



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Steve Canavero
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Nevada Department of Education
700 East Fifth Street
Carson City, Nevada 89701-5096

July 24, 2018

Dear Superintendent Canavero:

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

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

External peer reviewers and Department staff carefully evaluated NDE's submission and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that the general assessments for reading/language arts and mathematics in grades 3-8 (Smarter Balanced) meet all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of section 1111(b)(1) and (3) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB and ESSA. Congratulations on meeting these important ESEA requirements; an assessment system that produces valid and reliable results is fundamental to a State's accountability system.

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:

- General assessments in mathematics and R/LA for grades 3-8 (Smarter Balanced): **Meets requirements for ESEA, as amended by NCLB and ESSA**

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

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

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.

In addition, please be aware that approval of NDE's Smarter Balanced assessments is not a determination that the system complies with Federal civil rights requirements, including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, and requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Furthermore, NDE must still submit its other assessments (reading/language arts and mathematics assessments in high school; science assessments in grades 3-5, 6-9, and 10-12; and alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science) for peer review. Finally, please remember that, if NDE makes other significant changes in its 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. We have found it a pleasure working with your staff on this review. I wish you well in your continued efforts to improve student achievement in Nevada.

If you have any questions, please contact Daniel Behrend of my staff at: OSS.Nevada@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank Brogan
Assistant Secretary for Elementary and
Secondary Education

Enclosure

cc: Peter Zutz, Administrator, Assessment, Data, and Accountability Management

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

February 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS..... 3
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students 4
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards 6
1.3 – Required Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only) 7
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only) 8
1.5 – Participation Data (reviewed by Department staff only)10

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS..... 11
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....12
2.2 – Item Development.....17
2.3 – Test Administration19
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only) 25
2.5 – Test Security..... 27
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 30

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY 32
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 32
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes 34
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure..... 36
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables 37

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER 38
4.1 – Reliability..... 39
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility 43
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum 46
4.4 – Scoring..... 48
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms.....51
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment 54
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance..... 57

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS..... 59
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 60
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs 63
5.3 – Accommodations..... 65
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations 68

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING 70
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students..... 70
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting71
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 73
6.4 – Reporting..... 78

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

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 Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State.</p>	<p>Nevada’s adoption of the academic content standards fulfilled Nevada’s need more challenging standards to prepare its students for college and the modern workplace and to place Nevada’s education system on par with other states.</p> <p>Supporting Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #001 Nevada Executive Order 2013 06 Establish the Common Core State Standards Steering Committee • File #002 NV Transition Plan Overview Common Core State Standards from NDE website November 2017 • File #003 Nevada Statewide Implementation History Presentation to the Legislative Committee on Education April 22 2014 • File #004 Nevada K-12_ELA_Academic Content Standards • File #005 Nevada K12_Mathematics_Academic Content Standards • File #006 Nevada Academic Content Standard Based on the Common Core Brochure_V5 Retrieved from NDE website December 2017 • File #115 NAC Chapter 389 (see 389.195 – 389.4645) <p>Nevada’s ESSA Plan included information related to the adoption and implementation of these standards and has been approved by the U.S. Department of Education.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #009 Nevada Department of Education Consolidated State Plan Under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) April 2017. Information about standards adoption, transition, and implementation is on pages 30-31, 106, 115, • File #010 Approval Letter of Nevada’s ESSA Plan from Secretary Betsy DeVos August 9 2017 • File #011 US DOE Press Release Secretary DeVos Announces Approval of Nevada, New Jersey and New Mexico’s ESSA Plans Aug 9 2017 	<p>Evidence provided is sufficient. No additional evidence is required.</p>
<p>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science specify what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school to succeed in college and the workforce; contain content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.</p>	<p>Evidence provided for Section 1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students provides the relevant information related to the adoption of the Nevada Academic Content Standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #001 Nevada Executive Order 2013 06 Establish the Common Core State Standards Steering Committee • File #003 Nevada Statewide Implementation History Presentation to the Legislative Committee on Education April 22 2014 • File #024 Smarter Balanced English Language Arts Literacy Content Specifications (July 2015) • File #025 Smarter Balanced English Language Arts Literacy Content Specifications Appendix B Grade Level Tables (July 2015) • File #026 Smarter Balanced Mathematics Content Specifications (July 2015) 	<p>No additional evidence is required.</p>
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

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">1.3 – Required Assessments</p> <p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments (based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate academic achievement standards-AAAS) in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). 	<p>Evidence of this requirement being met is found in:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Nevada Alternate Assessment Test Administrator’s Manual 2) File #095 Nevada Alternate Assessment Administration Training 3) File #099 2017 Nevada Alternate Assessment Achievement Level Descriptors for Mathematics 4) File #098 2017 Nevada Alternate Assessment Achievement Level Descriptors for ELA 	<p>Nevada provided evidence that it has a system that includes annual general and alternate assessments, which incorporates the necessary subjects and grade levels. The evidence provided is adequate to meet this requirement.</p>
<p>Section 1.3 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 Nevada

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p align="center">1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</p> <p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system; • For English learners (EL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment; ○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years. 	<p>Nevada is using Smarter Balanced and have provided evidence that they meet this requirement. Below are a few items that they provided:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) File #112 Special Education Monitor Checklist 2) File #096 2017 Nevada Alternate Assessment Test Administration Manual 3) Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium: Guidelines for Accessibility for English Language Learners 4) File #106 2017 Nevada Summative Assessment Student Report Spanish 5) File #094 Smarter Balanced Students with Disabilities Advisory Committee 	<p>Nevada has provided evidence that it has policies and procedures in place to guide districts in determining, on a case-by-case basis, when and how to use Spanish language assessments. The evidence provided is adequate to meet this requirement.</p>
<p>Section 1.4 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 Nevada

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p align="center">1.5 – Participation Data</p> <p>The State’s participation data show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system. In addition, if the State administers end-of-course assessments for high school students, the State has procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates on each required assessment and provides the corresponding data.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) File #123 Participation Rates By Subgroup 2) See Smarter Balance 	<p>Nevada has provided evidence that all students must take State assessment.</p> <p>Evidence requirements met</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 Nevada

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 Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p 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); 	<p>Detailed information about the purpose of the Nevada Summative Assessment and the intended interpretations and uses of the results are described in the Nevada Summative Assessment Technical Report.</p> <p>Bullet 1 Evidence Files #38, 39, 40, 41 & 46. Nevada specific information supporting purpose and use of assessments.</p> <p>Bullet 2 Evidence Files #24, #25, #26 provide detailed information connecting evidence-centered design of the assessment with the Common Core State Standards.</p> <p>#24, pages 7-14. A clear theory of action explains how the assessment of content is intended to be fully integrated with learning system and provide accessibility to content within the assessment through use of universal design for learning (UDL) Pages 15-25 Detailed development process is provided for ELA claims, assessment targets, connection to CCSS, determining evidence to support claims, and determining item types for gathering evidence to support claims.</p> <p>Additional details on the overall ELA/Literacy claims, the four subclaims and the assessment targets for these claims are provided.</p> <p>Files #24 and #25 Depth of knowledge details are provided in appendix starting on page 54 and linked to Claims and Assessment Targets. File #26 provides similar detail for mathematics as described above for ELA.</p> <p>#24 page 29, The summative assessment targets reference the specific standards for each grade level that the test developer used to guide item and task development for consistent sampling within and across grade levels.</p>	<p>Bullet #1: Evidence requirements met for Statement of Purpose</p> <p>Nevada-specific statement of purpose Page 8, 2.1 Uses of Test Scores</p> <p>Bullet s# 2-4: See results of 2016/2018 Smarter Balance Assessment Peer 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 Nevada

