, please focus on the information that refers to the SAT assessments.</p> <p>Consistent with the <i>U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015</i>, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States, The College Board submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for C.E. 4.3.</p> <p><b>New Hampshire College Board</b> Consistent with the <i>U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015</i>, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States, The College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for CE 4.3, related the full performance continuum of the New Hampshire State Assessment's School Day SAT. Refer to response C.E. 4.3 within The College Board common submission, which has been independently peer reviewed and from which final committee resolved notes were drafted, for a complete presentation.</p> <p>The New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE) stipulates that The College Board response to CE 4.3 constitutes the complete presentation of the New Hampshire State Assessment's reliability criteria. The NHDOE provides no further narrative or supportive evidence related to the proprietary components of The College Board School Day SAT, beyond that of The College Board submission. The NHDOE further stipulates that the State complies fully with all elements of the College Board 4.3 presentation, without exception.</p>	<p><b>Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p> <p>The CSEMs presented in Evidence # 2.1.1.a show that the SAT provides precise estimates across the full performance continuum.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions</b></p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>based on the NH state submission.</b>		
__X_ No additional evidence is required from the State.		

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

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 SAT Submission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<h3>4.4 – Scoring</h3> <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>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts and Math:</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017).</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 2 - 4 describe the scores derived from the assessment and the intended use of results.</li> <li>Page 48 - 49 describes the inter-rater reliability statistics related to the essay portion of the assessment.</li> <li>Pages 60 - 74 describe the scoring procedures for the SAT, a description of how results are reported, and the item analysis that is performed on the operational items, including Differential Item Functioning (DIF) and Key Validation. The required qualifications for human scorers are also included in this section.</li> <li>Pages 75 - 106 describe scaling procedures, equating, analysis of normative information to support appropriate interpretations of the common score scales, reliability analysis and additional psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> <li>Pages 133 - 135 describe the processes that were used to develop and validate the SAT benchmarks for college and career readiness.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence #2.1.1.a SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appendix 5 (pages 37 - 65) provides the essay scoring rubric and data to support the item analysis findings summarized in the technical manual.</li> <li>Appendix 6 (pages 66 – 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence #3.3.1: Scaling for</a></p>	<p>Many of the publications created by the College Board refer to the SAT Suite of assessments, which includes the SAT, PSAT/NMSQT, PSAT 10, and PSAT 8/9. In your review of the submitted evidence, please focus on the information that refers to the SAT assessments.</p> <p>Consistent with the U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States, The College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for C.E. 4.4.</p> <p><b>New Hampshire College Board</b> Consistent with the U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for CE 4.4, related scoring of the New Hampshire State School Day SAT. Refer to response SB 4.4 within The College Board common submission, which has been independently peer reviewed and from which final committee resolved notes were drafted, for a complete presentation.</p> <p>The New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE) stipulates that The College Board response to CE 4.4 constitutes the complete presentation of the New Hampshire State Assessment’s School Day SAT reliability criteria. The NHDOE provides no further narrative or supportive evidence related to the proprietary components of The College Board assessment system, beyond that of The College Board submission. The NHDOE further stipulates that the State complies fully with all elements of the C.E.4.4 presentation, without exception.</p> <p><b>Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p> <p>The State has presented some evidence that it has “established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results [and] facilitate valid score interpretations.” However, no evidence is presented that, or how, these procedures and protocols relate to “report[ing] assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.”</p> <p>Reviewers noted in the description of one evidence document listed by New Hampshire a reference to inclusion of the SAT essay scoring rubric, but none to training and/or qualifying procedures for human raters or hand-scoring quality control procedures. Attention to these matters should not slip through given the division of support required by state-specific and common submissions.</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 SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><a href="#">the SAT Suite of Assessments (2017)</a> This document describes the methodology and scale development process for the SAT Suite of Assessments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 8-11 provide a description of the scores derived from the SAT and an overview of how the scores were developed.</li> <li>• Pages 16 – 24 describe how the scaling study was designed.</li> <li>• Pages 25 – 40 describe the characteristics of SAT scaling.</li> <li>• Pages 66 – 74 describe the characteristics of SAT subscore scaling.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></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 scoring procedures that are conducive to valid score interpretations, and to reporting assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards</li> <li>• Documentation of training and/or qualifying procedures for human raters or hand-scoring quality control procedures for the essay portion of the assessment</li> </ul>			

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.5 – 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>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts and Math:</b></p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017).</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 39-49 describe how the test is constructed to ensure multiple forms of the assessment are comparable</li> <li>Pages 82-90 describe equating procedures and results for the SAT.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence #2.1.1.a SAT@ Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appendix 6; Tables A-6.3.2 through A-6.3.5 (pages 72-78) show data and sample sets related to the equating procedures described in pages 96-104.</li> </ul>	<p>Many of the publications created by the College Board refer to the SAT Suite of assessments, which includes the SAT, PSAT/NMSQT, PSAT 10, and PSAT 8/9. In your review of the submitted evidence, please focus on the information that refers to the SAT assessments.</p> <p>Consistent with the <i>U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015</i>, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States, The College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for C.E. 4.5.</p> <p><b>New Hampshire College Board</b> Consistent with the <i>U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015</i>, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States, The College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for CE 4.5, related to multiple assessment forms of the New Hampshire State School Day SAT. Refer to response C.E. 4.5 within The College Board common submission, which has been independently peer reviewed and from which final committee resolved notes were drafted, for a complete presentation.</p> <p>The New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE) stipulates that The College Board response to CE 4.5 constitutes the complete presentation of the New Hampshire State Assessment’s School Day SAT reliability criteria. The NHDOE provides no further narrative or supportive evidence related to the proprietary component The College Board School Day SAT, beyond that of The College Board submission. The NHDOE further stipulates that the State complies fully with all elements of the C.E.4.5 presentation, without exception.</p>	<p><b>Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p> <p>The SAT program ensures that each of its forms “yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years,” but not that all forms “adequately represent [NH’s] academic content standards.”</p>
<p><b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></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 ensures that all forms adequately represent NH’s content standards</li> </ul>			

