



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Christopher N. Ruszkowski
Secretary of Education
New Mexico Public Education Department
300 Don Gaspar Avenue
Santa Fe, NM 87501

July 30, 2018

Dear Secretary Ruszkowski:

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 Mexico Public Education Department (NMPED) to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in February 2018 and which was a follow up to a 2016 review.

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

External peer reviewers and Department staff carefully evaluated NMPED's submission and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that the components of your assessment system for reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC)) meet all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of section 1111(b)(1) and (3) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB. In addition, Department staff also has determined that NMPED's PARCC assessments in grades 3-8 meet the new requirements for State assessments under the ESEA, as amended by ESSA. Congratulations on meeting this important ESEA requirement; assessments that produce valid and reliable results are fundamental to a State's accountability system.

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

Based on the recommendations from this peer review and the Department's analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following in regards to one of the submitted assessments:

- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC)): **Meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**
- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in high school (PARCC): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**

In addition, NMPED submitted information about the New Mexico Alternate Performance Assessment (NMAPA), the State's alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards in reading/language arts and mathematics for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. However, subsequent to that review, it became clear that NMPED has significantly revised the NMAPA. As a result, the result of that peer review are not included here and NMPED must submit new validity and technical quality evidence for this test in accordance with the assessment peer review guidance. In particular, NMPED must submit documentation for the NMAPA for critical elements 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, and 6.4.

For the PARCC high school assessments, an assessment that is identified as substantially meeting the requirements of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, the Department means that these assessments meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. The Department expects that NMPED may be able to provide this additional information within one year. 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 grant award related to those components of the assessment system. To satisfy this condition, NMPED must submit satisfactory evidence to address the items identified in the enclosed list. NMPED must provide to the Department a plan and timeline by which it will submit the additional documentation within 30 days of the receipt of this letter. If adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action.

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.

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. In particular, OSERS will monitor progress against critical elements 1.4 and 1.5. Insufficient progress to address such matters may lead OSERS to place a condition on NMPED's federal fiscal year 2019 IDEA Part B grant award.

Please be aware that approval of NMPED's PARCC assessments in grades 3-8 is not a determination that the system complies with Federal civil rights requirements, including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, and requirements under the Individuals with

Disabilities Education Act. Finally, please remember that, if NMPED makes significant changes in its PARCC assessments in grades 3-8, the State must submit information about those changes to the Department for review and approval.

Thank you for your ongoing commitment to improving educational outcomes for all students. I look forward to our continued partnership as we move ahead with this critical work. I appreciate the work you are doing to improve your schools and provide a high-quality education for your students.

If you have any questions, please contact Katherine Cox or Lisa Sadeghi of my staff at: OSS.NewMexico@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/
Frank Brogan
Assistant Secretary for
Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Lisa Chandler, Director of Assessment

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

Note: In 2016, the U.S. Department of Education peer reviewed the New Mexico Public Education Department (NMPED) administration of the National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC) alternate assessment. Since that review, NMPED has redesigned the alternate assessment such that it is now a different test than the NCSC and requires peer review of all validity-related evidence (critical elements 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, and 6.4) per the peer review guidance.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
1.3 – Required Assessments	For the PARCC high school assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of clear, documented policy that all students are assessed against the same challenging academic standards and are assessed using the same assessment (e.g., evidence that all students take the same high school test in each subject statewide; or if there are multiple high school tests required in each subject, evidence that all students take all required tests).
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments	For the PARCC high school assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The information for critical element 1.3 above will satisfy this requirement.
1.5 – Participation Data	For the PARCC high school assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation that demonstrates the participation of all students in the same statewide assessment (e.g., evidence that all students take the same high school test in each subject statewide; or if there are multiple high school tests required in each subject, evidence that all students take all required tests).