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"> If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design. 	<p>#26 page 29. Describes how assessment targets are linked to cluster levels of standards to support mathematics claims at domain level. “Therefore, this content specifications document <i>uses the cluster headings as the targets of assessment</i> for generating evidence for Claim #1. For each cluster, guidance is provided that gives item developers important information about item/task considerations for the cluster. Sample items are also provided that illustrate the content scope and range of difficulty appropriate to assess a cluster.”</p> <p>Blueprints for Smarter Balanced (Files #23 and #27) provide additional detail to connect how challenging content of CCSS is assessed and the level of coverage of content standards through details of available items/item types and DOK alignment within the computer adaptive assessment.</p> <p>In order 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), the Smarter Balanced organization had an alignment study completed by the Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) in 2014. Information on the method and results of the alignment student can be found in the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> File #034 Smarter Balanced HumRRO alignment-study-report April 2016) File #054 Smarter Balanced Press Release February 2016 National Evaluations Again Confirm Quality and Alignment of Smarter <p>The Smarter content specifications and test blueprints demonstrate that the State’s test design and test development processes are well-suited for the content, are technically sound, and align the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content</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 Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>standards. The content specifications show the item types, number of items assessing higher order thinking skills, and item alignment information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #024 Smarter Balanced English Language Arts Literacy Content Specifications (July 2015) • File #025 Smarter Balanced English Language Arts Literacy Content Specifications Appendix B Grade Level Tables (July 2015) • File #026 Smarter Balanced Mathematics Content Specifications (July 2015) <p>The test blueprints demonstrate alignment to content (standard) coverage and Depth of Knowledge range coverage. Highlights of each test blueprint is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #023 Smarter Balanced English Language Arts Literacy Summative Assessment Blueprint (November 10 2016): The test blueprint for ELA shows content organized according to claim categories that align to the Nevada Academic Content Standards in ELA/Literacy. Results aligned to these claim categories are reported on the Individual Student Reports and the Summary Reports. • File #027 Smarter Balanced Mathematics Summative Assessment Blueprint (November 11 2016): The Smarter test blueprints for the mathematics test similarly show content organized according to claim categories that align to the Nevada Academic Content Standards in Mathematics. Results aligned to these claim categories are reported on the Individual Student Reports and the Summary Reports. <p>Computer-Adaptive Testing: The Spring 2016 Nevada Smarter Balanced Summative assessment administration consisted of 12 operational grade-level assessments as well as a computer-adaptive test (CAT). The design of the online assessment contained the following components:</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 Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>ELA CAT Section ELA Performance Tasks (2 spiraled fixed forms) Mathematics CAT Section Mathematics Performance Tasks (2 spiraled fixed forms) For the accommodated tests, a fixed form was substituted for the CAT sections. Evidence to support the use of the computer-adaptive test component is documented in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #028 Nevada Summative Assessment Technical Report 2015- 2016 and File #029 Nevada Summative Assessment Technical Report 2016-2017 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Section 1.3 provides information on the design of the Nevada Summative Assessments ○ Chapter 3: Computer Adaptive Testing <p>Evidence to support the requirement that the computer adaptive the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design and hit the targets specified by the test blueprints, while insuring appropriate item exposure rates as supported by the following evidence obtained through CAT simulation testing. Simulation testing is performed annually after the item pool is refreshed with new items and metadata delivered by Smarter Balanced.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #031 Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment Simulation Results (October 2016) • File #028 Nevada Summative Assessment Technical Report 2015- 2016 and File #029 Nevada Summative Assessment Technical Report 2016-2017 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 3: Computer Adaptive Testing ○ Section 6.2: Distribution of Item Types ○ Section 6.4: Item Difficulty ○ Section 6.6: Blueprint Fidelity • File #057 UCLA CRESST 2016-2017-simulation-based-evaluationsummative-item-pools February 2017 	
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See results of 2016/2018 Smarter Balance Assessment Peer Review. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">2.2 – 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>The test content used for the Nevada Summative Assessment was provided by the Smarter Balanced organization. Nevada is a member state of Smarter Balanced and pays annual dues for access the test content provided by Smarter, as well as the content for the Smarter Interim Assessment, and the Smarter Digital Library.</p> <p>Evidence to support reasonable and sound procedures in Item and Test Development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #030 Smarter Balanced Summative Technical Report, 2015-2016 • File #051 Smarter Balanced Bias and Sensitivity Guidelines April 2012 • File #052 Smarter Balanced General Accessibility Guidelines • File #053 Smarter Balanced Guidelines-for-Accessibility-for-English Language-Learners • File #055 Smarter Balanced Style Guide April 2015 • File #056 Sample Items and Item Type Information http://sampleitems.smarterbalanced.org/ • File #058 Smarter Balanced Item and Test Specifications for ELA_ELA Item Specifications Tab Screen Shot December 2017 on webpage http://www.smarterbalanced.org/assessments/development/ • File #059 Smarter Balanced Item and Test Specifications for Mathematics_Mathematics Item Specifications Tab Screen Shot December 2017 on webpage http://www.smarterbalanced.org/assessments/development/ 	<p>See results of 2016/2018 Smarter Balance Assessment Peer Review.</p>
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See results of 2016/2018 Smarter Balance Assessment Peer Review. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

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 Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>General assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics and science: grade 3- 8 The Nevada Department of Education, communicates test administration policies and procedures to district and school staff via monthly webinars, trainings, manuals, testing activity calendars, and webpages. The Office of Assessment is tasked with ensuring the successful coordination and administration of the Nevada Summative Assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #046 Nevada State Assessment System Overview 2016_2017 from NDEwebsite November 2017 • File #022 Nevada Test Security Procedures, 2015-2016 • File #007 Smarter Balanced State Procedures Manual (2015) • File #060 Nevada Student Assessments Activity Calendar for District Test Directors • File #061 Nevada NDE Student Assessment Calendar for the 2015-16 School Year • File #028 Nevada Summative Assessment Technical Report 2015-2016 and • File #029 Nevada Summative Assessment Technical Report 2016-2017 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 4: Test Administration • File #122 District Test Director Monthly Agenda Sample <p>File #121 District Test Director Meeting PowerPoint Sample</p> <p>Published documents that communicate test administration policies and procedures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #016 2017 Nevada Summative Assessment Test Coordinator’s Manual • File #017 2016 Nevada Summative Test 	<p>Bullet # 1: Evidence requirements met.</p> <p>Bullet # 2: While evidence is provided of materials communicating procedures and requirements for training, it is unclear which procedures ensure that all individuals administering assessments receive the training. Confidentiality agreement is insufficient to meet this requirement. For example, page 8 of File # 022 requires principals to ensure staff are trained annually. However, it is unclear how the state education agency ensures principals received training and materials from district or state, and whether staff received annual training as per the documentation indicated on page 8.</p> <p>Peers request additional evidence to meet this critical element specific to ensuring established procedures result in all individuals receive training.</p> <p>Bullet #3: Some evidence is provided addressing test irregularities and technology-based assessment requirements and some procedures.</p> <p>Peers did not see evidence of state contingency-plans for technology-based test administration (such as force majeure, hacking, and other unforeseen incidents).</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 Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Administration Manual for Online Testing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #018 2016 Nevada Summative Test Administration Manual for Accommodated Testing • File #019 2016 Nevada Summative Assessment Test Administration Supplement ELA Scripts • File #020 2016 Nevada Summative Assessment Test Administration Supplement Mathematics Scripts • File #022 Nevada Test Security Procedures, 2015-2016 <p>The Nevada Department of Education, provides multiple training resources, including comprehensive manuals, in-person training events, and online live webinars and FAQ sessions to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the Nevada Summative Assessment receive training on the established administration procedures. The Nevada Department of Education annually conducts in-person, half-day test administration training events at four different locations around the State, approximately two months prior to the start of test administration window.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #062 Regional Admin Training Sessions_Invitation_02.02.17 • File #063 Regional Training Administration Presentation for February 2017_FINAL File. The presentation covers administration policies, procedures, and test preparation, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ All administrator roles and responsibilities ○ Test security policies, procedures, and resources ○ Accessibility policies, procedures, and resources ○ Staff and student preparation and 	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p align="center">training resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Technology overview ○ Test administration instructions <p>Accessibility training resources include the Nevada Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guide and instructions contained in the Test Administration Manual and the Test Coordinator Manual.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● File #037 Nevada Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodation Guide 2016- 2017 <p>To ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the Nevada Summative Assessment receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments, test administrators, proctors, and other staff authorized to view test content must sign a confidentiality form verifying that all test material and student information must be handled in a professional, secure, and confidential manner. The signed forms are collected and retained with the school’s test security documentation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● File #064 2017 Confidentiality Agreement Form <p>The district test coordinator is responsible for planning and implementing a training session for all individuals involved in the administration of the Nevada Summative Assessment, including test administrators and proctors. Training must involve the review of instructions for test administration, test security, and individual responsibilities such as distributing and collecting materials, coding the student identifying/demographic information in student management system, and monitoring to make certain that each student is working independently. This training requirement is documented in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● File #016 2017 Nevada Summative Assessment Test Coordinator’s Manual on page 9. The test security procedures are documented in the following documents used by district and school personnel: 	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

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"> • File #016 2017 Nevada Summative Assessment Test Coordinator’s Manual • File #017 2016 Nevada Summative Test Administration Manual for Online Testing • File #022 Nevada Test Security Procedures, 2015-2016 <p>The Nevada Summative Assessment an online technology-based assessment. The State has defined technology and system requirements and provides detailed instructions and guidance for district test directors and district technology personnel. Training materials include comprehensive Technology User Guides, System Requirement Documentation, memos, and webinars. The testing engine is referred to as DRC INSIGHT, and the student assessment registration and management system is known as DRC eDIRECT. •</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #014 2017 DRC INSIGHT User Guide • File #015 2017 DRC eDIRECT User Guide • File #065 Quick Reference Guide eDIRECT 2017 • File #066 Nevada DRC INSIGHT Testing Site Manager Software Webinar Oct2016 • File #067 Nevada Technology Training Webinar Invitation DRC INSIGHT • File #068 Nevada 2017 DRC INSIGHT Testing Site Manager Guidelines • File#069 Nevada DRC INSIGHT System Requirements_2016_Q4_10_12_16 <p>The state provides specific resources to schools and districts to ensure that test administrators and students are familiar with the online testing platform, electronic devices, and online tools that will be used to administer the Nevada Summative Assessment. Student video tutorials familiarize students with the navigation and features of the online test, and administrator video tutorials review administration procedures and instructions for managing</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 Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>students in the online testing software. The Online Tools Training (OTT) walks students and administrators through signing on to a test, selecting a test session, responding to different item types, using the many tools available in the testing system, navigating the review screen, and submitting the test.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #070 Student Tutorials and Online Tools Training hyperlink screen shot December 2017 • File #071 Student Tutorials and Online Tools Training Landing Page screen shot December 2017 • File #072 Online Tools Training screen shot December 2017 • File #073 Student Tutorial screen shot December 2017 • File #074 Student Practice Test screen shot December 2017 <p>Contingency plans to address any technology challenges or problems are determined based on each individual situation, and the nature or prevalence of the issue. Districts and schools are instructed to contact the DRC Helpdesk or the Office of Assessment as soon as any issue arises. In addition, Volume 5 of the Technology User Guide contains information about training, troubleshooting and FAQs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #016 2017 Nevada Summative Assessment Test Coordinator’s Manual <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Page 23 provides the Help Desk contact information on hours of operation. • File #043: Technology User Guide Volume 5: Troubleshooting 	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 2.3 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peers request additional evidence of established procedures ensuring that all individuals receive training. • Peers request evidence of state contingency plans for technology-based 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 Nevada