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.6 – 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>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts and Math. The SAT has been administered in English and as a pencil and paper assessment.</p>	<p>Consistent with the U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States, The College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for C.E. 4.6.</p> <p><b>New Hampshire College Board</b> Consistent with the U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States, The College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for CE 4.6, related to multiple versions of the New Hampshire State School Day SAT. Refer to response C.E.4.6 within The College Board common submission, which has been independently peer reviewed and from which final committee resolved notes were drafted, for a complete presentation.</p> <p>The New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE) stipulates that The College Board response to CE 4.6 constitutes the complete presentation of the New Hampshire State Assessment’s School Day SAT reliability criteria. The NHDOE provides no further narrative or supportive evidence related to the proprietary components of The College Board School Day SAT assessment system, beyond that of The College Board submission. The NHDOE further stipulates that the State complies fully with all elements of the C.E. 4.6 presentation, without exception.</p>	<p><b>Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p> <p>The State’s high school ELA / Mathematics assessments are administered in only one mode – paper and pencil, and in English. Thus, this CE is not applicable.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p>			
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required from the State.</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 SAT Submission**

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

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

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>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts and Math:</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017).</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 1-20 provide an overview of the assessment, including a description its purpose, test format and content, scores derived from the assessment and the intended use of results.</li> <li>Pages 107 – 135 examine the validity of the SAT and includes information on the evidentiary foundations behind the test content, concordance between the current and previous version of the SAT, and the relationship between SAT scores and first-year grade point average, as well as the relationship between SAT scores and college and career readiness benchmarks.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence #2.1.1.a SAT@ Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tables A-3.1 – A-3.15 in Appendix 3 (pages 11-35) provide test content specifications and content domains and descriptions.</li> <li>Appendix 5 (pages 37 - 65) provides additional detail regarding how statistical indices were computed.</li> <li>Appendix 6 (pages 66 – 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board.</li> <li>Appendix 7 (pages 321 – 396) displays the results of analyses performed to evaluate the validity of the SAT.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.2.1: An SAT Validity Primer (January 2015)</a> This paper provides validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores and important college outcomes. The evidence provided in this paper is based on a previous version of the</p>	<p>Many of the publications created by the College Board refer to the SAT Suite of assessments, which includes the SAT, PSAT/NMSQT, PSAT 10, and PSAT 8/9. In your review of the submitted evidence, please focus on the information that refers to the SAT assessments.</p> <p>Consistent with the <i>U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015</i>, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States, The College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for C.E. 4.7.</p> <p><b>New Hampshire College Board</b> Consistent with the <i>U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015</i>, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States, The College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for CE 4.7, related to technical analysis and ongoing maintenance of the New Hampshire State Assessment School Day SAT. Refer to response C.E. 4.7 within The College Board common submission, which has been independently peer reviewed and from which final committee resolved notes were drafted, for a complete presentation.</p> <p>The New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE) stipulates that The College Board response to CE 4.7 constitutes the complete presentation of the New Hampshire State Assessment’s School Day SAT reliability criteria. The NHDOE provides no further narrative or supportive evidence related to the proprietary components of The College Board School Day SAT assessment system, beyond that of The College Board submission. The NHDOE further stipulates that the State complies fully with all elements of the C.E.4.7 presentation, without exception.</p>	<p><b>Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p> <p>Evidence # 2.1.1 suffices to show that the State has established and implemented clear and technically sound criteria for analyses of its assessment system.</p> <p>This document, along with other documents cited, show that the SAT / the College Board has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of the SAT, but not as it relates to the needs of NH specifically, despite Evidence # 2.1.6. The system for monitoring/maintaining/improving must refer to the use of the test as a state accountability measure for NH.</p> <p>Evidence # 3.3.6 implies that the State has criteria for the analyses of its high school ELA / Math assessments, but those criteria are not explicit. (For example, in a document requesting the College Board to conduct such studies.)</p> <p>While CB presents validity evidence to the TACs of their state partners, this evidence appears to be generic rather than 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 New Hampshire SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>SAT. Pages 131 – 135 of the <i>SAT Suite Technical Manual</i> describe how the new version of the SAT correlates with the previous version of the assessment.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence #2.2.2: The Redesigned SAT® Pilot Predictive Validity Study: A First Look (2016)</a></p> <p>This white paper provides preliminary validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores resulting for the redesigned SAT and important college outcomes. The College Board is in the process of completing a validity study to replicate the findings of this white paper with a large, nationally representative sample. The study will examine students in the entering college class of fall 2017, the first full cohort to be admitted to college with the new SAT. For more information regarding this planned study, please refer to page 152 of the SAT Technical Manual.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire and Illinois</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 7-9 of each document describe how alignment between the standards and the assessment is determined.</li> <li>• Pages 16-106 provide a detailed alignment of the SAT to each respective state's English Language Arts and Math standards for grades 11 and 12.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 3.1.1: SAT Practice Test 8 (2017)</a></p> <p>This practice test is a version of a form that was used for a 2016 SAT test administration. The sample test includes the optional essay, answer key, answer sheet and instructions on how to score the test.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence #4.1.1: SAT Suite of</a></p>	<p>The state supports and participates in College Board Technical Advisory meetings, either in person or via webcast conferencing. The state recognizes The College Board as the primary technical assistance and consultation body regarding the School Day SAT, inclusive of system development, implementation, and analysis. The state similarly participates actively in all College Board program activities.</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 SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><a href="#">Assessments Administration Report Table of Contents</a></p> <p>This document displays the contents of a typical post-administration Test Analysis Report for the national administration of the SAT. The College Board provides state level administration reports to its state partners. Please refer to critical evidence #3.3.2 – 3.3.7 for the state specific administration reports.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence #4.7.1: Excerpt from TAC presentation regarding Validity Research</a></p> <p>The College Board presents validity evidence to the Technical Advisory Committees of our state partners. These slides are an excerpt from these presentations and covers information regarding College Board past, current and future validity studies.</p>		
<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p>			
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clearer articulation of contract specifications regarding analyses to provide evidence of validity, reliability, and fairness; independent studies of alignment; and other components/deliverables relevant to monitoring and continual improvement, for example analyses criteria for a state-specific technical report or addendum</li> <li>• Documentation clarifying roles and responsibilities of a NH technical advisory committee with respect to the high school ELA/Math 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 SAT Submission

