



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable MaryEllen Elia  
Commissioner  
New York State Education Department  
New York State Education Building  
89 Washington Avenue  
Albany, NY 12234

January 13, 2017

Dear Commissioner Elia:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) assessment peer review process under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) maintains the essential requirements from NCLB that each State annually administer high-quality assessments in at least reading/language arts, mathematics, and science that meet nationally recognized professional and technical standards. Therefore, as you know, the Department reinstated peer review of State assessment systems so that each State receives feedback from external experts on the assessments it is currently administering. We appreciate the efforts required to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in June 2016. State assessment systems provide essential information that States, districts, principals, and teachers can use to identify the academic needs of students, target resources and supports toward students who need them most, evaluate school and program effectiveness, and close achievement gaps among students. A high-quality assessment system also provides useful information to parents about their child's advancement against and achievement of grade-level standards. The Department's peer review of State assessment systems is designed to provide feedback to States to support the development and administration of high-quality assessments.

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

- Reading/ language arts (R/LA) and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (New York State Testing Program (NYSTP)): **Substantially meets requirements**
- R/LA and mathematics general assessments in high school (Regents Examinations): **Substantially meets requirements**

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

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

Page 2 – The Honorable MaryEllen Elia

**Substantially meets requirements** means that these components meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. The specific list of items required for NYSED to submit is enclosed with this letter. The Department expects that NYSED should be able to provide this additional information within one year. NYSED must provide to the Department a plan and timeline by which it will submit the additional documentation within 30 days of the receipt of this letter. If adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action.

The Department notes that NYSED submitted a waiver request for assessing speaking and listening that was approved on June 28, 2016, for the 2016–2017, 2017–2018, and 2018–2019 school years.

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

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

Sincerely,

/s/

Ann Whalen  
Senior Advisor to the Secretary  
Delegated the Duties of Assistant Secretary  
for Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Steven E. Katz, Director, Office of State Assessment

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Additional Evidence Needed</b>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b>	<p>For the reading/ language arts (R/LA) and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (New York State Testing Program (NYSTP)) and high school (Regents Examinations), New York State Education Department (NYSED) must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence in test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, including speaking and listening. NOTE: NYSED has received a speaking and listening waiver; therefore, the U.S. Department of Education does not expect NYSED to submit additional evidence regarding speaking and listening during the period of the waiver.</li> <li>• Evidence in test blueprints or other design documents that 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, depth of knowledge levels (DOK), cognitive complexity).</li> </ul>
<b>2.3 – Test Administration</b>	<p>For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (NYSTP) and high school (Regents Examinations), NYSED must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments, including test security procedures.</li> </ul>
<b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b>	<p>For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (NYSTP) and high school (Regents Examinations), NYSED must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the process used for selecting the sample of schools monitored by NYSED staff.</li> <li>• Evidence of the process used for selecting the sample of schools monitored by district partners.</li> <li>• Evidence that the samples selected for monitoring are adequate to ensure that test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity.</li> </ul>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b>	<p>For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (NYSTP) and high school (Regents Examinations), NYSED must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence 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 (e.g., an independent alignment study of test forms to evaluate these claims).</li> </ul>
<b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b>	<p>For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (NYSTP) and high school (Regents Examinations), NYSED must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that documents how the tests measure the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s</li> </ul>

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Additional Evidence Needed</b>
	<p>academic content standards, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Results of cognitive labs exploring student performance on items that show the items require complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills; OR</li> <li>○ Reports of expert judgment of items that show the items require complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills; OR</li> <li>○ Empirical evidence that shows the relationships of items intended to require complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills to other measures that require similar levels of cognitive complexity in the content area (e.g., teacher ratings of student performance, student performance on performance tasks or external assessments of the same knowledge and skills); OR</li> <li>○ An independent alignment study of test forms that documents the cognitive complexity and processes of the tests.</li> </ul>
<p><b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b></p>	<p>For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (NYSTP) and high school (Regents Examinations), NYSED must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of assessment results across the translated language versions and English versions for all tests.</li> </ul>
<p><b>5.2 – Procedures for including English Learners</b></p>	<p>For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (NYSTP) and high school (Regents Examinations), NYSED must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence of guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners (e.g., guidance that addresses whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s)).</li> <li>● Evidence of information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners.</li> </ul>
<p><b>5.3 – Accommodations</b></p>	<p>For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (NYSTP) and high school (Regents Examinations), NYSED must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence that the State has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</li> </ul>

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

## June, 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW YORK

Contents

**SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS . 3**  
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students .... 3  
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards ..... 5  
1.3 – Required Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 6  
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments(reviewed by Department staff only)..... 8  
1.5 – Participation Data(reviewed by Department staff only)..... 12

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS ..... 13**  
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 13  
2.2 – Item Development..... 18  
2.3 – Test Administration ..... 22  
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..... 29

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 31**  
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 31  
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 35  
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure ..... 38  
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables ..... 42

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER ..... 45**  
4.1 – Reliability..... 45  
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 49  
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... 52  
4.4 – Scoring ..... 57  
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms ..... 63  
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment ..... 65  
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance..... 67

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS ..... 71**  
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities ..... 71  
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 75  
5.3 – Accommodations..... 78  
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations ..... 82

**SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 84**  
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students ..... 84  
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 87  
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards ..... 89  
6.4 – Reporting..... 93

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW YORK

The state’s technical report for 2015 should provide additional information for validity (section 3) and reliability (section 4), and we encourage its review.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</b></p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State.</p>	<p><b>Evidence of adoption of New York’s Academic content standards</b></p> <p>Evidence #001: Proposal to Board of Regents: New York Common Core State Standards Adoption, July 2010</p> <p>Evidence #002: NYS Board of Regents Minutes- Adoption of CCSS-July 2010</p> <p>Evidence #003: Proposal to Board of Regents: Approval of recommended additions to the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) for English Language Arts &amp; Literacy and CCSS for Mathematics and approval of new Prekindergarten Learning Standards- December 2010</p> <p>Evidence #004: NYS Board of Regents Minutes- Approval of CCLS-January 2011</p> <p>Evidence #005: Education Laws of New York, Title 1, General Provisions, Section 207, Legislative power</p> <p>Evidence #006: Education Laws of New York, Title 1, General Provisions, Section 211, Review of regents learning standards</p> <p>Evidence #007: New York Assessment Letter Dated February 26, 2008</p> <p><b>Documentation that states that the State’s academic content standards apply to all public</b></p>	<p>Evidence of a waiver state - requirements previously met.</p> <p>New York has maintained the learning standards in science that were approved by USDE on February 26, 2008. New York State is in the process of reviewing and revising its science standards.</p>