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p align="center">2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p>Smarter Balance 1) File #128 NDE Online Monitoring Procedures</p>	<p>Evidence provided is adequate to meet this requirement.</p>
<p>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

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 Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.5 – Test Security</p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. 	<p>District and school personnel involved in testing are required to review the test security materials and sign a statement indicating that they have reviewed the materials and will adhere to the security protocols. The district test coordinator is responsible for planning and implementing a training session for all individuals involved in the administration of the Nevada Summative Assessment, including test administrators and proctors. Training must involve the review of instructions for test administration, test security, and individual responsibilities such as distributing and collecting materials, coding the student identifying/demographic information in student management system, and monitoring to make certain that each student is working independently. This training requirement is documented in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #016 2017 Nevada Summative Assessment Test Coordinator’s Manual, page 9. • File #064 2017 Confidentiality Agreement Form <p>The test security procedures are documented in the following documents used by district and school personnel:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #016 2017 Nevada Summative Assessment Test Coordinator’s Manual • File #017 2016 Nevada Summative Test Administration Manual for Online Testing • File #022 Nevada Test Security Procedures, 2015-2016 <p>After testing is complete, NDE reviews telemetry data that provide information about numbers of answer changes, average length of testing, and average testing time per item.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #083 Nevada 2017 Summative Assessment Telemetry Report Each year NDE reports all monitoring findings to the Nevada State Assembly • File #117 Test Security Summary 	<p>Bullets # 1-4: Evidence is sufficient to meet this critical element.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	NDE contracted with Caveon Consulting to analyze and report on Nevada’s test security system. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #127 Caveon CBT Security Analysis for NDE • File #128 NDE Online Monitoring Procedures 	
Section 2.5 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 Nevada

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 Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 	<p>Protecting the privacy of students is a both a legal and moral responsibility that the Nevada Department of Education takes very seriously. The State and its assessment vendor have policies and procedures in place to protect the security of test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable student information. NDE provides guidance data privacy to districts who are responsible for ensuring secure test administration and securely managing student information. NDE and its test vendor follow FERPA regulations. NDE maintain secure folders on NDE servers (Bighorn) for test-related materials and data, with access limited to those authorized by the NDE based on district requests. The testing vendor uses a secure SFTP site for transferring student information with NDE. Additionally, the test vendor uses separate SFTP sites to transfer student information with several of the larger districts in Nevada. Further, access to student information and test scores on the eDIRECT assessment management system is permission based and requires secure user names and passwords. Access is granted to the State and District Test Directors. District Test Directors may grant access to other authorized staff in their own district</p> <p>Security of test materials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #016 2017 Nevada Summative Assessment Test Coordinator’s Manual • File #017 2016 Nevada Summative Test Administration Manual for Online Testing • File #022 Nevada Summative Materials Accountability Form • File #022 Nevada Test Security Procedures, 2015-2016 Data security and student privacy • File #042 Nevada Data privacy fact sheet 04112014 	<p>Evidence needed to demonstrate the state meets this critical element specific to the following.</p> <p>Bullet 1: use of results—confidentiality agreement covers test materials and related data but does not specifically address or provide guidance on confidentiality procedures with regards to the use of results of the assessments at student and group levels.</p> <p>Bullet 2: Materials submitted address policies and procedures to protect integrity and confidentiality of <i>test materials and administration</i>. Evidence provided to support this bullet <i>did not include</i> guidelines for districts and schools on how to protect <i>student privacy and confidentiality</i>.</p> <p>Bullet 3: To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, specifically, in the evidence submitted for this critical element peers did not find evidence of how the state defines the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups, as well as how it addresses of uniformity of scores for any particular group of 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 Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p style="text-align: center;">- version 2a from NDE website November 2017</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #043 Nevada Data Dictionary 04292014 • File #044 Nevada Information Security and Privacy Policy Approved by State Board of Education 012915 • File #085 Family Education Rights and Privacy Act FERPA • File #086 FERPA Summary • File #087 Nevada Data Sharing Agreement with test vendor Sept2015 • File #119 NDE Information Security and Privacy Policy • File #118 NRS 385A.830 Operation of system in compliance with federal laws governing release and confidentiality of records. • File #120 NDE Information Security Policy and Procedures Report 	
Section 2.6 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peers request evidence of guidelines for districts and schools on how to protect <i>student</i> privacy and confidentiality. • Peers request evidence of how the state defines the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups, as well as how it addresses reporting in instances of uniformity of scores for any particular group of students. In addition, peers request evidence these procedures are incorporated into training. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

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 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>The Nevada Summative Assessment Technical Report and the Smarter Balanced Technical Report provide evidence of the validity and reliability of the Nevada Summative Assessment, in adherence to the <i>Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing</i> (American Educational Research Association [AERA], American Psychological Association [APA], & National Council on Measurement in Education [NCME], 2014), and provides evidence that valid inferences about Nevada student performance can be derived from this assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #028 Nevada Summative Assessment Technical Report 2015-2016 and File #029 Nevada Summative Assessment Technical Report 2016- 2017 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 7: Test Results - The results in the tables in this chapter present evidence of reliability and validity of the scores from the Nevada Smarter Balanced Summative assessments. ○ Chapter 9: Evidence of Construct-Related Validity – this chapter demonstrates the adherence to AERA, APA, & NCME (2014) Standards 2.0, 2.3, 2.13, 2.14, 2.16, and 2.19. ○ Chapter 10: Fairness - This chapter is relevant to AERA, APA, & NCME (2014) Standards 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, and 3.6. 	<p>See results of 2016/2018 Smarter Balance Assessment Peer Review.</p>
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See results of 2016/2018 Smarter Balance Assessment Peer Review. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

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 Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">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>As part of the Smarter Balanced item development and selection, content experts reviewed items to ensure representativeness of content standards and grade-level appropriateness. Item writers focus on the cognitive dimensions of what the items are assessing, as well as the content dimensions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #030 Smarter Balanced Summative Technical Report 2015-2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 1: Validity ○ Chapter 4: Test Design, provides evidence on pages 4-14 through 4-20 on the item development process, item writer qualifications and training, and reviews by committees of educators for accessibility, bias/sensitivity, and content. ○ Appendix B: Test Design Development Activity and Outcome. <p>The Content Specifications detail the numbers of items by reporting category, standard, item type and DOK. The test blueprints outline reporting categories as well as the range (by grade level) of the depth of knowledge (DOK) expectations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #023 Smarter Balanced English Language Arts Literacy Summative Assessment Blueprint (November 10 2016) • File #024 Smarter Balanced English Language Arts Literacy Content Specifications (July 2015) • File #025 Smarter Balanced English Language Arts Literacy Content Specifications Appendix B Grade Level Tables (July 2015) • File #026 Smarter Balanced Mathematics Content Specifications (July 2015) • File #027 Smarter Balanced Mathematics Summative Assessment Blueprint (November 11 2016) • File #058 Smarter Balanced Item and Test Specifications for ELA_ELA Item Specifications Tab Screen Shot December 2017 on webpage http://www.smarterbalanced.org/assessments/development/ 	<p>See results of 2016/2018 Smarter Balance Assessment Peer 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 Nevada

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"> • File #059 Smarter Balanced Item and Test Specifications for Mathematics_Mathematics Item Specifications Tab Screen Shot December 2017 on webpage http://www.smarterbalanced.org/assessments/development/ • File #030 Smarter Balanced Summative Technical Report 2015-2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 4: Test Design provides evidence that the CCSS address skills required for college and career readiness. It also describes test structure (claims, targets) and its relationship to the CCSS, item and task development and alignment studies. Chapter 4 also has information about the operational blueprints, adaptive algorithm, test scoring method and application and pool analysis. <p>To verify that the Nevada Summative Assessment use the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards, the Smarter Balanced organization had an alignment study completed by the Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) in 2014. Information on the method and results of the alignment student can be found in the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #034 Smarter Balanced HumRRO alignment-study-report April 2016) • File #054 Smarter Balanced Press Release February 2016 National Evaluations Again Confirm Quality and Alignment of Smarter Balanced End-of-Year Test 	
Section 3.2 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See results of 2016/2018 Smarter Balance Assessment Peer Review. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p>The Nevada Summative Assessment’s end-to-end design includes a front-end process to ensure that the blueprint/design is followed in item review and form building, which minimizes irrelevant construct information. This process is documented in the following places.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #030 Smarter Balanced Summative Technical Report 2015-2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 4: Test Design • Appendix B: Test Design Development Activity and Outcome. <p>After testing, several statistics are calculated to verify that the scoring and reporting structures of the Nevada Summative Assessment are consistent with the content standards. Analyses include differential item functioning (DIF), correlations between content standards, and principal component analysis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #030 Smarter Balanced Summative Technical Report 2015-2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 3: Test Fairness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pages 3-14 through 3-18 describe DIF calculations ▪ Tables 3.5 and 3.6 present DIF results • File #028 Nevada Summative Assessment Technical Report 2015-2016 and File #029 Nevada Summative Assessment Technical Report 2016- 2017 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Section 10.2 describes the DIF calculations and results for the Nevada Summative Assessment are reported by Nevada’s test vendor. 	<p>See results of 2016/2018 Smarter Balance Assessment Peer Review.</p>
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See results of 2016/2018 Smarter Balance Assessment Peer Review. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>The Smarter Balanced organization evaluated the Smarter Balanced test scores to other external variables as a way of evaluating the validity of the test. This type of evidence is essential for supporting the validity of certain inferences based on scores from the Smarter Balanced assessments for certifying college and career readiness, which is one of the primary test purposes. Chapter 5 of the Smarter Balanced Summative Technical Report 2015-2016 provides information on the item performance for NAEP, PISA, and Smarter Balanced items for a subset of students who took National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) items as embedded field test items in spring 2014 field test. These NAEP and PISA items were included in the Ordered Item Booklets used during the bookmark standard setting procedure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #030 Smarter Balanced Summative Technical Report 2015-2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 5: Scores, Scales, and Norms 	<p>See results of 2016/2018 Smarter Balance Assessment Peer Review.</p>
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See results of 2016/2018 Smarter Balance Assessment Peer Review. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