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

February 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes-Resubmission



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 Mexico

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS . 3
 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments (from 2016 review)
 3
 1.5 – Participation Data (from 2016 review)..... 4

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS 5
 2.3 – Test Administration (from 2016 review-note see also consortium notes)
 6

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER
 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS
 5.2 – Procedures for including ELs (see 2016 notes-also consortium notes)
 10
 5.3 – Accommodations (2016 review-see also consortium notes)..... 13

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 15
 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students
 (2016 review) 15
 6.4 – Reporting (from 2016 review see also consortium notes) 17

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

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments (from 2016 review)</p> <p>For the entire New Mexico Public Education Department (NMPED) assessment system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Evidence that the State includes all students, including those with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, are included in the assessment system. 	<p>New Mexico did not submit any evidence to address this critical element.</p>	<p>New Mexico should submit evidence that it includes all students, including those with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, are included in the assessment system.</p>
<p>Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State includes all students, including those with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, are included in the assessment system. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Mexico

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p align="center">1.5 – Participation Data (from 2016 review)</p> <p>For the science assessments in NMPED: Data disaggregated by student group for science, including the number of students tested and the number of students enrolled, for each required assessment for science.</p>	<p>Section 1 – 1.5.e – NM submitted a table entitled “Participation Rates 2017.”</p>	<p>The participation rates 2017 table details the grade, subgroup, and participation in the science assessment by providing a science numerator, science denominator, and science rate.</p> <p>Additionally, the participation rate of students with disabilities in grade 11 is 101.1%.</p>
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u> x </u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Mexico

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 Mexico

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.3 – Test Administration (from 2016 review-note see also consortium notes)</p> <p>For the NCSC/MSAA, evidence that NMPED established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the NCSC/MSAA assessments that include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a troubleshooting guide to address technology-related contingency plans. • Evidence of policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration (including the assessment delivery devices, accessibility tools and features available for students, and item formats) prior to testing. • Evidence of training to ensure consistency of administration across districts and schools. 	<p>AA-AAAS: 2.3.b.1 Test administrator online training excerpt</p>	<p>Evidence provided is a 2-page set of screen shots showing:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The URL for location of TA online training, date training opened, and that a certificate is printed at the end of the training 2. 5 icons that name the Online Training Modules: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Eligibility and important info about the NMAPA b. Determining starting & stopping points c. Administering and scoring the NMAPA d. Entering scores e. Viewing score reports <p>Since NM's AA-AAAS has been changed to be now administered on paper, a trouble-shooting guide is no longer necessary</p> <p>No evidence is provided about policies regarding opportunities for students to practice and become familiar with the paper-based test format prior to testing.</p> <p>While the state provided the basic topics about training, they did not provide evidence about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who is being trained • Documentation of what has to be accomplished to be certified • Assurance that only certified test administrators have given the test (because the test is now paper-based, what would prevent an untrained test administrator from being able to give the test?) • A process to monitor the effectiveness of the training, such as follow-up activities before, during and after test administration to ensure adherence to standardized

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>procedures, especially administration with accommodations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether the training for test administrators has been modified appropriately from the NCSC version to the state-based paper version of the assessment.
Section 2.3 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with sample items and formats representing the paper-based format prior to testing. • Evidence of training to ensure consistency of administration across districts and schools. 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 		<p>AA-AAAS:</p> <p>Since the state has converted the AA-AAAS from the original online version of the NCSC to a paper-based version, evidence must be provided that the change in format does not alter the technical qualities of the assessment. The state must demonstrate that there is little difference in student performance between the two modes of test administration.</p>
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>Because the State has converted the AA-AAAS from the original online version of the NCSC to a paper-based version, the State must provide evidence that they have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the online and the paper versions of the assessment; • Demonstrated comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results between the paper-based and the online versions. 		