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p><b>elementary and secondary schools and all public elementary and secondary school students.</b></p> <p>Evidence #008: NYSED Regulations of the Commissioner 100.1 (t)(2)</p> <p>Evidence #009: New York State P-12 Common Core Learning Standards for Mathematics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding mathematics, p 4</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #010: New York State P-12 Common Core Learning Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CCR and grade-specific standards, p2</li> </ul> <p>What is not covered by the Standards, p 4</p>	
<b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b>		
_X_ No additional evidence is required		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</b></p> <p>The State’s academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science specify what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school to succeed in college and the workforce; contain content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all three subjects</p> <p><b>Evidence that the State’s academic content standards contain coherent and rigorous content and encourage the teaching of advanced skills.</b> Evidence #011: Peer review webinar notes 12-8-15</p> <p>Evidence #012: New York State ESEA Flexibility Request, 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Principle 1: College- and Career-Ready Expectations for All Students               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A1 Adopt college- and career-ready standards, pp 28-35</li> <li>○ A2 Transition to college- and career-ready standards, pp 35-57</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Evidence #013: USDE Approval Letter New York State's ESEA Flexibility Renewal Request</p> <p>Evidence #007: New York Assessment Letter Dated February 26, 2008</p>	<p>Evidence of a waiver state - requirements previously met.</p> <p>New York has maintained the learning standards in science that were approved by USDE on February 26, 2008. New York State is in the process of reviewing and revising its science standards.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

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

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p><b>1.3 – Required Assessments</b></p> <p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments (based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate academic achievement standards-AAAS) in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12);</li> <li>• Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12).</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for grade/subject combinations listed in left column</p> <p><b>General Assessments in Mathematics, ELA, and Science</b>            Evidence #014: Education Laws of New York, Title 1, General Provisions, Section 209, Academic examinations; admission and fees</p> <p>Evidence #015: NYSED Regulations of the Commissioner 100.3 Program requirements for students grades prekindergarten through four</p> <p>Evidence #016: NYSED Regulations of the Commissioner 100.4 Program requirements for students grades five through eight</p> <p>Evidence #017: NYSED Regulations of the Commissioner 100.5 Diploma Requirements</p> <p><b>Alternate Assessments in Mathematics, ELA, and Science</b>            Evidence #018: NYSED Regulations of the Commissioner 100.2 General School Requirements</p> <p>Evidence #015: NYSED Regulations of the Commissioner 100.3 Program requirements for students grades prekindergarten through four</p> <p>Evidence #016: NYSED Regulations of the Commissioner 100.4 Program requirements for students grades five through eight</p>	<p>NYSED has an outlined an assessment system that includes general and alternate assessments. The State has also outlined a process for alternate assessments which are determined by the commissioner.</p> <p>The process includes students with disabilities and English Language learners.</p>

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

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

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<b>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>		
_x_ No additional evidence is required.		

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

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

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p><b>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</b></p> <p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system;</li> <li>• For English learners (EL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment;</li> <li>○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students</b></p> <p>Evidence #019: School Administrator’s Manual New York State Testing Program (NYSTP) Common Core English Language Arts and Mathematics Tests Grades 3-8 2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students to Be Tested, pp 9 – 10</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #020: School Administrator’s Manual, 2015 Edition Secondary Level Examinations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section One, General Information <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ State Testing Requirements for Graduation, pp 1-1 – 1-2</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Evidence #021: New York State Diploma Requirements Applicable to Grade 9 Students First Entering High School in 2008-2015</p> <p>Evidence #022: Diploma/Credential Requirements, Updated May 2015</p> <p><b>Inclusion of Students With Disabilities</b></p> <p>Evidence #023: NYSED Regulations of the Commissioner 200.4 Procedures for referral, evaluation, individualized education program (IEP) development, placement and review</p> <p>Evidence #024: NYSED Regulations of the Commissioner 200.6 Continuum of Services</p> <p>Evidence #025: NYSED Regulations of the Commissioner 200.7 Program standards for education programs for students and preschool students with disabilities being educated in private schools and State-operated or State-supported</p>	<p>NYSED has a policy in place for the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system. The policy is outlined clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <p>NYSED provides assessments in 5 native languages and there is a process in place to determine and assess students who are eligible to take these tests.</p> <p>The assessment process is clear for SWD through the referral system and CSE evaluation. Clarity is needed for the EL policies and referral system. Although the information is outlined, the information is embedded in the documentation for SWD and IEP’s. NYSED might consider spelling out the testing process for EL learners in a more detailed manner in order to provide a clear pathway for EL students in regards to assessments or perhaps a separate guide to include the process for not only EL’s but also EL’s with disabilities.</p> <p>Requirements for this element are met</p>

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

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

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>schools</p> <p>Evidence #019: School Administrator’s Manual New York State Testing Program (NYSTP) Common Core English Language Arts and Mathematics Tests Grades 3-8 2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students to Be Tested, pp 9 – 10</li> <li>• Appendix G: Testing Accommodations for Students with Disabilities, pp A-9 – A-10</li> <li>• Appendix H: Specific Testing Accommodations, pp A-11 – A-15</li> <li>• Appendix I: Information on Ungraded Students, p A-16</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #020: School Administrator’s Manual, 2015 Edition Secondary Level Examinations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section Two: Requesting and Administering Regents Examinations and Regents Competency Tests <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Administering Exams to Students with Disabilities, pp 2-16 – 2-18</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Evidence #026: Test Access &amp; Accommodations for Students with Disabilities: Policy and Tools to Guide Decision-Making and Implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 1: Access and Accountability, p1</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #027: Memo: Special Education Field Advisory, November 2012</p> <p><b>Inclusion of English Learners</b></p> <p>Evidence #019: School Administrator’s Manual, New York State Testing Program (NYSTP) Common Core English Language Arts and Mathematics Tests Grades 3-8 2015</p>	