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 Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.1 – Reliability</p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement. 	<p>Evidence for the measurement precision of the Nevada Summative Assessment is provided in the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment Technical Report (File #030) and the Nevada Summative Assessment Technical Reports (Files #028 and File #029). The evidence shows that the reliability of the scores meet acceptable levels according to standards of best practice. Standard errors of measurement and conditional standard errors of measurement show that the scores of the Nevada Summative Assessment are sufficiently precise to provide meaningful information at both individual student and aggregate levels. Additionally, evidence is provided showing that the Nevada Summative Assessment accurately classifies Nevada students into proficiency levels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #030 Smarter Balanced Summative Technical Report 2015-2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 2: Reliability/Precision and Errors of Measurement presents simulated and operational conditional standard errors of measurement, marginal and fixed-form reliability, test information curves; observed decision consistency and accuracy; simulation results for bias and theta recovery. ○ Pages 2-51 through 2-57 discuss test reliability and Standard Error of Measurement (SEM) and Conditional Standard Error of Measurement (CSEM). ○ Table 2-56 presents the overall SEM and the CSEM by scale score decile for ELA/literacy and mathematics. This table shows that the CSEM is relatively similar for deciles between 2 and 10. The CSEM tends to be higher at the first decile. 	<p>See results of 2016/2018 Smarter Balance Assessment Peer 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 Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>To evaluate whether the computer-adaptive tests provide adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement, the Nevada Summative Assessment is run through a series of CAT simulations prior to any students taking the tests. Overall, the results of the simulations found that the CAT provided good estimation of student proficiency while maintaining very low item exposure rates for the vast majority of items. The evidence from the simulation studies are presented in the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File # 057 UCLA CRESST 2016-2017-simulatin-based-evaluation-summative-item-pools February 2017 • File #088 Smarter Balanced testing-procedures-for-adaptive- item-selection-algorithm • File #030 Smarter Balanced Summative Technical Report 2015-2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Page 2.2 - Simulations Studies for 2014-15 Operational Summative Tests • File #028 Nevada Summative Assessment Technical Report 2015-2016 and File #029 Nevada Summative Assessment Technical Report 2016-2017 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Section 3.8 provides a summary of simulation results ○ Chapter 3 provides information on Nevada Smarter Balanced CAT algorithm including entry point, ability estimation and standard error of measurement, passage selection, test navigation, test termination, and forced submission. 	
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
<input type="checkbox"/> No additional state-specific evidence is required.		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

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"> See results of 2016/2018 Smarter Balance Assessment Peer Review. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

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 Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<p>The Smarter Balanced organization takes great effort was undertaken to ensure that the Smarter Balanced content used on the Nevada Summative Assessment is accessible and fair to all students and student groups. All Smarter Balanced test items and performance tasks were reviewed for content and fairness by content experts and bias/sensitivity committees. Content area test development specialists and content editorial specialists reviewed items and passages for fairness and sensitivity, and adherence to the Principles of Universal Design in all steps of the forms creation and review process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #030 Smarter Balanced Summative Technical Report 2015-2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 3: Fairness ○ Chapter 4: Test Design. • Appendix A: Item Development Process Flowchart • Appendix B: Test Design Development Activity and Outcome. <p>In the Smarter Balanced item design and review process, writers and reviewers are provided training and guidance to ensure fairness across student groups.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #051 Smarter Balanced Bias and Sensitivity Guidelines April 2012 • File #052 Smarter Balanced General Accessibility Guidelines • File #053 Smarter Balanced Guidelines-for-Accessibility-for-English-Language-Learners • File #055 Smarter Balanced Style Guide April 2015 <p>The Nevada Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodation Guide provides a description of the universal tools, designated supports, and accommodations available to students when taking the Nevada Summative Assessment.</p>	<p>See results of 2016/2018 Smarter Balance Assessment Peer 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 Nevada

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"> • File #035 Smarter Balanced Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guide • File #036 Nevada Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodation Guide 2015-2016 <p>The Technical Report also includes information regarding the Differential Item Functioning (DIF) analyses performed to determine fairness across subgroups as well as correlations between content area scores between subgroups.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #030 Smarter Balanced Summative Technical Report 2015-2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 3: Test Fairness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pages 3-14 through 3-18 describe DIF calculations ▪ Tables 3.5 and 3.6 present DIF results ○ Tables 2.15 and 2.16 provide the marginal reliability of total summative scores by ethnic group. • File #028 Nevada Summative Assessment Technical Report 2015-2016 • File #029 Nevada Summative Assessment Technical Report 2016- 2017 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Section 10.2 describes the DIF calculations and results for the Nevada Summative Assessment are reported by Nevada’s test vendor. ○ Tables 9.5 and 9.6 provide the marginal reliability of total summative scores by ethnic group. 	
Section 4.2 Summary Statement		
<u> </u> X No additional state-specific 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 Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See results of 2016/2018 Smarter Balance Assessment Peer Review. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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>The Nevada Summative Assessment provides a precise estimate of student performance across the entire score scale, as shown in the Technical Report. The results of the scaling and calibration efforts is shown in the Test Characteristic Curves (TCC) and standard error curves.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #030 Smarter Balanced Summative Technical Report 2015-2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 5: Scores, Scales and Norms - 60-68 describe calibration, scaling, equating, and test scales • File #089 Smarter Balanced Scoring Specifications July 28 2016 and • File #090 Smarter Balanced Scoring Specifications 2014_2015 describe the methodology of deriving the scaled scores, standard error of measurement, and the highest obtainable scale score (HOSS) and lowest obtainable scale score (LOSS) 	<p>See results of 2016/2018 Smarter Balance Assessment Peer Review.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional state-specific 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"> • See results of 2016/2018 Smarter Balance Assessment Peer Review. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

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 Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>The Smarter Balanced Technical Report and the Nevada Summative Assessment Technical Reports provide evidence that Nevada has established and documented standardized scoring procedures designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results that are consistent with Nevada’s academic performance standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #028 Nevada Summative Assessment Technical Report 2015-2016 and File #029 Nevada Summative Assessment Technical Report 2016-2017 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Section 5.1 describes the hand-scoring process for human scored test items, including information on the training and monitoring of human scorers. ○ Section 5.2 describes the scoring process for technology-enhanced items ○ Section 5.3 describes the machine scoring process for multiple-choice and multiple-select items. <p>In the Smarter Balanced Technical Report, data calibration, test scaling, and the process of the derivation of student scale scores is described.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #030 Smarter Balanced Summative Technical Report, 2015-2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 7: Reporting and Interpretation <p>Smarter Balanced provides scoring specifications to be used by their member states to standards scoring procedures and score scales.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #089 Smarter Balanced Scoring Specifications July 28 2016 • File #090 Smarter Balanced Scoring Specifications 2014_2015` <p>To assist with valid score interpretations the following documents are provided to districts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #038 Nevada Interpretive Guide to the Smarter Balanced Assessment Reports - 2017 • File #039 NDE Press Release New Score Reports Show Parents How Students Perform Year Over Year July 31 2017_files • File #041 NDE Press Release Department of Education Unveils Nevadareportcard.com to Help Drive Data Decision Making Process for Schools and Districts • File #040 Nevada Report Card website link http://www.nevadareportcard.com/di/ • File #075 Sample 2017 Individual Student Report 	<p>See results of 2016/2018 Smarter Balance Assessment Peer 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 Nevada

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"> • File #076 Sample 2017 Summary Report • File #077 File layout for District Student Data Files Reporting Deliverable • File #084 Smarter Balanced interpretation-and-use-of-scores-and- achievement-levels 	
Section 4.4 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional state-specific 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"> • See results of 2016/2018 Smarter Balance Assessment Peer Review. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