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><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</li> </ul>	<p>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts and Math, so no evidence will be provided related to a specific state’s alternate assessment. The state will determine which students take the general or the alternate assessment. Below we provide documentation regarding the accommodations that the College Board provides for administrations of the general assessment.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017).</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 49 – 52 describe the types of available allowable accommodations.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</a></p> <p>This manual provides instructions for supervisors who will be responsible for registering students for testing accommodations, and managing the test administration for students who require testing accommodations.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence #2.3.5: SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017)</a></p> <p>This PowerPoint deck is presented to SSD supervisors via an online training session and reviews the policies and procedures related to SAT administrations for students who require testing accommodations.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 5.1.1 Pages from the College Board Students with Disabilities website. (accessed September 1, 2017)</a></p> <p>This document provides images of the College Board web pages regarding the accommodations request and approval process. This information is available through the College Board website - <a href="https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities">https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities</a></p> <p><a href="#">Evidence #5.1.2. College Board Typical Accommodations (accessed October 2, 2017)</a></p> <p>This document provides information regarding typical testing accommodations available for SAT test administrations. This information is available through the College Board website - <a href="https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities/typical-accommodations">https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities/typical-accommodations</a>.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence #5.1.3. Support for Students with</a></p> <p>Many of the publications created by the College Board refer to the SAT Suite of assessments, which includes the SAT, PSAT/NMSQT, PSAT 10, and PSAT 8/9. In your review of the submitted evidence, please focus on the information that refers to the SAT assessments.</p> <p>In adherence to applicable state and federal accessibility laws, College Board reports and resources are designed to meet accessibility standards including Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act</p> <p>Consistent with the U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States, The College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for C.E. 5.1.</p> <p><b>New Hampshire School Day SAT</b> Consistent with the U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States, The College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for CE 5.1, related to procedures for including students with disabilities in the New Hampshire State Assessment School Day SAT. Refer to response C.E. 5.1 within The College Board common submission, which has been independently peer reviewed and from which final committee resolved notes were drafted, for a complete presentation.</p> <p>The New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE) stipulates that The College Board response to CE 5.1 constitutes the complete presentation of the New Hampshire State Assessment’s School Day SAT student inclusion criteria. The NHDOE provides no further narrative or supportive evidence related to the proprietary components of The College Board School Day SAT assessment system, beyond that of The College Board submission. The NHDOE further stipulates that the State complies</p>	<p><b>Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p> <p>5.1.1: The State has not provided evidence that it has in place “procedures... that: [Provide] clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards....”</p> <p>The description of Evidence # 5.1.4 and # 5.1.5 refers to students who test using state-allowed accommodations, but there is no detail provided by NH to clarify if they allow any accommodations beyond those authorized by CB for results to serve as valid SAT results for college admission reporting purposes.</p> <p>5.1.2: NHG61 provides documentation showing guidance for IEP teams stating 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.</p> <p>5.1.3: NHG61 provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general versus an alternate test. However, reviewers were unable to locate any guidelines for assessing the general population with or without accommodations.</p> <p>5.1.4: The SAT-provided documentation shows a list of accessibility tools and features on the general assessments for high school ELA / Math. Peers could not locate documentation of</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 SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>students in general and assessment accommodations available for 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><a href="#">Temporary Physical/ Medical Conditions</a> This form is used to request testing support for students with temporary impairments (caused by injury, accident, etc) who cannot postpone their tests.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence #5.1.4 Reports for Students who Test with State Allowed Accommodations</a> Students who test using state allowed accommodations will receive test results that are marked with an "SAA" label. These screen shots show how the designation appears on their reports.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence #5.1.5 Parent Consent Form Templates</a> The College Board provides a template that district and school administrators may use to attain parental consent to administer the SAT with testing accommodations to particular students. This resource is optionally used by our state partners.</p> <p><b>New Hampshire Policies and Procedures to Ensure the Inclusion of SWD</b></p> <p><a href="#">KM7 September 13 Assessment pg. 2</a> New Hampshire is a non-opt out state.</p> <p><a href="#">NHG61 Alternative Assessment Decision Making Worksheet</a> <a href="#">Special Education Decision Making Guideline</a></p> <p><a href="#">NHG63 State Approved Special Consideration Forms and Guide</a> Guidance for Special Considerations</p> <p><a href="#">NHG64 Statewide Assessment Required Student Participation</a> New Hampshire is a non-opt out state.</p> <p><a href="#">NHG66 Statewide Assessment Memo 2014-2015</a> New Hampshire is a non-opt out state.</p> <p><a href="#">R2 Section 193-C3 Program Established Goals</a> <a href="#">Evidence of binding statute.</a></p> <p><a href="#">R5 Section 193-H School Performance and Accountability</a> Evidence of binding statute.</p> <p><a href="#">R6 Title XV Chapter 193-C Statewide Education Improvement and Assessment Program</a> New Hampshire is a non-opt out state.</p> <p><a href="#">TA2 No Assessment Exemptions</a> New Hampshire is a non-opt out state.</p>	<p>fully with all elements of the C.E. 5.1 presentation, without exception.</p> <p>New Hampshire believes all students must be college- and career-ready by the time they complete high school. This means not only meeting the content knowledge expectations of the NH CCRS in English language arts/literacy and mathematics, but also demonstrating necessary college- and career-ready skills and dispositions. New Hampshire's system must show that students are advancing not just by demonstrating growth in learning, but by demonstrating competency in the understanding and application of content knowledge.</p> <p>A competency education system, to which New Hampshire aspires, starts with a system of college- and career-ready standards. These standards are implemented through a comprehensive Networked Strategy which connects and uses educator, school and district development and supports. The NHDOE networked system will have all stakeholders – teachers, leaders and the community – engaged and sharing the intention and desire to help every student reach proficiency – a theory of positive intent.</p>	<p>accessibility tools/features available to students taking the alternate assessment.</p> <p>5.1.5: Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities could not be located.</p> <p><b>[If factors 5.1.6, 5.1.7, and 5.1.8 are relevant to this submission, then consider the following:]</b></p> <p>5.1.6: Could not locate 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.</p> <p>5.1.7: Although the state indicates that it is provided, peers could not locate notification to parents stating that their student's achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and listing any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy.</p> <p>5.1.8: Peers could not locate documentation that 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.</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 SAT Submission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<a href="#">TA3 Technical Advisory No Assessment Opt-out</a> New Hampshire is a non-opt out state.  <a href="#">TA5 Technical Advisory Required Participation 2014</a> New Hampshire is a non-opt out state.  <a href="#">W6 NH DOEESEA Flexibility Waiver Updated 2013 pp. 21, 31-32;</a> NH Theory of Action for all students.  <a href="#">W4 NH DOE ESEA Flexibility Waiver Concept Paper. Pp. 4-5; Pp. 6-7</a> NH Theory of Action for all students.		
<b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b>			
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More thorough documentation that 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:                             <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, including consequences for college-reportability of scores</li> <li>○ Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s) or the general assessment with accommodation(s)</li> <li>○ Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities, including a full list of accessibility / accommodations features for the general and for the alternate assessments, and clarifying whether any of these are state-specific and go beyond those authorized by the College Board</li> <li>○ Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities</li> <li>○ <b>[If relevant to this submission]</b> 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>○ <b>[If relevant to this submission]</b> 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>○ <b>[If relevant to this submission]</b> 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> </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 SAT Submission**