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

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

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students to Be Tested, pp 9 – 10</li> <li>• Appendix F: Testing Accommodations for English Language Learners, pp A-7 – A-8</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #020: School Administrator’s Manual, 2015 Edition Secondary Level Examinations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section Two, Requesting and Administering Regents Examinations and Regents Competency Tests               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Exams for English Language Learners, p 2-2</li> <li>○ Administering Exams to English Language Learners, p 2-15</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Evidence #028: Commissioner’s letter to educators, re AIMHighNY review</p> <p>Evidence #029: AimHighNY Common Core State Standards Review, presented to the NY Board of Regents, December 2015</p> <p>Evidence #030: Memo--Changes for the 2016 Grades 3-8 English Language Arts and Mathematics Tests</p> <p>Evidence #031: Assessment 101: An Educator’s Guide to Quality Practices (website)</p> <p>Evidence #032: Assessments Toolkit</p> <p>Evidence #033: WTVB Television news story: “Education commissioner visiting schools with high opt out rates.”</p> <p>Evidence #034: WBFO Radio news story “NYSED Commissioner_ ‘We need to have high standards’”</p>	

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

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

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
	Evidence #035: Newsday Letter-Opting out of state tests is not the answer-ME Elia	
<b>Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>		
__X_ No additional evidence is required		

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

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

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p><b>1.5 – Participation Data</b></p> <p>The State’s participation data show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system. In addition, if the State administers end-of-course assessments for high school students, the State has procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates on each required assessment and provides the corresponding data.</p>	<p>Evidence #036: 2015 NY STATE 3-8 Assessment Student Data-ELA</p> <p>Evidence #037: 2015 NY STATE 3-8 Assessment Student Data-Math</p> <p>Evidence #038: 2015 NY STATE Report Card</p> <p>Evidence #039: New York State Student Information Repository System (SIRS) Manual, 2015-2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 2: Student Reporting Rules, pp 9 - 68</li> <li>• Chapter 5: Codes and Descriptions</li> </ul> <p>Assessment Measure Standard Codes and Descriptions, pp 100 - 115</p>	<p>Evidence meets requirements.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

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

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results;</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills);</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Statement of Purpose</b></p> <p>Evidence #040: Technical Report, New York State Testing Program 2014: English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 1: Introduction and Overview, pp 1 - 5</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #041: New York State Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core) 2015 Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1.3 Purposes of the Exam (Standard 12.1), pp 1 - 2</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #042: New York State Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core) 2015 Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1.3 Purposes of the Exam (Standard 12.1), pp 1 - 2</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #020: 2015 Edition School Administrator’s Manual Secondary Level Examinations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 1: Introduction and Overview, p1-1 “Purpose of the Exams”</li> </ul> <p><b>Test Blueprints</b></p> <p><b>AND</b></p> <p><b>Documentation of challenging content and complex thinking skills</b></p> <p>Evidence #040: Technical Report, New York State Testing Program 2014: English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8</p>	<p>The vendor contract (Questar Assessments, Inc.) describes what is planned, not what actually was implemented or the quality of subsequent deliverables. Need to review all operational internal blueprints. The contractor’s work plan appears complete, but we have no documentation regarding the actual implementation or the quality/success of the work plan components.</p> <p>Various methods of determining text difficulty and complexity were presented and a link to the State’s guidelines for test selection was referenced, however the outcomes/results of the text reviews for the selected texts were not provided.</p> <p>Consider a full external alignment study for your assessments.</p> <p>External blueprints provide limited detail.</p> <p>Algebra I internal blueprints do not appear to reference cognitive complexity.</p> <p>ELA blueprint contain “tiers”, but do not define tiers.</p>

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix B, Table B1, p141, “ELA Test Blueprint”</li> <li>• Appendix B, Table B2, p142, “Mathematics Test Blueprint”</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #043: Contract C012427 with vendor Questar Assessments, Inc. “Development of State Assessments in Elementary and Intermediate Level English Language Arts and Mathematics”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix D, Work Plan               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Common Core English Language Arts Test Design, pp 55 – 58</li> <li>○ Mathematics Test Design, p 62</li> <li>○ Content Emphases, pp 64 – 71</li> <li>○ Attachment L1: Draft Enhanced Internal Blueprint for Grade 5 Math, pp 558</li> <li>○ Attachment M: Revised Enhanced Test Development Criteria, pp 559 – 570</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Evidence #044: Educator Guide to the 2014 Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Types of Texts Featured on the Test, pp 4 - 5</li> <li>• The Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core), pp 6 - 10</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #045: Educator Guide to the Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regents Exam in Algebra I (Common Core) Blueprint, pp 2 – 3</li> <li>• Content Emphases, pp 3 – 4</li> <li>• Question Formats, pp 5 – 6</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #046: Internal Blueprint Alignment-- Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core)</p>	

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>Documentation that the Test Design is tailored to the specific knowledge and skills in the State’s academic content standards</b></p> <p>Evidence #047: “Independent Review of Item Development Processes and Alignment Verification for the New York State Testing Program (NYSTP): Final Report” HumRRO, February 21, 2014</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Task 2: Item Content Alignment and DOK Verification, pp3-8</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #048: Review of Regents Exam in Algebra I (Common Core) conducted by external consultant Darren Burris</p> <p>Evidence #049: Odell Education: Review with Feedback—June 2014 Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core)</p> <p>Evidence #040: Technical Report, New York State Testing Program 2014: English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 2: Test Design and Development, pp 6 - 16</li> <li>• Appendix G: Operational Items Maps, pp 150 - 166</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #043: Contract C012427 with vendor Questar Assessments, Inc. “Development of State Assessments in Elementary and Intermediate Level English Language Arts and Mathematics”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix D: Work Plan               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Attachment G: Grades 3-8 Test Development Process – Revised, p114</li> <li>○ Attachment H: Passage Development, pp115-117</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Attachment I: Item Development, pp118-141</li> <li>○ Attachment J: Passage Review Criteria, pp142-145</li> <li>○ Attachment J-1: Standard Interpretations for Multiple-Choice Questions English Language Arts Grades 3 – 8, pp 146 - 214</li> <li>○ Attachment J-2: New York State Passage Review Criteria—English Language Arts Grades 3-8, pp 215 - 483</li> <li>○ Attachment K: Review Criteria for Potential Grades 3-5 and 6-8 ELA Items, pp 484 – 505</li> <li>○ Attachment K1: Item Review Criteria for Potential Grades 3 – 8 ELA Items, pp 506 – 548</li> <li>○ Attachment L: Math Enhanced Specs CCLS Cluster 5, pp 549 – 557</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #050: 2014 Grade 5 Mathematics Map to the Standards</p> <p>Evidence #051: 2014 Grade 7 ELA Map to the Standards</p> <p>Evidence #052: Procedural Validity for Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core)</p> <p>Evidence #053: Procedural Validity for Regents Exam in Algebra I (Common Core)</p> <p>Evidence #041: New York State Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core) 2015 Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix B—Standards Interpretations for</li> </ul>	