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 Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p>Information describing the construction of forms is provided in the Smarter Balanced Technical Report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> File #030 Smarter Balanced Summative Technical Report, 2015-2016, Chapter 4: Test Design. <p>The Nevada Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment consists of 12 operational grade- level assessments (6 for ELA and 6 for mathematics) as well as a computer-adaptive test (CAT). The design of the online assessment contained the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ELA CAT Section ELA Performance Tasks (2 spiraled fixed forms) Mathematics CAT Section Mathematics Performance Tasks (2 spiraled fixed forms) <p>Fixed form tests are substituted for the CAT Sections for students who require accommodations.</p> <p>The method of combining item level scores to produce overall scale scores is presented in detail in the Smarter Balanced Scoring Specification document. Scores are calculated based on item-pattern scoring using maximum likelihood estimation applied at the overall test level. No additional weights for item types or performance tasks are applied. Instead, a student’s scale score is based on the student’s responses to each item (his/her item- response vector) in combination with the properties of each item in terms of item information. In this way, items with characteristics that more accurately estimate a student’s score contribute more weight (i.e., information) to the total score.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> File #090 Smarter Balanced Scoring Specifications 2014_2015 <p>The Smarter Balanced Technical Report discusses the IRT</p>	<p>See results of 2016/2018 Smarter Balance Assessment Peer 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 Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>scaling for Smarter Balanced items, and the establishment of vertical and horizontal scales, which allow for consistent score interpretations within or across school years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> File #030 Smarter Balanced Summative Technical Report, 2015-2016, page 5-4 on Vertical Scale. <p>After scores are placed on the scale, which is reused annually, Achievement Level performance can be determined by using the scale score ranges identified for each of the four Achievement Levels, which are used across years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> File #101 Nevada Summative Assessment Achievement Level Descriptors for Grades 3 through 5 File #102 Nevada Summative Assessment Achievement Level Descriptors for Grades 6 through 8 File #103 Nevada Summative Achievement Level Cut Scores 08182017 <p>ELA and mathematics claim-level scores are reported as: Above Standard At/Near Standard Below Standard</p> <p>Claim-level performance can be used to identify an individual student’s strengths and weaknesses or can be analyzed at a group level to identify areas where several students are in need of additional instruction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> File #030 Smarter Balanced Summative Technical Report, 2015-2016, pages 7-3 and 7-5 on Subscores 	
Section 4.5 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional state-specific evidence is required.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See results of 2016/2018 Smarter Balance Assessment Peer Review. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

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 Nevada

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>A feature of Smarter Balanced assessments is that they are customized for each student for a more accurate measurement of the student’s performance. To accomplish this, the computer-based test adjusts the difficulty of questions throughout the assessment based on the student’s response. If a student answers a question correctly, the next question will be harder; if a student answers incorrectly, the next question will be easier. This system is called computer adaptive testing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> File #028 Nevada Summative Assessment Technical Report 2015-2016 and File #029 Nevada Summative Assessment Technical Report 2016-2017 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 3: Computer Adaptive Testing <p>The method of combining item level scores to produce overall scale scores is presented in detail in the Smarter Balanced Scoring Specification document. Scores are calculated based on item-pattern scoring using maximum likelihood estimation applied at the overall test level. No additional weights for item types or performance tasks are applied.</p> <p>Instead, a student’s scale score is based on the student’s responses to each item (his/her item-response vector) in combination with the properties of each item in terms of item information. In this way, items with characteristics that more accurately estimate a student’s score contribute more weight (i.e., information) to the total score.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> File #090 Smarter Balanced Scoring Specifications 2014_2015 <p>The Nevada Smarter Balanced Summative</p>	<p>See results of 2016/2018 Smarter Balance Assessment Peer 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 Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Assessment consists of 12 operational grade- level assessments (6 for ELA and 6 for mathematics) as well as a computer-adaptive test (CAT). The design of the online assessment contained the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ELA CAT Section ELA Performance Tasks (2 spiraled fixed forms) Mathematics CAT Section Mathematics Performance Tasks (2 spiraled fixed forms) <p>Specific fixed forms are developed for the Nevada Summative Assessment to replace the CAT sections to provide for the following accommodated tests. Generally the same fixed forms are used for the paper/pencil, Large-Print, and Braille tests.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paper/pencil test (printed) • Large-Print test (printed) • Braille test (hard copy Braille) • Text-to-Speech (TTS) (computer-based) • Video Sign Language (VSL) with closed captioning (computer-based) 	
Section 4.6 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional state-specific evidence is required.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See results of 2016/2018 Smarter Balance Assessment Peer Review. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

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 Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p>The State has established and <i>implemented clear and technically sound criteria for analyses of the Nevada Smarter Summative data to ensure the quality of the assessment.</i> The entire Nevada Summative Assessment Technical Report and the Smarter Balanced Technical Report document the technical quality of the assessment through the test development, administration, scoring, data analysis and reporting processes.</p> <p>The State engages external consultants who serve as Technical Advisory Committee members to provide technical review of the components of the State’s assessment system, and advise the State on psychometric and measurement issues related to the design, development, implementation and technical maintenance related to its large-scale assessments. In addition to national experts who serve as consultants, NDE invites other stakeholders, such as District Test Coordinators to attend TAC meetings to provide perspective from the field in regard to the assessment program. The agenda and September 2016 Nevada TAC meeting is provided as evidence of technical analyses and ongoing maintenance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #091 NV_TAC_Agenda_9.12.2016 <p>Smarter Balanced has established a Technical Advisory Committee to inform the ongoing development and operation of the assessment system. These teams of national experts work to ensure the assessments accurately measure student progress and growth toward college and career readiness.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #092 Smarter Balanced Technical Advisory Committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dr. Derek Briggs serves on both the 	<p>TAC is included as part of a system to monitor and maintain the quality of the system.</p> <p>Although File #091 provides a TAC agenda. The TAC agenda, dated 09.12.2016.</p> <p>Peers request evidence of ongoing TAC meetings to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agenda (specific to the Grades 3-8 assessments that are the subject of this review) • Minutes (to include members in attendance, summary of discussion and TAC recommendations), • TAC membership with affiliations. <p>Peers requested a clearer connection between the work of the SBAC TAC and the implications for Nevada’s assessment system.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Nevada Technical Advisory Committee and the Smarter Balanced Technical Advisory Committee	

Section 4.7 Summary Statement

X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Peers requested a clearer connection between the work of the SBAC TAC and the implications for Nevada’s assessment system.
- Peers request evidence of ongoing TAC meetings to include:
 - Agenda (specific to the Grades 3-8 assessments that are the subject of this review)
 - Minutes (to include members in attendance, summary of discussion and TAC recommendations),
 - TAC membership with affiliations.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

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 Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards; • States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs; • Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment; • Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities; • Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students 	<p>All Nevada students enrolled in grades 3-8 must participate in the state assessment in English language arts and mathematics, including students with disabilities. NDE has provided guidance to districts, as described in Critical Element 1.4, to schools and parents regarding participation policies and impacts through the NDE website and other documents.</p> <p>The academic content standards for the Nevada Alternate Assessment are titled the Nevada Academic Content Standard (NVACS) Connectors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #097 NVACS Connectors on NDE Assessment Webpage Screen Shot Retrieved December 2017 Screen Shot <p>Individualized Educational Plan (IEP) teams are responsible for deciding whether students with disabilities will participate in the general education assessments (the Nevada Summative Assessment) with or without testing accommodations, or in the alternate assessment (NAA) with or without accommodations. In a given year, a student must participate in either all general education assessments or all alternate assessments, not parts of both. When determining whether a student who is eligible for special education services should participate in the alternate assessment or the general assessment, the student’s IEP team must determine whether the student meets all criteria for participation in the Alternate Assessment. If the IEP team determines that all criteria described on this form accurately characterize a student’s current educational situation, then the alternate assessment should be administered rather than the general assessment, in order to provide a meaningful evaluation of the student’s current academic achievement.</p> <p>The criteria for student inclusion in the Nevada Alternate Assessment is spelled on during Nevada Alternate Administration Training and in the Nevada Alternate Assessment Test Administration Manual.</p>	<p>Peers commend Nevada for the thoroughness of the response to this critical element.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>with disabilities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; • Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments); • The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #095 Nevada Alternate Assessment Administration Training o Slides 6, 7 and 8 • File #096 2017 Nevada Alternate Assessment Test Administration Manual <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Participation Guidelines, page 4 <p>IEP teams are required to document all accommodations and accessibility related needs within a student’s IEP or 504 Plan. To support the inclusion of all students in the Nevada Summative Assessment, the state provides the Nevada Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guide (UAAG). The UAAG is based on the Smarter Balanced Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodation Guidelines and the Nevada specific guidelines. Details on the embedded and non-embedded universal tools, designated supports, and accommodations are provided in the Nevada UAAG on an annual basis. Additionally, for students who have an IEP or 504 Plan that indicate the use of an accommodation on the state assessments, administrators are required to complete the Nevada Special Testing Accommodation Request Form and a Testing Accommodations for Students in Special Education and 504 Programs (that is a required attachment to the student’s IEP or 504 Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #016 2017 Nevada Summative Assessment Test Coordinator’s Manual, Section on Students with Special Needs, pages 12-13. • File #035 Smarter Balanced Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guide • File #036 Nevada Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodation Guide 2015-2016 • File #037 Nevada Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodation Guide 2016-2017 • File #049 Nevada IEP_504Accommodations1718_110117 • File #050 Nevada Special Testing Accommodation Request Form 	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>The Smarter Balanced organization has established an advisory committee o provide technical guidance regarding the assessment of students of all abilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #094 Smarter Balanced Students with Disabilities Advisory Committee <p>Parents/guardians are informed by the student’s IEP team if they will be participating on the alternate assessment or the general education assessment, with or without accommodations. Students’ performance on the alternate or general education assessment are reported on different scales and use different achievement levels that were established through separate standard settings. The different scales, achievement levels, and cut scores are documented in the following program evidence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #098 2017 Nevada Alternate Assessment Achievement Level Descriptors for ELA • File #099 2017 Nevada Alternate Assessment Achievement Level Descriptors for Mathematics • File #100 2017 Nevada Alternate Assessment Cut Scores • File #101 Nevada Summative Assessment Achievement Level Descriptors for Grades 3 through 5 • File #102 Nevada Summative Assessment Achievement Level Descriptors for Grades 6 through 8 • File #103 Nevada Summative Achievement Level Cut Scores 08182017 • File #123 Participation Rates by Subgroup 	
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. 	<p>The Smarter Balanced assessment system does not include or allow for accommodations that are specific to English learners; however, the Universal Tools and Designated Supports, including (but not limited to) stacked translations, English glossaries, and translated glossaries, are available to all students when deemed appropriate by an adult or team familiar with a student’s needs and background, including English learners (File #035 Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines).</p> <p>Where specified, such as for ELA performance task full writes, a student may also use a bilingual dictionary as a non-embedded language support. In general, language supports for English learners should be reflective of the supports provided to those students in daily classroom instruction. To assist local educators in determining the appropriate Designated Supports for students, including English learners, Smarter Balanced has developed the Resources and Practices Comparison Crosswalk (Evidence File #114).</p> <p>Evidence that English Language Learners are to be included in the Nevada Smarter Summative Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #053 Smarter Balanced Guidelines-for-Accessibility-for-English-Language-Learners • File #093 Smarter Balanced English Language Learners Advisory Committee • File #123 Participation Rates by Subgroup 	<p>Evidence provided in this element, along with evidence provided in critical element 5.1, met evidence criteria for this critical element.</p>
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