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

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

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>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts and Math:</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017).</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Pages 50 - 51 describe the types of accommodations available to English learners.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 5.2.1: College Board-Approved Word-to-Word Glossaries for the SAT® Suite of Assessments (2017)</a></p> <p>This document lists the word-to-word glossaries that the College Board has approved for use with the SAT by English Learner students. The state education agency decides which students can use these language supports. These supports do not require an accommodations request and provide college reportable scores to students.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 5.2.2: College Board translated instructions for the SAT (2017)</a></p> <p>The College Board provides translated test instructions to English language learners in the following languages: (a) English, (b) Arabic, (c) Chinese, (d) Haitian Creole, (e) Polish, (f) Russian, (g) Portuguese, (h) Spanish, and (i) Vietnamese. The state education agency decides which students can use these language supports. These supports do not require an accommodations request and provide college reportable scores to students.</p> <p>Students who are English learners with disabilities may apply for accommodations using the procedures described in critical element 5.1 and 5.3.</p> <p><b>New Hampshire Policies and Procedures to Ensure the Inclusion of ELL</b></p> <p><a href="#">E1 NH Consolidated State Application for Title III Accountability Procedures Title III Accountability Procedures</a></p> <p><a href="#">KM7 September 13 Assessment pg. 2</a> New Hampshire is a non-opt out state.</p>	<p>The College Board is in the process of planning and implementing a special data collection to understand the effectiveness of the extended time accommodation for ELL students.</p> <p>Consistent with the <i>U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems: Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015</i>, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States, The College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for C.E. 5.2.</p> <p><b>New Hampshire School Day SAT</b></p> <p>Consistent with the <i>U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems: Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015</i>, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States, The College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for CE 5.2, related to procedures for including English learners in the New Hampshire State Assessment School Day SAT. Refer to response C.E. 5.2 within The College Board common submission, which has been independently peer reviewed and from which final committee resolved notes were drafted, for a complete presentation.</p> <p>The New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE) stipulates that The College Board response to CE 5.2 constitutes the complete presentation of the New Hampshire State Assessment’s School Day SAT student inclusion criteria. The NHDOE provides no further narrative or supportive evidence related to the proprietary components of The College Board School Day SAT assessment system, beyond that of The College Board submission. The NHDOE further stipulates that the State</p>	<p><b>Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p> <p>5.2.1: Specific procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodations could not be located.</p> <p>5.2.2: This factor is addressed in Evidence # 2.1.1, pp 49-51.</p> <p>5.2.3: Peers could not locate guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for <i>any</i> students (see 5.1.5), including English learners.</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 SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><a href="#">NHG61 Alternative Assessment Decision Making Worksheet</a> Special Education Decision Making Guideline</p> <p><a href="#">NHG63 State Approved Special Consideration Forms and Guide</a> Guidance for Special Considerations</p> <p><a href="#">NHG64 Statewide Assessment Required Student Participation</a> New Hampshire is a non-opt out state.</p> <p><a href="#">NHG66 Statewide Assessment Memo 2014-2015</a> New Hampshire is a non-opt out state.</p> <p><a href="#">R2 Section 193-C3 Program Established Goals</a> Evidence of binding statute.</p> <p><a href="#">R5 Section 193-H School Performance and Accountability</a> Evidence of binding statute.</p> <p><a href="#">R6 Title XV Chapter 193-C Statewide Education Improvement and Assessment Program</a> New Hampshire is a non-opt out state.</p> <p><a href="#">TA2 No Assessment Exemptions</a> New Hampshire is a non-opt out state.</p> <p><a href="#">TA3 Technical Advisory No Assessment Opt-out</a> New Hampshire is a non-opt out state.</p> <p><a href="#">TA5 Technical Advisory Required Participation 2014</a> New Hampshire is a non-opt out state.</p> <p><a href="#">W6 NH DOE ESEA Flexibility Waiver Updated 2013 pp. 21, 31-32;</a> NH Theory of Action for all students.</p> <p><a href="#">W4 NH DOE ESEA Flexibility Waiver Concept Paper. Pp. 4-5; Pp. 6-7</a> NH Theory of Action for all students.</p>	<p>complies fully with all elements of the C.E. 5.2 presentation, without exception.</p>	
<p><b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p>			
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation that 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s)</li> <li>• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners</li> </ul> </li> </ul>			