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p align="center">Multiple Choice Items, pp 41 – 52</p> <p>Evidence #054: Review Criteria Checklist for Potential Math Items (Regents Exam)</p>	
<b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:                      Internal test blueprints including evidence that all DOK levels, cognitive complexity, and the entire range of standards are considered in the test construction at all grades.</p>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.2 – Item Development</b></p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p><b>Evidence that the items elicit the intended response processes, such as cognitive labs or interaction studies.</b></p> <p>Evidence #040: Technical Report, New York State Testing Program 2014: English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test Design and Development               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Passage Selection and Item Criteria Documents, pp 9 - 12</li> <li>○ Passage Finding, p 12</li> <li>○ Item Development, pp 12 – 13</li> <li>○ Educator Item Review, p 13</li> <li>○ Field Testing, p 14</li> <li>○ Rangefinding, p 15</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Evidence #055: Passage Selection Guidelines for Assessing CCSS ELA</p> <p>Evidence #056: New York State Passage Review Criteria Protocol</p> <p>Evidence #057: Item Review Criteria for Potential Grade 3-5 ELA Questions</p> <p>Evidence #058: Item Review Criteria for Potential Grade 6-8 ELA Items</p> <p>Evidence #059: Item Writing Criteria for Potential Math Questions</p> <p>Evidence #043: Contract C012427 with vendor Questar Assessments, Inc. “Development of State Assessments in Elementary and Intermediate Level English Language Arts and Mathematics”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix D: Work Plan               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Attachment K1: Item Review Criteria for</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>When state “educators” or “stakeholders” reviewed assessment items, it would be helpful to provide details about the assessment reviewers as to their qualifications, (for example, urban teacher grade 3) would be helpful for the next assessment to ensure adequate representation.</p> <p>Do the changes (timed to untimed) and reducing the number of items effect the assessment parameters?</p> <p>The guidelines seem appropriate, but what were the results of the passage selection process (did all/some of the selected passages meet all/some of the selection criteria?)</p> <p>The protocol seems appropriate, but what were the results (did all/some of the selected items meet all/some of the selection criteria?)</p> <p>What are the criteria for rejecting an item (one “no”, more than one “no”); training documents would be helpful.</p> <p>Notice to public of change in grades 3-8 test contractors (from Pearson to Questar) notes more educator involvement in test development.</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW YORK

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Potential Grades 3-8 ELA Items, pp 506 - 548</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Attachment L: Math Enhanced Specs CCLS Cluster 5, pp 549 - 558</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #041: New York State Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core) 2015 Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 2.1 Item Difficulty, p 3</li> <li>● 5.1 Evidence Based on Test Content               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Item Development Process, pp 24 – 26</li> </ul> </li> <li>● 5.2 Evidence Based on Response Processes, pp 27 – 29</li> <li>● Appendix B – Standards Interpretations for Multiple Choice Items, pp 40 – 51</li> <li>● Appendix C – Item Review Criteria, pp 52 - 53</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #042: New York State Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core) 2015 Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 2.1 Item Difficulty, p 4</li> <li>● 5.1 Evidence Based on Test Content               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Item Development Process, pp 24 - 27</li> </ul> </li> <li>● 5.2 Evidence Based on Response Processes, pp 26 – 29</li> <li>● Appendix A – Item Writing Guidelines, pp 37 - 38</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #052: Procedural Validity for Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core)</p> <p>Evidence #053: Procedural Validity for Regents Exam in Algebra I (Common Core)</p> <p>Evidence #060: Guidelines for Text Selection, Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core)</p>	

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Evidence #061: Text Complexity Form: Quantitative and Qualitative Review, Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core)</p> <p>Evidence #062: Text Review Form, Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core)</p> <p>Evidence #063: Multiple-Choice Item Writing Form, Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core)</p> <p>Evidence #064: Multiple-Choice Item Review Checklist, New York State Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core)</p> <p>Evidence #065: Guidelines for Writing Multiple-Choice Math Items</p> <p>Evidence #066: Guidelines for Writing Constructed-Response Math Items</p> <p>Evidence #067: Algebra I (Common Core) Item Writing Criteria</p> <p>Evidence #068: Algebra I (Common Core) Evidence Statement Table</p> <p><b>Documentation that items are developed by individuals with content area expertise, experience as educators, and experience with students with disabilities, English learners, and other student populations of the state.</b></p> <p>Evidence #030: Memo--Changes for the 2016 Grades 3-8 English Language Arts and Mathematics Tests</p>	

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p>Evidence #041: New York State Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core) 2015 Technical Report</p> <p>Evidence #042: New York State Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core) 2015 Technical Report</p> <p>Evidence #069: New York State Education Department Teacher Participation Opportunities (web site)</p> <p>Evidence #070: Education Specialists Description</p> <p>Evidence #071: History of Regents Exams (website)</p> <p>Evidence #072: Educator Involvement Opportunities for Regents Exams (website)</p>	
<b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required .		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>• Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments;</li> <li>• If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Instructions on the use of accommodations allowed by the state that addresses each accommodation</b></p> <p>Evidence #019: School Administrator’s Manual, New York State Testing Program (NYSTP) Common Core English Language Arts and Mathematics Tests Grades 3-8 2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix F: Testing Accommodations for English Language Learners, pp A-7 - A-8</li> <li>• Appendix G: Testing Accommodations for Students with Disabilities, pp A-9 - A-10</li> <li>• Reporting Irregularities and/or Misadministrations, pp 42 – 44</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #020: School Administrator’s Manual, 2015 Edition Secondary Level Examinations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section Two: Requesting and Administering Regents Examinations and Regents Competency Tests <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Instructions for Proctors, pp 2-6</li> <li>○ Orientation of Proctors, p 2-6</li> <li>○ Rules for Proctoring, pp 2-10 – 2-12</li> <li>○ Administering Exams to English Language Learners, p 2-15</li> <li>○ Administering Exams to Students with Disabilities, pp 2-16 -- 2-18</li> <li>○ Reporting Testing Misconduct and Irregularities to the Department, p 2-14</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Evidence #026: Test Access &amp; Accommodations for Students with Disabilities: Policy and Tools to Guide Decision-Making and Implementation</p> <p><b>Evidence that the state provides key documents regarding test administration to districts and school test coordinators and administrators such</b></p>	<p>Scoring of constructed response questions raises validity questions (not centralized) across scoring locations. The audit information using five percent of the schools provides additional information. What actions are to be taken if the inter-rater reliabilities are not as high as they should be?</p> <p>Preparing educators for the change from timed to untimed will be essential.</p> <p>Training schedules, PowerPoints, participation logs or assurances were not submitted.</p>