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

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 Mexico

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs (see 2016 notes-also consortium notes)</p> <p>For the NCSC/MSAA, NMPED must provide evidence that the State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all ELs in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed with accommodation(s); • Procedures to ensure the inclusion of ELs who are eligible for the AA-AAAS in the NCSC/MSAA; and • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for ELs. 	<p>AA-AAAS:</p> <p>5.2.a.1: NMPED Accommodations Manual excerpts</p>	<p>Evidence for procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed with accommodations can be found on page 5 of the Accommodations Manual, including who should be on the team who makes the decision as well as specific factors to consider in the student’s learning profile (e.g., level of English proficiency).</p> <p>Appendices B, C, and D in 5.2.a.1 lists accommodations for NMAPA that are for online administration (e.g., text-to-speech, use of backlighting) that are no longer appropriate for the paper-based AA-AAAS. This information should be updated appropriately.</p> <p>Several sections of the NMPED Accommodations Manual (5.2.a.1) provide evidence of state procedures and guidance to ensure the inclusion of EL students in the state assessments.</p> <p>The manual lacks a specific statement that these are the procedures that should be followed to ensure that ELs are appropriately included in the AA-AAAS.</p> <p>Documentation about the numbers of ELs who take the AA-AAAS would be strong evidence to indicate that ELs are in fact being included in the AA-AAAS.</p> <p>No evidence is given about procedures the State uses to clearly communicate information regarding the assessment of an EL with accommodations to parents, in a language that parents can understand.</p> <p>While the procedures described on p. 5 of the Accommodations Manual provide some guidance</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 Mexico

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for ELs, this guidance could be strengthened with the inclusion of examples of specific EL profiles and how to consider the various factors in making the decision regarding appropriate accommodations. Any examples given should be clearly marked as illustrative but not required.
Section 5.2 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of the numbers of ELs who take the AA-AAAS, and the numbers of ELs who take the AA-AAAS with and without the various types of accommodations. • Evidence about procedures the State uses to clearly communicate information regarding the assessment of an EL with accommodations to parents, in language that parents can understand. 		

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

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 Mexico

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.3 – Accommodations (2016 review-see also consortium notes) For the NCSC/MSAA, NMPED must provide</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the accommodations provided (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. • Evidence that appropriate accommodations for ELs are available. • Evidence that the State has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 	<p>AA-AAAS:</p> <p>5.2.a.1: NMPED Accommodations Manual excerpts</p>	<p>No evidence was provided regarding the frequency of use of each EL accommodation and procedures for monitoring the use of EL accommodations, such as schedules for onsite monitoring, instruments and criteria to assist in the monitoring and evaluating of EL accommodations use during test administrations. For example, checklists can be used to verify if oral administration accommodations onsite were provided in accordance with test administration procedures, i.e., it’s possible that a read-aloud accommodation was provided and contents that should not have been read aloud was read to the students (not just instructions but the reading passage as well).</p> <p>Evidence about the number or percent of SWD receiving the various accommodations would be helpful to document the appropriateness of accommodations given.</p> <p>The Accommodations Manual differentiates between accommodations and modifications and makes it clear that modifications are not allowed, including a chart of examples of prohibited modifications. However, no evidence is provided to show that the accommodations provided do not alter the construct being assessed. Also, no evidence is provided to show that accommodations that are used allow for meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students with accommodations and those without.</p> <p>The state should provide results of studies that document that the use of these accommodations does not alter the construct being measured and allows for comparable results for students who are using the accommodations and those who are 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 Mexico

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	5.3.d.1: Nonstandard accommodation request form	<p>using accommodations.</p> <p>Ample evidence is provided in the Accommodations Manual that appropriate accommodations for ELs are available.</p> <p>The nonstandard accommodation request form (5.3.d.1) provides evidence that the state has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</p>
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the accommodations provided (i) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (ii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Mexico

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students (2016 review)</p> <p>For PARCC, NMPED must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the State formally adopted the achievement standards indicated in the submission. <p>For NCSC/MSAA, NMPED must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the State formally adopted the achievement standards indicated in the submission. 	<p>AA-AAAS:</p> <p>6.1.a.1: Formal adoption of academic achievement standards</p> <p>NM:</p> <p>6.1.a.2: Formal adoption of academic achievement standards</p>	<p>The state provided evidence of the formal adoption of the academic achievement standards for the alternative assessment indicated in the submission, dated December 1, 2017.</p> <p>The state provided evidence of the formal adoption of the academic achievement standards for the general state assessment indicated in the submission, dated December 1, 2017, for English language arts, mathematics, and science.</p>
Section 6.1 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Mexico