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAT Submission

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAT Submission**

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><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>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts and Math, so no evidence will be provided related to a specific state’s alternate assessment. The state will determine which students take the general or the alternate assessment. Below we provide documentation regarding the accommodations that the College Board provides for administrations of the general assessment. The processes described below apply to students with disabilities who are native English speakers and those who are English language learners.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.1.1: SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017).</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 49 – 51 describe the types of available allowable accommodations, including a description of the supports available for English Learners.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence #2.3.5: SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017)</a></p> <p>This PowerPoint deck is presented to SSD supervisors via an online training session and reviews the policies and procedures related to SAT administrations for students who require testing accommodations.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 5.1.1 Pages from the College Board Students with Disabilities website. (accessed September 1, 2017)</a></p> <p>This document provides images of the College Board web pages regarding the accommodations request and approval process. This information is available through the College Board website - <a href="https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities">https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities</a></p> <p><a href="#">Evidence #5.1.2. College Board Typical Accommodations (accessed October 2, 2017)</a></p> <p>This document provides information regarding typical testing accommodations available for SAT test administrations. This information is available through the College Board website - <a href="https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities/typical-accommodations">https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities/typical-accommodations</a>.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence #5.1.3. Support for Students with</a></p>	<p>Many of the publications created by the College Board refer to the SAT Suite of assessments, which includes the SAT, PSAT/NMSQT, PSAT 10, and PSAT 8/9. In your review of the submitted evidence, please focus on the information that refers to the SAT assessments.</p> <p>The College Board is in the process of planning and implementing a special data collection to understand the effectiveness of the extended time accommodation for ELL students.</p> <p>In adherence to applicable state and federal accessibility laws, College Board reports and resources are designed to meet accessibility standards including Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.</p> <p>Consistent with the U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States, The College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for C.E. 5.3.</p> <p><b>New Hampshire</b></p>	<p><b>Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p> <p>5.3.1: No evidence could be located stating that “appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities (SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504.”</p> <p>5.3.2: Accommodations are available for English learners, but not evidence of their appropriateness, such as “a literature review, empirical research, recommendations by advocacy and professional organizations, and/or consultations with the State’s TAC” (from the Guidance, p.47).</p> <p>5.3.3: See 5.3.2.</p> <p>5.4.3: No evidence could be located of a process to individually review and allow exceptional accommodations requests.</p> <p>Since the descriptions for several of the College Board evidence documents refer to “state-allowed accommodations,” it would be helpful to know if NH offers accommodations beyond or other than those authorized by College Board for administration of the SAT. This may be inferred based on the absence of such information but should be made clear.</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 SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><u><a href="#">Temporary Physical/ Medical Conditions</a></u> This form is used to request testing support for students with temporary impairments (caused by injury, accident, etc.) who cannot postpone their tests.</p> <p><u><a href="#">Evidence #5.1.4. Reports for Students who Test with State Allowed Accommodations</a></u> Student who test with State Allowed Accommodations receive a non-college reportable score. This document shows the online and paper-based score report that these students obtain. In adherence to applicable state and federal accessibility laws, College Board reports and resources are designed to meet accessibility standards including Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.</p> <p><u><a href="#">Evidence #5.1.5 Parent Consent Forms Templates</a></u> The College Board provides to its state clients templates that they may use to obtain parental consent for students to test with College Board approved accommodations or State Allowed Accommodations. The template is included here as evidence of supports the College Board provides to the state.</p>	<p><b>School Day SAT</b> Consistent with the U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States, The College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for CE 5.3, related to accommodations in the New Hampshire State Assessment School Day SAT. Refer to response SB 5.3 within The College Board common submission, which has been independently peer reviewed and from which final committee resolved notes were drafted, for a complete presentation.</p> <p>The New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE) stipulates that The College Board response to CE 5.3 constitutes the complete presentation of the New Hampshire State Assessment's School Day SAT student inclusion criteria. The NHDOE provides no further narrative or supportive evidence related to the proprietary components of The College Board School Day SAT assessment system, beyond that of The College Board submission. The NHDOE further stipulates that the State complies fully with all elements of the C.E. 5.3 presentation, without exception.</p>	
<p><b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions</b></p>			

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>based on the NH state submission.</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation that the State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, documentation that NH:               <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> </li> <li>• Clarification whether NH offers accommodations beyond or other than those authorized by College Board for administration of the SAT</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 SAT Submission

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 SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b></p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul>	<p>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts and Math, so no evidence will be provided related to a specific state’s alternate assessment. The state will determine which students take the general or the alternate assessment. Below we provide documentation regarding the accommodations that the College Board provides for administrations of the general assessment.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.3.3: The SAT School Day SSD Coordinator Manual (Spring 2017)</a></p> <p>This manual provides instructions for supervisors who will be responsible for registering students for testing accommodations, and managing the test administration for students who require testing accommodations.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence #2.3.5: SAT School Day Accommodations webinar (January 2017)</a></p> <p>This PowerPoint deck is presented to SSD supervisors via an online training session and reviews the policies and procedures related to SAT administrations for students who require testing accommodations.</p>	<p>Many of the publications created by the College Board refer to the SAT Suite of assessments, which includes the SAT, PSAT/NMSQT, PSAT 10, and PSAT 8/9. In your review of the submitted evidence, please focus on the information that refers to the SAT assessments.</p> <p>Consistent with the U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States, The College Day has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for C.E. 5.4.</p> <p><b>New Hampshire School Day SAT</b> Consistent with the U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States, The College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for CE 5.4, related to monitoring test administration for special populations in the New Hampshire State Assessment School Day SAT. Refer to response C.E. 5.4 within The College Board common submission, which has been independently peer reviewed and from which final committee resolved notes were drafted, for a complete presentation.</p> <p>The New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE) stipulates that The College Board response to CE 5.4 constitutes the complete presentation of the New Hampshire State Assessment’s School Day SAT student inclusion criteria. The NHDOE provides no further narrative or supportive evidence related to the proprietary components of The College Board School Day SAT assessment system, beyond that of The College Board submission. The NHDOE further stipulates that the State complies fully with all elements of the CE 5.4 presentation, without exception.</p>	<p><b>Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p> <p>Although New Hampshire states that the CB response to CE 5.4 “constitutes the complete presentation of the New Hampshire State Assessment’s School Day SAT student inclusion criteria,” the reviewers would have liked to have seen an explicit statement to the effect that there are no other/additional accommodations allowed by the State.</p> <p>The reviewers were unable to find any evidence in the documents referenced to of details regarding State monitoring of assessment administration to ensure the full and appropriate use of approved accommodations. This would seem to be a state responsibility but is not addressed in the evidence or notes for CE 5.4. Such evidence, according to the Non-Regulatory Guidance (p.48), might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of procedures NH uses to monitor that accommodations selected and approved for students with disabilities, students covered by Section 504, and ELs are appropriate and have been implemented</li> <li>• Description of procedures NH uses to monitor that students with disabilities are placed by IEP Teams in the appropriate assessment</li> <li>• NH’s written procedures for monitoring the use of accommodations during test administration (and schedules for monitoring)</li> <li>• Summary of results of monitoring for the</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 SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		most recent test administration
<b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of State monitoring of assessment administration to ensure the full and appropriate use of approved accommodations, such as:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Procedures used to monitor that accommodations are appropriate and have been implemented</li> <li>○ Procedures used to monitor that students with disabilities are placed by IEP teams into the appropriate assessment</li> <li>○ Summaries of the results of monitoring for the most recent test administration</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAT Submission**