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>as emails, websites, or listserv messages to inform relevant staff of the availability of documents for down-loading to cover memos that accompany hard copies of the materials delivered to districts or schools.</p> <p>Evidence #073: Memo: Procedures for Requesting, Shipping, and Storing of Materials for the 2015–16 Administration of the New York State Elementary- and Intermediate-Level Tests and Information on Computer-Based Field Testing for Spring 2016</p> <p>Evidence #074: Memo: Administration of the January 2016 Regents Exams</p> <p><b>Training materials such as agendas, slide presentations, and school test coordinator manuals and test administrator manuals provided to participants</b></p> <p>Evidence #075: Teacher’s Directions, 2015 Common Core English Language Arts Tests, Grades 3, 4, and 5</p> <p>Evidence #076: Teacher’s Directions, 2015 Common Core English Language Arts Tests, Grades 6, 7, and 8</p> <p>Evidence #077: Teacher’s Directions, 2015 Common Core Mathematics Tests, Grades 3, 4, and 5</p> <p>Evidence #078: Teacher’s Directions, 2015 Common Core Mathematics Tests, Grades 6, 7, and 8</p> <p>Evidence #079: Directions for Administering Regents Examinations June and August 2015 Administrations</p> <p><b>Established Procedures to Ensure that Responsible Individuals Receive Training</b></p> <p>Evidence #080: Test Security Unit Update presented</p>	

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	to the Board of Regents Meeting September 2014 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TSU Corrective Action Plans, “Major Components, Mandatory test security training for all educators,” p11</li> <li>• Promotion of Secure, Ethical Testing, “Increased test security training for educators,” p14</li> </ul> Evidence #081: Tips for Ethical Testing, Test Security Unit	
<b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:                      Current 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. Training schedules, PowerPoints, participation logs, assurances, etc. would add additional evidence.</p>		

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

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

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p><b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p><b>description of State’s approach to monitoring test administration</b>            Evidence #080: Test Security Unit Update presented to the Board of Regents Meeting September 2014</p> <p><b>Existing written documentation of the State’s procedures for monitoring test administration across the state including, for example, strategies for selection of districts and schools for monitoring, cycle for reaching schools and districts across the State, schedule for monitoring, monitors’ roles, and the responsibilities of key personnel</b>            Evidence #082: Checklist for Monitoring Test Security for 2014-15 English Language Arts and Math Tests</p> <p>Evidence #083: Checklist for Monitoring Exam Security and Testing Accommodations Provided for Eligible Students Taking Regents Exams</p> <p>Evidence #084: Test Security Unit Monitoring Plan, Grade 3-8 ELA and Math, April 2015</p> <p>Evidence #085: Test Security Unit Monitoring Plan, Regents Examinations, January 2015</p> <p>Evidence #086: Test Security Unit Monitoring Plan, Regents Examinations, June 2015</p> <p>Evidence #087: Letter of Introduction for Monitors of Regents Examinations</p> <p>Evidence #088: NYCDOE Test Administration Handbook: Elementary and Middle Schools 2015-16</p>	<p>The creation of the TSU has provided support for monitoring the state assessments. The State may want to consider monitoring the administration of a larger scope of assessments (onsite by NYSED) to ensure that the proper procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools especially given the number of schools and testing sites in NYSED’s purview and the number of past cases transferred to TSU as well as the number of correction actions post 2012.</p> <p>NYSED may consider creating a year to year analysis to ascertain if the corrective actions are isolated incidents or if there are repeat offenders or trends in the location/local monitoring of the testing cases.</p>

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

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

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
	<p>Evidence #089: NYCDOE Test Administration Handbook: High Schools 2015-16</p> <p><b>Summary of the results of the State’s monitoring of the most recent year of test administration in the State.</b></p> <p>Evidence #080: Test Security Unit Update presented to the Board of Regents Meeting September 2014 TSU Monitoring of Testing, page 12</p>	
<b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the process used for selecting the sample of schools monitored by SED staff</li> <li>• Evidence of the process used for selecting the sample of schools monitored by district partners.</li> <li>• Evidence that the samples selected for monitoring are adequate to ensure that test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity.</li> </ul>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.5 – Test Security</b></p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Brief description of State’s approach to monitoring test administration</b>            Evidence #080: Test Security Unit Update presented to the Board of Regents Meeting September 2014</p> <p><b>Existing written documentation of the State’s procedures for monitoring test administration across the state including, for example, strategies for selection of districts and schools for monitoring, cycle for reaching schools and districts across the State, schedule for monitoring, monitors’ roles, and the responsibilities of key personnel</b>            Evidence #082: Checklist for Monitoring Test Security for 2014-15 English Language Arts and Math Tests</p> <p>Evidence #083: Checklist for Monitoring Exam Security and Testing Accommodations Provided for Eligible Students Taking Regents Exams</p> <p>Evidence #084: Test Security Unit Monitoring Plan, Grade 3-8 ELA and Math, April 2015</p> <p>Evidence #085: Test Security Unit Monitoring Plan, Regents Examinations, January 2015</p> <p>Evidence #086: Test Security Unit Monitoring Plan, Regents Examinations, June 2015</p> <p>Evidence #087: Letter of Introduction for Monitors of Regents Examinations</p> <p>Evidence #088: NYCDOE Test Administration Handbook: Elementary and Middle Schools 2015-16</p>	<p>Excellent documentation of appropriate policies and procedures regarding test security. Much of the security rests with the building administrator. Use of the Test Security Unit, experts in test security and investigation, is to be commended.</p> <p>The School Administrator’s Manual, New York State Testing Program (NYSTP) Common Core English Language Arts and Mathematics Tests Grades 3-8 2016 explains the importance of security to standardized testing programs; defines security-related roles and responsibilities of administrators, proctors, and students; and provides detailed instructions on the handling of test materials. The Reporting Irregularities and/or Misadministration section provides a list of security violations that must be reported to NYSED and clearly states that “the building principal is responsible for all aspects of the school’s test administration and must take appropriate measures both to prevent, as much as possible, and to investigate all security breaches and irregularities associated with the administration...of the test.” (p42)</p> <p>Alternate Assessment was not specifically addressed.</p> <p>Additional evidence is needed that documents that the requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration were achieved.</p>