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 Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 	<p>NDE has adopted robust accessibility policies that promote inclusion of both students with disabilities and English learners in the state assessments. The Nevada Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodation Guide describes in detail the three categories of supports available to students taking the Nevada Summative Assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #037 Nevada Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodation Guide 2016-2017: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Universal Tools - available to all students; the use of these tools is determined by student preference. ○ Designated Supports - features available to a student for whom the need has been indicated by an educator or team of educators (with parent/guardian and student input as appropriate) and are part of the student’s regular classroom instruction. ○ Accommodations - features available to a student for whom there is a documented need in an Individualized Education Program (IEP) or 504 plan and who use a similar accommodation as part of regular classroom instruction. <p>NDE has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for the small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. Districts must submit a Special Testing Accommodation Request Form to NDE for consideration and approval, for any accommodation or support that is not included in the UAAG.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #050 Nevada Special Testing Accommodation Request Form 	<p>Evidence provided in this element, along with evidence provided in critical elements 5.1 and 5.2, met evidence criteria for this critical element.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 5.3 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 Nevada

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 Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. 	<p>The state of Nevada requires assessment of English Language Arts and mathematics of all students by state law as evidenced by NRS 390.810. Nevada tracks the use of accommodations via reports provided by our testing vendors DRC and Smarter balanced such as 2016-17 Summary Table-Nevada Accommodations File #013. Accommodation data is published on the Nevada Report Card site. The 2017 Nevada Summative Assessment Test Coordinator’s Manual and the Nevada UAAG both detail the mandatory nature of state assessments and describe the implementation of accommodations deemed necessary for all students, including those deemed such by IEP, 504, and EL learning strategists.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #119 Nevada Administrative Regulations 390.105 Testing Requirements • File #013 2016-17 Summary Table-Nevada Accommodations • File #040 Nevada Report Card website link http://www.nevadareportcard.com/di/ • File #016 2017 Nevada Summative Assessment Test Coordinator’s Manual • File #037 Nevada Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodation Guide 2016-2017 <p>Additionally the NDE Offices of Special Education and the Title III office conduct audits of Special Education and English Learner programs giving feedback to programs as to the appropriateness of both instructional and assessment accommodations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #109 Title III Monitoring Part I • File #110 Title III Monitoring Part II • File #111 FY17 Sample Title III Monitor Report • File #112 Special Education Monitor Checklist • File #123 Participation Rates by Subgroup 	<p>Met evidence criteria.</p> <p>Suggestions for future submissions. File #40 needs to be accompanied by data reports or samples that illustrate how this file meets evidence criteria. Files #109-111 require additional explanation to evaluate how these support meeting evidence criteria for this critical element.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

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

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; • The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels. 	<p>The four levels of achievement are Advanced, Proficient, Basic, and Below Basic, and apply to all students participating in the Nevada Summative Assessment.</p> <p>The ELA and mathematics Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs) are included the Smarter Balanced Technical Report. There are four achievement levels for the ELA and mathematics ALDs: Advanced, Proficient, Basic and Below Basic. Smarter Balanced cuts were adopted by Nevada at a joint meeting of the Nevada Board of Education and Council to Establish Academic Standards on December 11th 2014 (p. 2 of minutes)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #030 Smarter Balanced Summative • File #101 Nevada Summative Assessment Achievement Level Descriptors for Grades 3 through 5 • File #102 Nevada Summative Assessment Achievement Level Descriptors for Grades 6 through 8 • File #075 Sample 2017 Individual Student Report • File #012 State Board minutes December 11, 2014 	<p>Met evidence criteria.</p>
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

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>Achievement level setting for Smarter Balanced assessments in Mathematics and English/Language Arts and Literacy occurred in three phases:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phase 1: Online panel Phase 2: In-person workshop Phase 3: Cross-grade review <p>The purpose of the three activities was to derive cut scores, using a subset of 2014 Smarter Balanced field test data and based on a transparent, scientifically rigorous, well documented procedure that would stand up to external scrutiny. This Achievement Level Setting Final Report documents each of the three phases and provides results and recommendations for cut scores for Smarter Balanced Assessment. To ensure the academic achievement standards are challenging, student performance on the NAEP and PISA was included in the standard setting procedure. The cut scores from the Achievement Level Setting are used for the Nevada Summative Assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #032 Smarter Balanced Achievement Level Setting Final Report (January 7 2015) • File #103 Nevada Summative Achievement Level Cut Scores 08182017 	<p>See results of 2016/2018 Smarter Balance Assessment Peer Review.</p>
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional state-specific evidence is required.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See results of 2016/2018 Smarter Balance Assessment Peer Review. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

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 Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p>Prior to the Achievement Level Standard Setting, Smarter Balanced awarded a contract for the development of achievement level descriptors (ALDs). There are four sets of ALDs for the development of achievement level descriptors (ALDs). There are four sets of ALDs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy – brief statements that articulate policy makers’ vision of goals and rigor for the final performance standards; • Range – guidelines created by test developers to identify which aspects of items align to a particular performance level in regard to the cognitive and content rigor that has been defined; • Threshold (Target) – detailed statements created in conjunction with the Range ALDs and are used by achievement level setting panelists to represent the knowledge and skills of a student just at the threshold of a given level; • Reporting – relative brief statements developed to define the appropriate and intended interpretations of test scores. <p>The Reporting ALDs are used when reporting results from the Nevada Summative Assessment. The development of the ALDs is described in detail in the following document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #033 Smarter Balanced Technical Report Initial Achievement Level Descriptors (April 26 2013) • File #101 Nevada Summative Assessment Achievement Level Descriptors for Grades 3 through 5 • File #102 Nevada Summative Assessment Achievement Level Descriptors for Grades 6 through 8 <p>Achievement level setting for Smarter Balanced assessments in Mathematics and English/Language Arts and Literacy occurred in three phases:</p> <p>Phase 1: Online panel Phase 2: In-person workshop Phase 3: Cross-grade review</p>	<p>See results of 2016/2018 Smarter Balance Assessment Peer 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 Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>The purpose of the three activities was to derive cut scores, using a subset of 2014 Smarter Balanced field test data and based on a transparent, scientifically rigorous, well documented procedure that would stand up to external scrutiny. This Achievement Level Setting Final Report documents each of the three phases and provides results and recommendations for cut scores for Smarter Balanced Assessment. To ensure the academic achievement standards are challenging, student performance on the NAEP and PISA was included in the standard setting procedure. The cut scores from the Achievement Level Setting are used for the Nevada Summative Assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #032 Smarter Balanced Achievement Level Setting Final Report (January 7 2015) • File #103 Nevada Summative Achievement Level Cut Scores 08182017 <p>The test designs, blueprints, and specifications documents provide information about the numbers of items, item types and DOK of items on the Nevada Summative Assessments. This evidence demonstrates that a portion of the test score is based on items and item types requiring complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #023 Smarter Balanced English Language Arts Literacy Summative Assessment Blueprint (November 10 2016) • File #024 Smarter Balanced English Language Arts Literacy Content Specifications (July 2015) • File #025 Smarter Balanced English Language Arts Literacy Content Specifications Appendix B Grade Level Tables (July 2015) • File #026 Smarter Balanced Mathematics Content Specifications (July 2015) • File #027 Smarter Balanced Mathematics Summative 	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Assessment Blueprint (November 11 2016)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #056 Sample Items and Item Type Information Screen Shot December 2017 http://sampleitems.smarterbalanced.org/ • File #058 Smarter Balanced Item and Test Specifications for ELA_ELA Item Specifications Tab Screen Shot December 2017 on webpage http://www.smarterbalanced.org/assessments/development/ • File #059 Smarter Balanced Item and Test Specifications for Mathematics_Mathematics Item Specifications Tab Screen Shot December 2017 on webpage http://www.smarterbalanced.org/assessments/development/ <p>A third-party alignment study was contracted by Smarter Balanced and performed by HumRRO, which provides comprehensive evidence about the alignment of the Smarter Balanced summative assessments to the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). Because the Nevada Academic Content Standards are based on the Common Core, the evidence supports that the Nevada Summative Assessment is aligned with the Nevada Academic Standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #034 Smarter Balanced HumRRO alignment-study-report April 2016 • File #006 Nevada Academic Content Standard Based on the Common Core Brochure_V5 Retrieved from NDE website December 2017 • File #004 Nevada K-12_ELA_Academic Content Standards • File #005 Nevada K-12_Mathematics_Academic Content Standards 	
Section 6.3 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional state-specific 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 Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See results of 2016/2018 Smarter Balance Assessment Peer Review. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