**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>New Hampshire 6.1.1 Adoption of Standards</p> <p><a href="#">SBSB27 State Board Minutes</a></p> <p><a href="#">Formal Adoption of Standards</a> <a href="#">F1 FAQ Adoption of NH CCSS pg. 2</a></p> <p><a href="#">W6 NH DOESEA Flexibility Waiver Updated 2013 pp. 23-24</a></p> <p><a href="#">W2 NH DOE ESSA Flexibility Waiver: NH State Board Meeting Minutes. Pp. 28-29. Item V:</a> Special Presentation: Public Hearing on Common Core State Standards for New Hampshire. Official vote 4-1 to adopt standards.</p>	<p>SB27 references the adoption of “minimum standards”. No grades or content areas are mentioned.</p> <p>F1 FAQ p.2 references the adoption of the CCSS (academic content standards), not academic achievement standards.</p> <p>W6 NH pp 23-24 references the State’s adoption of the CCSS, not academic achievement standards.</p> <p>W2 NH pp 28-29 is references the State’s adoption of CCSS. It does not mention academic achievement standards.</p> <p>The evidence provided by the State references only academic content standards, not academic achievement standards.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation that NH has formally adopted academic achievement standards for high school ELA and mathematics (e.g. performance levels and cut scores), meeting the requirements of this critical element (e.g., applicable to all public secondary school students except SWSCD, with at least three levels of achievement, descriptions of competencies associated with each level, etc.)</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAT Submission**

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

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

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 SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><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>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts and Math, so no evidence will be provided related to a specific state's alternate assessment.</p> <p>The College Board provides the below documentation to our state partners as support resources to be used during their standard setting process.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence #2.1.1 – SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017)</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 120 - 133 describe how the benchmarks were determined and how they are related to college outcomes.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board SAT Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire, and Illinois</a></p> <p>Each of these College Board produced documents contains a detailed alignment between the state standards and the SAT. Please refer to Critical Element 2.1 for the relevant sections. These documents were provided to each panelist as a reference that could be used during the Achievement standards setting process.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence #2.1.8 – Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)</a></p> <p>Panelists were provided with this document as a reference that could be used during the standards setting process.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence #6.2.1 – Final Report on the 2016 SAT Multi-State Standard Setting.</a></p> <p>This report summarizes the procedures used to obtain recommended cut scores from the standard setting panels, as well as the final cut scores that were agreed upon by the four states: Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, and New Hampshire. First, an overview of the standard setting meeting is presented, followed by a detailed description of the procedures and</p> <p>Many of the publications created by the College Board refer to the SAT Suite of assessments, which includes the SAT, PSAT/NMSQT, PSAT 10, and PSAT 8/9. In your review of the submitted evidence, please focus on the information that refers to the SAT assessments.</p> <p>Consistent with the U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States, The College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for C.E. 6.2.</p> <p>New Hampshire School Day SAT</p> <p>Consistent with the U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States, The College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for CE 6.2, related to achievement standards-setting for the New Hampshire State Assessment School Day SAT. Refer to response CE 6.2 within The College Board common submission, which has been independently peer reviewed and from which final committee resolved notes were drafted, for a complete presentation.</p> <p>The New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE) stipulates that The College Board response to CE 6.2 constitutes the complete presentation of the New Hampshire State Assessment's School Day SAT academic achievement standards and reporting criteria. The NHDOE provides no further narrative or supportive evidence related to the proprietary components of The College Board School Day SAT assessment system, beyond that of The College Board submission. The NHDOE further stipulates that the State complies fully with all elements of the CE 6.2 presentation, without</p>	<p><b>Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p> <p>A technically sound standard setting methodology (modified Angoff) was adopted, but it was not implemented in accordance with generally accepted practice for standard setting studies.</p> <p>Importantly, the tests on which standards were set were not written to the academic content standards to which the academic achievement standards refer.</p> <p>There was minimal information provided on the process and participants involved in the development of the ALDs, which played a key part in the standard setting process. Although participants were identified as content experts from four states, including NH, no other demographic information was provided concerning the ALD authors. The ALDs drafted also reference the CCSS, a set of standards not identical to the standards on which the items were developed and on which performance would be judged.</p> <p>In addition, some aspects of standard setting implementation raise questions as to the validity of the results. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The rating scale for mathematics was adjusted to include lower ratings during the standard setting based on an observation of a circumstance that could have been identified ahead of time. See page 5 of Evidence # 6.2.1: "... it was later decided to allow panelists ratings to go to zero on all Math items and not just the SPRs since</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 SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence		
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>results. <a href="#">NH_Standard_Setting_Attendee_Confirmation</a></td> <td>exception.</td> </tr> </table>	results. <a href="#">NH_Standard_Setting_Attendee_Confirmation</a>	exception.	<p>inspection of the percent correct values provided after Round 1 of ratings indicated extremely low performance on some items making it a realistic expectation that the borderline examinee at the lower cut scores may be expected to do even worse than chance.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No TAC appears to have been engaged prior to, during, or after the standard setting study to ascertain that the process was technically sound and the results were reasonable.</li> </ul> <p>Moreover, there was no information on the number and background of NH educators / stakeholders on the panels. This critical element references panelists “with appropriate experience and expertise.”</p>
results. <a href="#">NH_Standard_Setting_Attendee_Confirmation</a>	exception.			
<p><b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p>				
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A description of the process for selecting panelists, including consideration of their state affiliations</li> <li>• Additional documentation to provide validation of the method and process employed, especially considering the areas of concern cited: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The content standards to which the standard setting results are intended to apply were not those on which the test was based</li> <li>○ The impact of a mid-stream change in the rating scale for mathematics</li> </ul> </li> </ul>				