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p>Evidence #089: NYCDOE Test Administration Handbook: High Schools 2015-16</p> <p><b>Summary of the results of the State’s monitoring of the most recent year of test administration in the State.</b></p> <p>Evidence #080: Test Security Unit Update presented to the Board of Regents Meeting September 2014 TSU Monitoring of Testing, page 12</p>	
<b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence that the requirements for annual training including violations of test security and testing conduct at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration were achieved.</p>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</b></p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results;</li> <li>• To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> <li>• To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.</li> </ul>	<p><b>State operations manual or other document that describes how the states rules for protecting personally identifiable information are implemented</b></p> <p>Evidence #094: Information and Reporting Security Data Transfer Protocols (internal document)</p> <p>Evidence #095: Identity Verification and Authorization to Access or Disclose Confidential Education Information Regarding Pre-School, Elementary, Secondary, and Post-Secondary Education (form)</p> <p>Evidence #012: NYS ESEA Flexibility Request</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring, Reporting, and Corrective Action— To Ensure That Measures Are Valid and Implementation Is Consistent with SEA Guidelines, pp 191 - 193</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #043: Contract C012427 with vendor Questar Assessments, Inc. “Development of State Assessments in Elementary and Intermediate Level English Language Arts and Mathematics”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix D: Work Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Security, p 98</li> <li>○ Attachment C: Security Guidelines for the NYS Assessment Program, p 104</li> <li>○ Attachment D: Non-Disclosure Agreement, pp 105 - 107</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Questar Technical Proposal response to RFP 15-008 -- Continuing the Development of State Assessments in Elementary - and Intermediate - Level ELA and Mathematics Measuring the Common Core State Standards <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Component 1: Item 7: Security, pp 701 - 720</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The Information and Reporting Security Data Transfer Protocols is an internal document provided by NYSED’s Office of Information and Reporting Security. The Protocols document excerpts from training guides prepared for LEA’s, application user manuals, data request forms, and other documents created by the office. The Protocols describes NYSED’s procedures for protecting security including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The FERPA Waiver section describes the Department’s procedure for releasing educational records to students, parents, or legal guardians. Such requests may be granted after the submission of a completed Identity Verification and Authorization to Access or Disclose Confidential Education Information Regarding Pre-School, Elementary, Secondary, and Post-Secondary Education form.</li> <li>• The Information and Reporting Services Portal (IRSP) describes the software tool through which “authorized users [with] a secure online connection” can access secure data files. (p2) Users must be approved by a delegated administrator within their agency who has been given authority by NYSED. The IRSP is securely connected to the NYSED Business Portal.</li> <li>• The New York State Report Card section defines the state’s SDL rules, stating that “the Department does not publish data for groups with <u>fewer than five students</u> or data that would allow readers to easily determine the performance of a group with fewer than five students.” (emphasis in the original, p3) Additional measures are taken, such as the suppression of other student data (e.g., “the next smallest group”) to impede identification</li> </ul>

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix R: Data Security and Privacy Plan, pp 810 - 812</li> <li>• Appendix S: Parents’ Bill of Rights for Data Privacy and Security, pp 813 - 823</li> <li>• Appendix S-1: Attachment to Parents’ Bill of Rights for Contracts Involving Disclosure of Certain Personally Identifiable Information, pp 824 - 826</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #020: School Administrator’s Manual, 2015 Edition Secondary Level Examinations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safeguarding Exam Materials, pp 2-3 – 2-4</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #039: New York State Student Information Repository System (SIRS) Manual, 2015-2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 1: What is SIRS?, pp 6 - 8</li> <li>• Appendix IV: Selected Federal and State Reporting Requirements, pp 249 - 253</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #096: New York State Student Identification System (NYSSIS)Users Guide, Version 7.0</p> <p>Evidence #097: Privacy-Student Confidentiality Issues (website)</p>	<p>of the limited data.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Regional Information Centers: Data Integration and Federation Project section provides guidance to LEA’s on the protection of student data. In addition to high level rules such as “data should be used only for educational purposes” (p3), the section includes an extensive list of the types of student data that must be protected. and the laws that regulate student privacy.</li> </ul> <p>Work plan regarding this critical element seems appropriate.</p>
<b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b>		
<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 NEW YORK**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> <li>• If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Chapter on validity in the technical report for the State’s assessment</b></p> <p>Evidence #040: Technical Report, New York State Testing Program 2014: English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 3: Validity, pp 17 - 23</li> <li>• Appendix B: ELA and Mathematics Test Blueprints, pp 141 - 142</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #041: New York State Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core) 2015 Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 5: Validity (Standard 1), pp 22 - 33</li> </ul> <p>Evidence # 042: New York State Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core) 2015 Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 5: Validity (Standard 1), pp 23 - 33</li> </ul> <p><b>Other validity evidence, in addition to that outlined in critical elements 3.2 through 3.4, that is necessary to document adequate validity evidence for the assessments</b></p> <p>Evidence #047: Independent Review of Item Development Processes and Alignment Verification for the New York State Testing Program (NYSIP): Final Report, HumRRO, February 21, 2014</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Task 2: Item Content Alignment and DOK Verification, pp 3 - 8</li> <li>• Recommendations and Conclusions, Task 2, pp 8 - 10</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #048: Review of Regents Exam in Algebra I (Common Core) conducted by external consultant Darren Burris</p>	<p>The external reviewers indicate alignment of the assessment items and the standards. An independent review on the test versions themselves is necessary to complete the alignment documentation. This would be an alignment of items and standards without DOK levels given. The review would need to look at the full range of academic content standards (knowledge and process), cognitive complexity, range of knowledge, and balance of representation.</p> <p>When a sizable number of items are released following an administration, the independent review would need to be repeated. This is true despite strict protocols for assessment design.</p> <p>Need the internal blueprints, rather than the external blueprints in Appendix B.</p> <p>Overall, the items reviewed in ELA and mathematics (grades 3-8) were judged to assess the content Common Core Standards with fidelity at the intended DOK level. HumRRO offered suggestions for both ELA and math. Good support for content validity (grades 3-8) regular assessment.</p> <p>Review of Regents Exam in Algebra I (Common Core) conducted by external consultant Darren Burris. Several of the 10 item rating criteria relate to content validity.</p> <p>The external studies of the Regents tests do not provide sufficient evidence regarding the tests measuring the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content and cognitive complexity.</p>