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 Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-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 	<p>Nevada 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #104 Smarter Balance PPT from NV Sept 2017 State Board Mtg <p>Nevada districts have access to a secure online reporting suite (eDIRECT) that provides Nevada Summative Assessment results at the district, school, and student level. These reports incorporate text and graphic presentation of score data. Reports can be downloaded directly as PDFs and data files can be downloaded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #116: eDIRECT User Guide, Reporting System, Pages 40-42. Student Reports for parents/guardians include information about student achievement on grade-level descriptors. Student Reports are available electronically to schools and districts through the secure reporting suite (eDIRECT) and hard copies of Student Reports are shipped to districts. Districts are responsible to distribute Student Reports to parents and guardians, in compliance with state and federal student privacy laws, as soon as they become available. • File #075 Sample 2017 Individual Student Report <p>NDE provided districts and schools with a brief interpretation guide for the Individual Student Report. Additionally, NDE provides to districts a Spanish-translated version of a sample student report. The interpretation guide and the Spanish samples are for printing and distribution to parents. Additionally, the release of student Reports are generally accompanied by media attention and articles describing the score reports and overall state performance. A more detailed Score Interpretation Guide from Smarter Balanced is available for districts and school use.</p>	<p>Bullet # 1: File #104 does not indicate participation rates (percentage not tested) as required.</p> <p>Peers noted the information in File # 040 gives access to the number of students tested, but does not provide the percentage of students tested or not tested. The number tested and number expected to test are provided and the percentage must be calculated by the person reviewing the report. It would be more transparent in reporting to provide the actual percent tested in addition to the numerator and denominator.</p> <p>Bullet # 2: File #116 is incorrectly noted as the eDirect User Guide in the Evidence list.</p> <p>The eDirect User Guide provides information on how to access a variety of reports. However it is insufficient to support interpretation of the reports available system. Peers noted that a comprehensive guide to test interpretation for Nevada is needed for the Nevada reporting system including listing of and explanations of each of the available reports, along with guidance for interpreting the results reported on each of the available reports.</p> <p>The evidence submitted, file #084 and #38, are insufficient given the stated purposes and use of the assessment results in prior evidence documents (page 8 of File #029).</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 Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>academic needs of students;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #038 Nevada Interpretive Guide to the Smarter Balanced Assessment Reports – 2017 • File #039 NDE Press Release New Score Reports Show Parents How Students Perform Year Over Year July 31 2017_files • File #084 Smarter Balanced interpretation-and-use-of-scores-and- achievement-levels • File #106 2017 Smarter Summative Assessment Student Report Spanish Reports are linked to Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs). <p>The ALDs describe to parents and educators what students in each performance category know and are able to do relative to the Nevada Academic Content Standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #101 Nevada Summative Assessment Achievement Level Descriptors for Grades 3 through 5 • File #102 Nevada Summative Assessment Achievement Level Descriptors for Grades 6 through 8 <p>The Nevada Department of Education and its testing vendor work collaboratively to develop an annual report delivery schedules, which is incorporated into a contract amendment. The assessment results are delivered in a timely manner and a calendar of testing and reporting activities is provided. Nevada’s testing vendor provides district-level student data files, individual student reports, schools and district summary reports both electronically through the DRC eDIRECT Reporting System and as paper reports shipped to districts and schools.</p> <p>Data files are also provided directly to the Nevada Department of Education Accountability Office who has responsibility for reporting federal and state mandated accountability reports. Data files are also provided to a separate reporting vendor and reported on the Nevada Report Card website, where results are loaded into a web-based application. Data can be displayed for</p>	<p>Bullet #3: Peer reviewers commend Nevada on the quality of the individual student interpretive reports. These reports provide student results within relevant contexts for parents to understand student’s achievement relative to the state’s challenging academic content standards. Identical reports are available in Spanish.</p> <p>Bullet # 4: Peers commended Nevada for including a financial penalty to ensure timely delivery of digital and paper reports by the deadline listed in the contract addendum</p> <p>The state has a process and timeline for delivery of reports to schools for distribution to teachers and parents. Peers suggest the state agency employ a process that ensures parents are receiving student reports in a timely manner.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Nevada

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>multiple years and can be grouped and filtered by a variety of demographics including grade level, gender, race/ethnicity, economic status, disability, English proficiency, and migrant status. Data download files are also available.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File #060 Nevada Student Assessments Activity Calendar for District Test Directors • File #105 NV DRC Amendment 3 Executed with Attachment AA Reporting Dates • File #076 Sample 2017 Summary Report • File #077 File layout for District Student Data Files Reporting Deliverable • File #040 Nevada Report Card website link http://www.nevadareportcard.com/di/ • File #041 NDE Press Release Department of Education Unveils Nevadareportcard.com to Help Drive Data Decision Making Process for Schools and Districts • File #104 Smarter Balance PPT from NV Sept 2017 State Board Mtg The Student Report, Summary Report(s), and Data Deliverables all include claim-level reporting based on calculations provided by Smarter Balanced. • File #107 Smarter-Balanced-ELA-Literacy-Claims • File #108 Smarter-Balanced-Mathematics-Claims • File #089 Smarter Balanced Scoring Specifications July 28 2016 • File #090 Smarter Balanced Scoring Specifications 2014_2015 	

<p>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</p>
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report percentage of students not tested. • Peers noted that a comprehensive guide for test interpretation for Nevada is needed for the Nevada reporting system including listing of and explanations for each of the available reports, along with guidance for interpreting the results reported on each of the available reports.

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

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

February 201 State Assessment Peer Review Notes

(resubmission of evidence based on 2016 Peer Review)



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

Contents

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS	3
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	4
2.2 – Item Development.....	6
2.3 – Test Administration	7
SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....	8
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	9
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	11
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	12
SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER	13
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	13
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	14
4.4 – Scoring	15
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	16
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	17
5.3 – Accommodations.....	18

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced 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
------------------	--	--

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced 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"> Evidence that, for cases where an assessment includes off-grade-level content, assessments produce grade level student achievement scores that are based only on grade-level items. Evidence that the item pools for all versions of the assessments (i.e., general, American Sign Language, Braille and Spanish) are sufficient to support the test design requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Evidence #S023</i> – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Race to the Top Grant Proposal (pp. 45-46) Evidence #S025 – Smarter Balanced Mathematics Expanded Item Pools <i>Evidence #S026</i> – Pool Expansion Information Presentation Evidence #S027 – 2016-17 Expanded Pool Standards Alignment Evidence Packet #S010 – Blueprint Fidelity <i>Evidence Packet #S012</i> – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses <i>S013</i> 	<p>This requirement is met.</p> <p>Peers would have appreciated a clarification that when expanded pool items are used, that the relevant psychometric considerations are being addressed – e.g., that item parameters used are established for all grades spanned.</p> <p>Peers noted that several items span a relatively large grade range (roughly 20% in MA and 13% in R/LA span 3 or more grades). (Peer calculations based on S027). This seemed high.</p> <p>Peers commend SBAC for producing the gap analyses (S012). Peers believe that steps taken to bridge the gaps as described in S013 should resolve the issues.</p> <p>Peers ask that the program continue to monitor those grades/versions where blueprint fulfillment was less than 100%, as well as those where there had yet to be administrations.</p>
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Evidence that the Smarter Balanced test design aligns the assessments to the full depth and breadth for all the academic content standards in R/LA and mathematics at each grade level. B. Evidence that the item selection procedures for the computer adaptive test (CAT) online assessment adequately deliver tests that meet test design requirements for the intended depth of knowledge (DOK) of the assessments (also applies to evidence requested for element 2.2). C. Evidence that the item pools for all versions of the assessments (i.e., general, American Sign Language, Braille and Spanish) are sufficient to support the test design requirements. Provide, upon completion of the item development plans, evidence that 100% of test events for students receiving any version of the assessment conform to the test blueprints. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment 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;">2.2 – Item Development (stemming from 2016 review)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See evidence regarding DOK and item pools in element 2.1 above. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Evidence #15a</i> – Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment Blueprints for Mathematics Evidence #15b – Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment Blueprints for ELA/L <i>Evidence #S008</i> – Smarter Balanced Math Summative CAT and Interim Assessment Item Development Plan Evidence #S009 – Smarter Balanced ELA Summative CAT and Interim Assessment Item Development Plan <i>Evidence Packet #S010</i> – Smarter Balanced Blueprint Fidelity Study Evidence Packet #S012 – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses <i>Evidence #S013</i> – Gap Analysis and Development Plans Evidence Packet #S014 – Member Managed Item Development Assignments <i>Evidence #S029</i> – Summary of Smarter Balanced CAT Algorithm on Depth of Knowledge 	<p>The item selection procedures for the CAT should result in test events that, for every student and for all versions of the assessments, meet all blueprint constraints.</p> <p>See Comments on 2.1, bullets 2 and 4.</p>
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p> <p><u> </u>x The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See 2.1 B and C. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>(stemming from 2016 review-individual States may provide own evidence to address this item)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of contingency plans to address potential technology issues during test administration 	<p>No evidence provided.</p>	<p><u>Peers assume this evidence is provided by States using Smarter Balanced.</u></p>
<p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence from States using SBAC is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of contingency plans to address potential technology issues during 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 the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced 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
------------------	--	--