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAT Submission**

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><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>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts and Math, so no evidence will be provided related to a specific state’s alternate assessment.</p> <p>The College Board provides the below documentation to our state partners as support resources to be used during their standard setting process.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.1.1 – SAT Suite Technical Manual (October 2017)</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 21 - 26 describe the processes used to ensure the fairness of the assessment.</li> <li>Pages 27 - 52 provide a detailed description of test development procedures.</li> <li>Pages 108 - 114 describe the evidentiary foundation for the decisions made about the content included in the SAT.</li> <li>Pages 120 - 133 describe how the benchmarks were determined and how they are related to college outcomes.</li> <li>Pages 133 - 135 describe how the SAT assesses student readiness for college.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.1.2 – 2.1.7: College Board SAT Alignment to the state standards of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire, and Illinois</a></p> <p>Each of these College Board produced documents contains a detailed alignment between the state standards and the SAT. Please refer to Critical Element 2.1 for the relevant sections. These documents were provided to each panelist as a reference that could be used during the Achievement standards setting process.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence #2.1.8 – Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015)</a></p> <p>Panelists were provided with this document as a reference that could be used during the standards setting process.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 2.2.1: An SAT Validity Primer (January 2015)</a></p> <p>This paper provides validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores and important college outcomes. The evidence provided in this paper is based on a</p>	<p>Many of the publications created by the College Board refer to the SAT Suite of assessments, which includes the SAT, PSAT/NMSQT, PSAT 10, and PSAT 8/9. In your review of the submitted evidence, please focus on the information that refers to the SAT assessments.</p> <p>Consistent with the <i>U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015</i>, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States, The College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for C.E. 6.3.</p> <p><b>New Hampshire School Day SAT</b> Consistent with the <i>U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015</i>, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States, The College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for CE 6.3, related to challenging and aligned academic achievement standards for the New Hampshire State Assessment School Day SAT. Refer to response CE 6.3 within The College Board common submission, which has been independently peer reviewed and from which final committee resolved notes were drafted, for a complete presentation.</p> <p>The New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE) stipulates that The College Board response to CE 6.3 constitutes the complete presentation of the New Hampshire State Assessment’s School Day SAT academic achievement standards and reporting criteria. The NHDOE provides no further narrative or supportive evidence related to the proprietary components of The College Board School Day SAT assessment system, beyond that of The College Board submission. The NHDOE further stipulates that the State complies fully with all elements of the CE 6.3 presentation, without exception.</p>	<p><b>Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p> <p>No evidence was presented specifically linking performance at the “proficient and above” level to mastery of 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.</p> <p>The SAT Benchmarks and the research showing how they relate to some college success metrics provides a model that NH may consider for part of what is needed to meet this critical element (specifically the inferences concerning college success for students scoring proficient or above).</p> <p><b>[If the second paragraph of this CE is relevant to this submission, then consider the following:]</b></p> <p>Peers were not provided evidence to evaluate the extent to which the State’s 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>

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>previous version of the SAT. Pages 131 – 135 of the SAT Suite Technical Manual describe how the new version of the SAT correlates with the previous version of the assessment.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence #2.2.2: The Redesigned SAT® Pilot Predictive Validity Study: A First Look (2016)</a>                      This white paper provides preliminary validity evidence on the relationship between SAT scores resulting for the redesigned SAT and important college outcomes. The College Board is in the process of completing a validity study to replicate the findings of this white paper with a large, nationally representative sample. The study will examine students in the entering college class of fall 2017, the first full cohort to be admitted to college with the new SAT. For more information regarding this planned study, please refer to page 152 of the SAT Technical Manual.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence #6.2.1 – Final Report on the 2016 SAT Multi-State Standard Setting.</a>                      This report summarizes the procedures used to obtain recommended cut scores from the standard setting panels, as well as the final cut scores that were agreed upon by the four states: Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, and New Hampshire. First, an overview of the standard setting meeting is presented, followed by a detailed description of the procedures and results.</p>	
<p><b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation specifically linking performance at the “proficient and above” level to mastery of 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</li> <li>• <b>[If relevant to this submission]</b> Documentation of the extent to which the State’s 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</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 SAT Submission