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Evidence #098: Odell Education: Regents Review</p> <p>Evidence #049: Odell Education Feedback—June 2014 Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core)</p> <p><b>Validity evidence based on the assessment content that shows levels of validity generally consistent with expectations of current professional standards</b></p> <p>Evidence #044: Educator Guide to the 2014 Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Test Blueprint, pp 6 - 8</li> <li>○ Part I: Multiple-Choice Question CCLS Coverage, p 9</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Evidence #045: Educator Guide to the Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regents Exam in Algebra I (Common Core) Blueprint, pp 2 - 3</li> <li>• Content Emphases, pp 3 - 4</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #099: Test Blueprint: Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core)</p> <p>Evidence #100: 2014 Grade 7 ELA Test Released Questions with Annotations</p> <p>Evidence #101: 2014 Grade 5 Mathematics Test Released Questions with Annotations</p> <p>Evidence #102: Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core)--August 2015 administration</p>	<p>Some support for content validity of the results of the 2016 tests at grades 3-8 is provided in the Questar contract.</p> <p>Nothing included for science.</p>

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p>Evidence #103: Regents Exam in Algebra I (Common Core)--June 2015 administration                      Evidence #050: 2014 Grade 5 Mathematics Map to the Standards</p> <p>Evidence #051: 2014 Grade 7 ELA Map to the Standards</p> <p>Evidence #104: Scoring Key and Rating Guide--Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core)--June 2015 administration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Map to the Common Core Learning Standards, p 77</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #105: Scoring Key and Rating Guide--Regents Exam in Algebra I (Common Core)--June 2015 administration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Map to the Common Core Learning Standards, pp 14 - 15</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #106: Definitions of Performance Levels for the 2015 Grades 3-8 English Language Arts Tests</p> <p>Evidence #107: Definitions of Performance Levels for the 2015 Grades 3-8 Mathematics Tests</p> <p>Evidence #108: Performance Level Descriptions, ELA Regents Exam (Common Core)</p> <p>Evidence #109: Performance Level Descriptions, Algebra I Regents Exam (Common Core)</p> <p>Evidence #043: Contract C012427 with vendor Questar Assessments, Inc. "Development of State Assessments in Elementary and Intermediate Level English Language Arts and Mathematics"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Common Core English Language Arts Test</li> </ul>	

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p>Design, pp 55 - 58</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Content Emphases and Sequencing [Math], pp 64 - 71</li> <li>• Attachment H: Passage Development, pp 115 – 117</li> <li>• Attachment I: Item Development, pp 118 - 141</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #006: Education Laws of New York, Title 1, General Provisions, Section 211, Review of regents learning standards</p> <p>Evidence #110: Presentation to the Board of Regents—Revision and Implementation of New English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics Standards</p> <p>Evidence #052: Procedural Validity for Regents Exam in ELA (Common Core)</p> <p>Evidence #053: Procedural Validity for Regents Exam in Algebra I (Common Core)</p>	
<b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:            Evidence that the Regents Exam in Algebra I (Common Core), Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core), and Grades 3-8 ELA and Mathematics measure the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity, for example, an alignment study.</p>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p><b>Results of cognitive labs exploring student performance on items that show the items require complex demonstration or applications of knowledge and skills.</b>  Evidence #111: Warner, Z. (2013). Comparing Cognitive Models of Domain Mastery and Task Performance in Algebra: Validity Evidence for a State Assessment (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University at Albany, State University of New York, Albany, NY.</p> <p><b>Reports of expert judgement of items that show the items require complex demonstration or applications of knowledge and skills.</b>  Evidence #047: Independent Review of Item Development Processes and Alignment Verification for the New York State Testing Program (NYSTP): Final Report, HumRRO, February 21, 2014</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Task 2: Item Content Alignment and DOK Verification, pp 3 - 8</li> <li>• Recommendations and Conclusions, Task 2, pp 8 - 10</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #043: Contract C012427 with vendor Questar Assessments, Inc. “Development of State Assessments in Elementary and Intermediate Level English Language Arts and Mathematics”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attachment M: Revised Enhanced Test Development Criteria, pp 559 - 570</li> <li>• Questar Technical Proposal response to RFP 15-008 -- Continuing the Development of State Assessments in Elementary- and Intermediate-Level ELA and Mathematics Measuring the Common Core State Standards Component 1: Project Description; Item 2: Test Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Item Development, pp 618 - 628</li> <li>o Range-finding, p 630</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Various verification studies were completed. While these are not as rigorous as the traditional alignment students, they do add evidence of validity.</p> <p>This information could be included in the suggested alignment study.</p> <p>Do not believe that the cognitive labs generalize to current assessments.</p> <p>The Recommendations and Conclusions section of the Independent Review of Item Development Processes and Alignment Verification for the New York State Testing Program (NYSTP): Final Report by HumRRO states that “the items reviewed in ELA and mathematics were judged to assess the content Common Core Standards with fidelity at the intended DOK level.”</p> <p>PARCC Education Leader Fellow Darren Burris performed an external review of the Regents Exams in Algebra I (Common Core) for 2014 and 2015. This review included an examination of depth of knowledge/complexity on all the items presented in two ways. On the Math Content Verification Checklist, Burris identified issues by various categories, including DOK, for all items. On his review spreadsheet Burris addressed the appropriateness of complexity for items in the Evidence Statement comments columns. <b>Several of the 10 item rating criteria relate to content validity, but little if any relevance to cognitive processes.</b></p> <p>Odell Education reviewed the first three administrations of the Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core) to determine if items were aligned with the CCLS and that passages</p>

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questar Technical Proposal response to RFP 15-008 -- Continuing the Development of State Assessments in Elementary- and Intermediate-Level ELA and Mathematics Measuring the Common Core State Standards Component 1: Project Description; Item 4: Field Testing               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Range-finding Sessions, pp 666 - 667</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Evidence #112: Contract C012340 with Measurement, Incorporated, “Scoring Pilot and Field Tests for select NYS examinations”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rangefinding, pp 25 -26</li> <li>• Attachment 2: Approximate Numbers of Days and Teachers Needed to Conduct Rangefinding for Scoring Pilot and Field Tests, p 36</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #048: Review of Regents Exam in Algebra I (Common Core) conducted by external consultant Darren Burris</p> <p>Evidence #113: Review of Math Content Verification Checklist conducted by external consultant Darren Burris</p> <p>Evidence #098: Odell Education: Regents Review</p> <p>Evidence #064: Multiple-Choice Item Writing Form, Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core)</p> <p>Evidence #059: Item Criteria for Potential Math Questions</p> <p><b>Empirical evidence that shows the relationships of items intended to require complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills to other measures that require similar levels of cognitive complexity in the content area.</b></p>	<p>and items were appropriately complex. Odell found that the large majority of the items and passages met the standards’ complexity requirement. Regents Review of passages and review of format includes complexity, but not cognitive processes. Not convinced that the study results generalize to the current tests or how the research informed test/item development.</p> <p>The checklist could well be useful, but it does not appear to address cognitive processes.</p>