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 Mexico

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.4 – Reporting (from 2016 review see also consortium notes)</p> <p>For PARCC, NMPED must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that NMPED and PARCC provide reports that enable itemized score analyses to local educational agencies and schools. <p>For the NCSC/MSAA, NMPED must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. Evidence that individual student reports are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand. 	<p>NM:</p> <p>6.4.b.6: School Evidence Statement Analysis</p> <p>6.4.b.7: Content standards roster</p> <p>6.4.b.8: Interpretation Guide</p> <p>AA-AAAS:</p> <p>6.4.c.4: Individual student report in Spanish</p> <p>6.4.d.3: Excerpt from Assessment Newsletter</p>	<p>PARCC:</p> <p>Evidence is provided that NMPED and PARCC provide reports that enable itemized score analyses to local educational agencies and schools. Samples of the reports are provided, as well as an Interpretive Guide that helps users understand the data on the reports and make connections to the standards being assessed.</p> <p>No evidence was provided regarding appropriate uses of the results by teachers to address students’ academic needs, including score interpretations models to monitor student growth as he/she transitions from beginning to advanced for the PARCC assessments.</p> <p>AA-AAAS:</p> <p>Because the state has changed from the original online version of the NCSC to a paper-based version of the AA-AAAS, the state should submit all reports under this critical element, including the individual student report and itemized score analyses.</p> <p>Evidence is provided that the NMAPA student report is available in Spanish.</p> <p>State note: “While NM has never received a request for individual student reports in alternate formats such as Braille or large print, NM is prepared to provide those upon request.”</p> <p>The evidence provided gives the process for district and school staff members to gain access to the NMAPA scores but does not specify timeline for how soon after testing the reports are available, nor is it indicated how soon parents would get their reports</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 Mexico

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		or the process for report delivery to parents.
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Because the state has changed from the original online version of the NCSC to a paper-based version of the AA-AAAS, the state should submit all reports under this critical element, including the individual student report and itemized score analyses. • For the AA-AAAS, evidence of a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents 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.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT
CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

August 2017 State Assessment Peer Review Notes for the PARCC Assessment Consortium RESUBMISSION

(follow up on evidence requested from 2016 Peer Review)



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

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

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

Contents—NOTE—The items shown below represent areas from the 2016 consortium peer review where additional evidence was requested

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS	3
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	3
2.2 – Item Development.....	5
SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....	6
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	6
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	8
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	9
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	10
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....	11
6.4 – Reporting.....	13