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 SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;</li> <li>• The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;</li> <li>• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;</li> <li>○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;</li> <li>○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>For the SAT assessment administered as a general assessment in grade 11 to assess English Language Arts and Math:</b></p> <p>The following documents are reference materials provided by the College Board to educators to support their use of the College Board reporting platform.</p> <p>Many of the publications created by the College Board refer to the SAT Suite of assessments, which includes the SAT, PSAT/NMSQT, PSAT 10, and PSAT 8/9. In your review of the submitted evidence, please focus on the information that refers to the SAT assessments.</p> <p>In adherence to applicable state and federal accessibility laws, College Board reports and resources are designed to meet accessibility standards including Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 6.4.1: K–12 Educator Brief: The College and Career Readiness Benchmarks for the SAT® Suite of Assessments (April 2016)</a> This brochure explains how the SAT benchmarks were derived and how to interpret SAT test results.</p>	<p>Many of the publications created by the College Board refer to the SAT Suite of assessments, which includes the SAT, PSAT/NMSQT, PSAT 10, and PSAT 8/9. In your review of the submitted evidence, please focus on the information that refers to the SAT assessments.</p> <p>In adherence to applicable state and federal accessibility laws, College Board reports and resources are designed to meet accessibility standards including Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act</p> <p>The College Board is developing a Spanish Language version of Evidence #6.4.3 for the 2018-19 school year.</p> <p>Consistent with the U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States, The College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for C.E. 6.4.</p> <p>New Hampshire School</p>	<p><b>Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p> <p>6.4.1: Document “State Official Press Release Statewide Assessments” provides the percentage of students at achievement levels 3 and 4 combined for each content area, for Grade 11. It does not provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall percentages of students by achievement level</li> <li>• Overall percentages of students not tested</li> <li>• By student group percentages of students by achievement level</li> <li>• By student group percentages of students not tested</li> </ul> <p>6.4.2: Although the College Board provided sample reports and interpretive guides in its submission, no evidence could be located that NH reports assessment results as indicated in this part of this CE. Peers could not locate, for example, when and how teachers are provided with assessment results (other than via the link to the portal provided in Evidence # 6.4.3), when and how information is relayed to students and parents, and when and how information is made available to other stakeholders about performance school, district, and state level. The reviewers would have expected to see as evidence sample reports and details of the provision of reports, including whether and how reports are made available to the extent practicable in parents’/guardians’ native languages.</p> <p>6.4.3: Although the College Board provided samples of individual student interpretive, descriptive, 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 New Hampshire SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>	<p>It also provides a set of frequently asked questions regarding the assessment reporting.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 6.4.2: K-12 Educator Brief: The SAT@ Suite of Assessments: Using Scores and Reporting to Inform Instruction (2015)</a></p> <p>This educator brief provides an overview of the different reports available to teachers, and how these reports can be used for curricular and intervention purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pages 23-41 display and explain the uses for sample reports available through the College Board reporting portal.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 6.4.3: SAT Understanding Scores 2017 (2017)</a></p> <p>This brochure provides information to educators regarding scoring benchmarks, how the assessment is scored and how to access score reports on the College Board reporting portal. It also provides a guide on how to interpret student score reports.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 6.4.4: Professional Development Module #6: Using Scores and Reporting to Inform</a></p>	<p>Day SAT Consistent with the U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Non-Regulatory Guidance for States, September 25, 2015, which allows for a common, coordinated submission of evidence on behalf of a consortium of States, The College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of New Hampshire, narrative and supporting evidence for CE 6.4, related to reporting in the New Hampshire State Assessment SAT. Refer to response CE 6.4 within The College Board common submission, which has been independently peer reviewed and from which final committee resolved notes were drafted, for a complete presentation.</p> <p>The New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE) stipulates that The College Board response to CE 6.4 constitutes the complete presentation of the New Hampshire State Assessment's School Day SAT academic achievement standards and reporting criteria. The NHDOE provides no further narrative or supportive evidence related to the proprietary components of The</p>	<p>diagnostic reports, no evidence could be located that NH provides for their production and delivery.</p> <p>The sample reports provided by SAT (for example, in # 6.4.2 and # 6.4.3):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not provide State-Assessment-relevant information regarding a student's achievement</li> <li>Do not reference NH's grade-level academic achievement standards</li> <li>Provide information to address the specific academic needs of students, but not in relation to NH's academic content standards</li> </ul> <p>6.4.4: The State has not provided documentation of a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</p> <p>New Hampshire includes among evidence documents two resources: <i>State Release of Preliminary Data</i> and <i>Official Press Release Statewide Assessments</i>. The first is a memo regarding the date (May 22, 2017) by which reports will be available on the SAT K-12 Education Portal, and the second, a brief press release dated Nov. 1, 2016 on statewide assessment results (including the first administration of the School Day SAT). The reviewers would have welcomed some additional information under the comments/notes section of the Index document to clarify mode and timing of distribution of these and other communications to stakeholders regarding results of the School Day SAT.</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 SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><a href="#">Instruction (2015)</a> This PowerPoint presentation can be used to train educators on how to access, interpret and apply score report results to inform classroom instruction.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 6.4.5: Facilitator Guide to Professional Development Module #6: Using Scores and Reporting to Inform Instruction (2015)</a> This guide is a companion to the PowerPoint presentation and is intended as a support resource for administrators or district trainers who will be training their educators on how score reporting.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence # 6.4.6: Educator Online Reporting Screen Shot Demo [February 2017].</a> This PowerPoint shows the different reports that available through the College Board online reporting system.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence #6.4.7: K-12 Educator Brief: Concordance</a> This resource provides to educators a tool by which to compare scores from different assessments. Concordance tables are provided for the redesigned SAT and the SAT administered prior to the redesign, as well as a</p>	<p>College Board School Day SAT assessment system, beyond that of The College Board submission. The NHDOE further stipulates that the State complies fully with all elements of the CE 6.4 presentation, without exception.</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 SAT Submission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)		Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>concordance that allows for the comparison between the redesigned SAT and the ACT.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence #6.4.8: Student Online Reporting Screen Shot Demo</a> This PowerPoint deck shows the different reports that students can access using the College Board Online Reporting System.</p> <p><a href="#">Evidence #5.1.4 Reports for Students who Test with State Allowed Accommodations</a> Students who test using state allowed accommodations will receive test results that are marked with an “SAA” label. These screen shots show how the designation appears on their reports.</p> <p><a href="#">State Release of Preliminary Data</a></p> <p><a href="#">Official Press Release Statewide Assessments</a></p>		
<p><b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement Please refer to the SAT Peer Review of March 2018. Following are Peer comments/notes/questions/suggestions based on the NH state submission.</b></p>			
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation that NH reports its assessment results on student achievement, including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Overall percentages of students by achievement level (not just combined levels)</li> <li>○ Overall percentages of students not tested</li> </ul> </li> </ul>			

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAT Submission**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ By student group percentages of students by achievement level</li> <li>○ By student group percentages of students not tested</li> <li>• Documentation that the state reports results in ways that are useful for instruction. See Guidance, p.52, for examples of evidentiary documents</li> <li>• Documentation that individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports were produced and distributed, and that:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Student achievement is reported in a manner which references the state’s academic content and achievement standards</li> <li>○ Diagnostic information addressing the specific academic needs of students is reported in relation to NH’s academic content standards</li> <li>○ Reports are made available to the extent practicable in parents’/guardians’ native languages</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Documentation of a process and timeline (beyond release date) for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration</li> </ul>	

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