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content (stemming from 2016 peer review)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence as noted for all item pools in element 2.1 above. Evidence of a summary report that the CAT administered test forms matched test blueprints. Evidence that Smarter Balanced assessments that include off-grade level content conform to the on-grade level blueprint for the assessment. Evidence of alignment of sample test forms for grades 3, 4, 6 and 7 in R/LA and mathematics. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence #S005 – Hawaii Smarter Balanced Technical Report, 2014-2015 (pp. 42-46) Evidence #S006 – South Dakota Technical Report 2014-2015 (pp. 44-49) Evidence Packet #S010 – Blueprint Fidelity Evidence Packet #012 – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses Evidence Packet #S010 – Blueprint Fidelity Evidence #S011 – Smarter Balanced Technical Report, 2015-2016 (pp. 6-6 through 6-9) Evidence Packet #S010 – Blueprint Fidelity Evidence #S030 – WestEd Alignment Study Proposal Evidence #S032 – WestEd Alignment Study Evidence #104 – Fordham Institute – Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation Assessments (p. 18) Evidence #S008 – Smarter Balanced Math Summative CAT and Interim Assessment Item 	<p>See Comments in 2.1.</p> <p>See Comments in 2.1, bullets 2 and 4. The evidence was provided but it does not support the claim that the CAT administered test forms matched the test blueprints in every case.</p> <p>This evidence has been provided. See Comment in 2.1, bullet 3.</p> <p>The WestEd alignment study (S032) assessed the extent to which each item in the noted grades matched its targeted CCSS standard. However, for DoK (cognitive complexity), the study did not assess the extent to which each item matched the cognitive complexity implied by its targeted standard. Rather, it documented experts’ judgments of the level of cognitive complexity at which the item appears to be assessing the standard. The study’s design can furnish appropriate evidence to support (or refute) a claim concerning the degree of content alignment between items and standards, but it cannot provide appropriate evidence for a claim about the match between the cognitive complexity of a test and the cognitive complexity of the standards to which the test is written.</p> <p>Peers felt that the study does not address the question “Does the item match the DoK of the standard?”</p> <p>The measures taken to improve alignment are entirely appropriate. However, evidence of <i>improved</i> alignment was not provided. Peers expected to see a before-after comparison.</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 the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced 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"> Evidence of improved alignment of the tests, based upon the findings of the independent alignment study. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Plan <i>Evidence Packet #S010</i> – Blueprint Fidelity Evidence Packet #S012 – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses <i>Evidence #S013</i> – Gap Analysis and Development Plans Evidence Packet #S014 – Member-Managed Assignments <i>Evidence Packet #S015</i> – Member-Managed Item Development Training 	
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p> <p><u> </u>x<u> </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See 2.1 B and C. Evidence of alignment of sample test forms for grades 3, 4, 6 and 7 in R/LA and mathematics, specifically with respect to cognitive complexity (DoK). Evidence of improved alignment of the tests, based upon the findings of the independent alignment study. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure (stemming from 2016 peer review-States may address this with State-level data)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that supports the internal structure of the Smarter Balanced assessments using operational data from the summative assessments (e.g., a correlational analysis of subscores and total scores). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Evidence #S004</i> - Assessing the Dimensionality of Smarter Balanced Summative Tests (pp. 2-4). 	<p>S004 provides the evidence requested.</p> <p>Recommendation: Peers recognize the challenge of assessing dimensionality using item scores in a CAT context; SBAC could contribute meaningfully to the literature on this topic by taking it on as a special research study.</p>
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>(stemming from 2016 peer review-States may address this with State-level data)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validity evidence that shows the Smarter Balanced assessment scores are related as expected with other variables for all student groups (e.g., comparison of subscore relationships within content areas to those across content areas; a confirmatory factor analysis of math & R/LA together; or other analyses that demonstrate positive correlations between assessment results and external measures that assess similar constructs). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence #S004 – Assessing the Dimensionality of Smarter Balanced Summative Test (pp. 2-5) Evidence #S005 – Hawaii Smarter Balanced Technical Report, 2014-2015 (pp. 48-50) Evidence #S006 – South Dakota Technical Report, 2014-2015 (pp. 53-55) Evidence #S007 – Dimensionality of the SBAC: An argument for its validity Evidence #S031 – South Dakota BOR Policy 	<p>Peers appreciated the concurrent validity studies for high school R/LA and Math (S005 and S006). We believe that these studies help establish external validity evidence for the program.</p> <p>However, no evidence of validity based on relationships with other variables was provided for Grades 3-8 Math and R/LA.</p> <p>Please provide the results of a study or studies addressing this CE, such as correlations between SBAC scores and grades or correlations between SBAC adjacent grade scores.</p>
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>x<u> </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validity evidence that shows the Smarter Balanced assessment scores are related as expected with other variables for all student groups for Grades 3-8 R/LA and Math. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment 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>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility (stemming from 2016 peer review-States may address this with State-level data)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of estimated reliability for students receiving accommodations using operational data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Evidence #S011 – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Draft 2015-16 Technical Report</u>, Chapter 2 <i>Index</i> 	<p>Estimated reliabilities for the tests administered to these students are in the Index in Tables 11.1 and 11.2. Peers note that a few of the coefficients are low enough to raise concerns.</p> <p>It would be helpful in evaluating Tables 11.1 and 11.2 to know the source(s) of the data.</p> <p>Peers request a clarification about how item development plans (S013) specifically address the pool factors that are related to the low reliabilities for special versions of the test.</p> <p>Peers are also concerned by the statement in the Index “Students with lower scores have lower reliability than those with higher scores.” (p. 57). We were not sure that it was accurate.</p>
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p> <p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peers request a clarification about how item development plans (S013) specifically address the pool factors that are related to the low reliabilities for special versions of the test. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced 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>(stemming from 2016 peer review)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See evidence regarding DOK and item pools in element 2.1 above. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Evidence #015a</i> – Final Blueprint for Mathematics Summative Assessment <i>Evidence #015b</i> – Final Blueprint for ELA/L Summative Assessment <i>Evidence Packet #S010</i> – Smarter Balanced Blueprint Fidelity Study <i>Evidence #S011</i> – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Technical Report, 2015-2016 <i>Evidence Packet #S012</i> – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses 	<p>See Comments for 2.1.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>x<u> </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See 2.1 B and C. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>(stemming from 2016 peer review-States may address this with State-level evidence)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that Smarter Balanced has clear, unambiguous criteria, including minimum thresholds, to ensure and document inter-rater reliability for States that are conducting hand-scoring of Smarter Balanced performance items. Evidence that the State has monitored the quality and reliability of performance task scoring conducted during its test administration for the Smarter Balanced tests. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence #065a – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium: State Procedures Manual, 2014 Evidence #S001 – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium: Member Procedures Manual, 2016 <p>No evidence cited.</p>	<p>Peers appreciate the new guidance provided by the Consortium (S001). We believe the evidence requested was provided.</p> <p>Peers’ understanding is that this evidence is to be provided by States using Smarter Balanced.</p>
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence from States using SBAC is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the State has monitored the quality and reliability of performance task scoring conducted during its test administration for the Smarter Balanced tests. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment (stemming from 2016 peer review)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the design and development of the item pools used to support multiple versions of the assessments, specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ computer-adaptive in ASL (R/LA listening only, Math); ○ computer-adaptive in Braille (R/LA, math); ○ computer-based fixed form in Braille (math); ○ paper in Braille (R/LA, Math); ○ computer-adaptive in Spanish (math); and ○ paper in Spanish (math). • Evidence that item pools for these above-listed additional computer adaptive versions can support the adaptive test design. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Evidence #011a</i> – Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines • Evidence #143 – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium: Signing Guidelines • <i>Evidence Packet #S010</i> – Blueprint Fidelity Studies • Evidence #144 – Unified English Braille Implementation Guide • <i>Evidence #146</i> – Theory of Test Translation Error • Evidence #S011 – Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment Technical Report, 2015-2016 • <i>Evidence Packet #S012</i> – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses • Evidence #S013 – Gap Analysis and Development Plans • <i>Evidence #S016</i> – Literature Review of Testing Accommodations and Accessibility Tools for Students with Disabilities • Evidence #S017 – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Style Guide • <i>Evidence #S018</i> – Tri-Lin Proposal Response to Smarter Balanced RFP 13 • Evidence #S019 – Grade 8 Mathematics Item Specifications Claim 1 Target A 	<p>See Comments in 2.1 and 4.2.</p>
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>x The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Comments in 2.1 B and C, and 4.2. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

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 (stemming from 2016 peer review-States may address this with State-level evidence)</p> <p>Evidence of guidance regarding selection of the Spanish version of the Smarter Balanced assessments for English learners, and evidence of procedures for communication of this guidance to districts, schools, teachers and parents.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #11a – Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines (p. 11; pp. 32-33) • Evidence #68 – Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Implementation Guide • Evidence #69h – Accessibility and Accommodations Training Module (Slide 59) • Evidence #99 – Resources and Practices Comparison Crosswalk (p. 4) • Evidence #127 – ISAAP Training Module Screenshot • Evidence #S002 – UAAG Survey • Evidence #S003 – Including All Students in Assessments Digital Library Module • Evidence #S020 – Template Letter for Parents of English Learners 	<p>The SBAC response shows where to locate evidence of the guidance in the original submission, and evidence of communication of this guidance to school personnel. Provision of #S020 shows evidence of communication of this guidance to parents.</p> <p><u>The Peers understand that provision of greater specificity beyond the guidance provided by SBAC is a State level responsibility for any State using SBAC.</u></p>
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>x<u> </u> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p> <p><u> </u>x<u> </u> The following additional evidence from States using SBAC is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of guidance regarding selection of the Spanish version of the Smarter Balanced assessments for English learners at a level of specificity such that an educator can apply the decision for an individual student. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">5.3 – Accommodations (stemming from 2016 peer review-States may address this with State-level evidence)</p> <p>Evidence of a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</p>		<p>SBAC did not provide evidence for this request.</p> <p><u>Peers’ understanding is that States using Smarter Balanced are to provide this evidence.</u></p>
<p>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence from States using SBAC is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 		

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