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">2.1 – Test Design and Development</p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; • Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design. 	<p><i>State-specific evidence. Individual states will respond as necessary.</i></p>	<p>The PARCC assessment does not currently assess speaking and listening. While it is the case that States currently have waivers, there is no assurance that the Department will continue to grant waivers for speaking and listening.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: “Evidence that the assessment design measures the full breadth and depth of the State’s academic content standards, including the speaking and listening aspect of the standards.” NOTE—States must individually request a waiver from the requirement of testing the speaking and listening standards.</p>		
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a plan and timeline for addressing the speaking and listening aspect of the standards such that appropriate assessments will be available to the 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
PARCC States when their waivers expire.		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.2 – Item Development</p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p>Document 2.2_PARCC Item Review Committees_9 4 12</p> <p>lists available information about PARCC’s initial groups of item reviewers, including self-reported job title, organization, years of teaching experience, experience with special populations of students, geographic settings, and reviewer demographic information.</p>	<p>Document 2.2 provided evidence of representation on Item Review Committees.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: “Information about the composition and credentials of content and bias/sensitivity reviewers for the PARCC assessment. Specifically, information about the subject area specialization of content and bias/sensitivity reviewers on this panel (grade level, general or special education specialization, English learner (EL) specialization).”</p>		
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. 	<p>HumRRO, <u>Evaluating the Quality and Alignment of PARCC ELA/Literacy and Mathematics Assessments: Grades 3,4,6, and 7</u></p>	<p>The alignment study report notes that Speaking and Listening were not considered in the findings for ELA alignment. See 2.1.</p> <p>Per Recommendations on pages 28-30, PARCC needs a plan for addressing the recommendations resulting from the HumRRO alignment study. However, the report provided to the peers appears to have limited usefulness for improving the assessment. Peers are uncertain why the information is not provided in more detail. For example, item alignment to each standard rather than domain or cluster may be more helpful for developing plans for improving the assessment. PARCC may need to ask the contractors to provide more explicit findings.</p> <p>Peers were unable to find specific information regarding the composition and expertise of the 19 alignment study panel members.</p> <p>Will the PARCC program seek advice from the PARCC Technical Advisory Committee related to the study?</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: “Additional alignment evidence that addresses all remaining grades (grades 3, 4, 6, and 7) in both content areas, and Alignment evidence that supports a test design that assesses the full range of the State’s academic content standards, including speaking and listening, is needed for all tested grades.”</p>		
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As the plan for speaking and listening is developed, ensure that independent alignment studies will be completed. • Plan and timeline for how PARCC will address the alignment study recommendations for improving the assessments. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>HumRRO, <u>Evaluating the Quality and Alignment of PARCC ELA/Literacy and Mathematics Assessments: Grades 3,4,6, and 7</u></p>	<p>The alignment study notes that “Reviewers found PARCC’s cognitive complexity process and model difficult to understand and apply when confirming the quantitative and qualitative ratings. <u>Additional information about how these ratings are combined as well as information about the acceptable ranges is needed for others to effectively evaluate the cognitive complexity of PARCC’s ELA/literacy passages.</u>” (emphasis added) P. 28</p> <p>The alignment study notes that “Reviewers generally agreed with the cognitive complexity level that PARCC assigned the mathematics assessment items at grades 3, 4, 6, and 7. However, there were some exceptions. We recommend reviewing the cognitive complexity levels for Geometry at grade 3; Measurement and Data at grade 4; and Statistics and Probability, Number and Operations in Base Ten, and Number and Operations – Fractions, all at grade 6.”</p> <p>The report provided to the peers appears to have limited usefulness for improving the assessment. Peers are uncertain why the information is not provided in more detail. For example, item alignment to each standard rather than domain or cluster may be more helpful for developing plans for improving the assessment. PARCC may need to ask the contractors to provide more explicit findings.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: “Additional evidence, such as cognitive lab studies, that address the cognitive processes and cognitive complexity required by the standards across grades and content areas.”</p>		
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan and timeline for how PARCC will address the alignment study recommendations for improving the assessments, as regards cognitive processes and cognitive complexity. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>Documents 4.3.1, 4.3.2, and 4.3.3 include scale score cumulative frequency distributions for each assessment administered in spring 2015, fall 2015, and spring 2016.</p>	<p>Peers appreciate the cumulative distribution of scale scores to numbers of students. The omission of raw scores is noted.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: “Cumulative frequency distributions across raw score/scale scores, that include the number and percent of students scored at each raw/scale score point.”</p>		
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<p>Document 4.6_PARCC Mode and Device Comparability Study Plan outlines PARCC’s plans to study mode and device comparability in spring 2017.</p>	<p>The Table of PARCC Research Studies 2016 on page 15 show dates in the past. What additional milestones and timelines have been added since November 2016?</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: “A plan and timeline for the State/PARCC to continue studying the issue of mode comparability.”</p>		
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An updated timeline and milestones and any completed study reports to document adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results among modes and devices. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p>Document 6.2.1 PARCC Standard Setting Panels includes available information about standard setting panelists, including self-reported job title, organization, years of teaching experience, experience with special populations of students, geographic settings, and reviewer demographic information.</p> <p>Document 6.2.2 PARCC Standard Setting Panel Summary Information includes summary information of the self-reported information contained in Document 6.2.1.</p>	<p>Documents 6.2.1 and 6.2.2 provide evidence the standard-setting panels included members experienced in the areas of special education and EL.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: “Additional detailed information about areas of educational specialization for members of each achievement standards-setting panel, especially the specialty areas of special education and ELs.”</p>		
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">6.4 – Reporting</p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration; • The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results; • The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement; ○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors); ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; ○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand; 	<p><i>State-specific evidence. Individual states will respond as necessary.</i></p>	<p>PARCC produces item level data that are available to the States. However, States produce the reports.</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE PARCC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 		
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</p>		
<p>“Evidence that MSDE and PARCC provide reports that enable itemized score analyses to local educational agencies and schools”</p>		
<p>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		