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Evidence #114: Huff, K., Warner, Z., and Schweid J. (in press). The role of cognitive models in large-scale standards-based assessments of educational achievement. To appear in A. Rupp, and J. Leighton (Eds.), Handbook of cognition and assessment. New York, NY: Springer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examples of Best Practices from Current Testing Programs, pp 11 - 26</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #115: Hendrickson, A., Kaliski, P., and Huff, K. (2013) Evidence-Centered Design: Recommendations for Implementation and Practice. <i>Journal of Applied Testing Technology</i>, 14.</p>	
<b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:            Evidence that State’s assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in its academic content standards. The cognitive processes intended by the assessment could be examined as part of an alignment study (see 3.1)</p>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p><b>Reports of analyses of the internal structure of the assessments that show the extent to which the interrelationships among subscores are consistent with the State’s academic content standards for relevant groups</b></p> <p>Evidence #040: Technical Report, New York State Testing Program 2014: English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construct (Internal Structure) Validity               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Internal Consistency, p 18</li> <li>○ Unidimensionality, pp 18 - 22</li> <li>○ Detection of Bias, pp 22 - 23</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Section 5: Operational Test Data Collection and Classical Analysis               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Differential Item Functioning, pp 48 - 50</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Section 7: Reliability and Standard Error of Measurement               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Performance Level Classification Consistency and Accuracy, pp 97 - 100</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Appendix N: Items Flagged for DIF, pp 206 - 207</li> <li>• Appendix P: Derivation and Estimation of Classification Consistency and Accuracy, pp 241 - 243</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #116: New York State Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core), 2014 Field Test Analysis, Equating Procedure, and Scaling of Operational Test Forms, Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Classical Analysis               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Inter-rater Agreement, p 6</li> <li>○ Intraclass Correlation, pp 6 - 7</li> <li>○ Weighted Kappa, p 7</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Differential Item Functioning, pp 12 - 15</li> </ul>	<p>Validity evidence of the internal structure of the assessment is consistent with expectations.</p> <p>Results provided were structurally sound.</p> <p>Validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of the current <b>English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8 tests</b> 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. How did changes from 2014 to 2015 effect validity?</p> <p>The statistics appear reasonable for the New York State Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core) and Algebra I (Common Core).</p> <p>Do the three parts (reading comprehension, writing from sources: argument, text analysis: exposition) match the score report?</p> <p>The test blueprint shows that the Algebra conceptual category contains 50% - 56% of the credits, the Functions conceptual category contains 32% - 38% of the credits, the Number and Quantity conceptual category contains 2% - 8% of the credits and Statistics and Probability conceptual categories contains 5% - 10% of the credits on the exam. Do the conceptual categories match the score reports?</p> <p>Appears to be adequate support for construct validity of the high school Regents tests and the English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8; however most of the evidence supporting the construct validity of the English Language Arts and</p>

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section IV: Scaling of Operational Test Forms, pp 17 - 19</li> <li>• Appendix B: Inter-rater Consistency – Point Differences Between First and Second Reads, p 31</li> <li>• Appendix C: Additional Measures of Inter-rater Reliability and Agreement, p 32</li> <li>• Appendix E: DIF Statistics, pp 42 - 48</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #117: New York State Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core), 2014 Field Test Analysis, Equating Procedure, and Scaling of Operational Test Forms, Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Classical Analysis               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Inter-rater Agreement, pp 6 - 7</li> <li>○ Intraclass Correlation, pp 7 - 8</li> <li>○ Weighted Kappa, p 8</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Differential Item Functioning, pp 13 - 16</li> <li>• Appendix B: Inter-rater Consistency – Point Differences Between First and Second Reads, pp 38 - 40</li> <li>• Appendix C: Additional Measures of Inter-rater Reliability and Agreement, pp 39 - 42</li> <li>• Appendix E: DIF Statistics, pp 64 - 74</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #044: Educator Guide to the 2014 Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core), pp 6 - 10</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #045: Educator Guide to the Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core) Blueprint, pp 2 - 3</li> </ul>	<p>Mathematics Grades 3–8 tests in 2013-2014. Not sure if these apply to 2014-2015. Note: Questar included items developed by the prior contractor in 2016.</p>

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>Reports of analyses that show the dimensionality of the assessment is consistent with the structure of the State’s academic content standards and intented interpretations of results.</b></p> <p>Evidence #041: New York State Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core) 2015 Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unidimensionality, pp 9 - 10</li> <li>• Item Development Process, pp 25 - 28</li> <li>• 5.3 Evidence Based on Internal Structure, pp 30 - 33</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #042: New York State Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core) 2015 Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unidimensionality, pp 11 - 12</li> <li>• Item Development Process, pp 24 - 27</li> <li>• 5.3 Internal Validity, pp 29 - 31</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #054: Review Criteria Checklist for Potential Math Items—Regents Exam in Algebra I (Common Core)</p> <p><b>Evidence that ancillary constructs needed for success on the assessments do not provide inappropriate barriers for measuring the achievement of all students, such as evidence from cognitive labs or documentation of item development processes.</b></p> <p>Evidence #043: Contract C012427 with vendor Questar Assessments, Inc. “Development of State Assessments in Elementary and Intermediate Level English Language Arts and Mathematics”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attachment J: Passage Review Criteria, pp 142 - 145</li> <li>• Attachment J-1: Standard Interpretations for</li> </ul>	

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW YORK

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Multiple-Choice Questions English Language Arts Grades 3-8, pp 146 - 214</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attachment J-2: New York State Passage Review Criteria English Language Arts Grades 3-8, pp 215 - 483</li> <li>• Attachment K1: Item Review Criteria for Potential Grades 3-8 ELA Items, pp 506 – 548</li> <li>• Attachment L: Math Enhanced Specs CCLS Cluster 5, pp 549 – 557</li> </ul> <p><b>Reports of differential item functioning (DIF) analyses to show whether particular items (e.g., essays, performance tasks, or items requiring specific knowledge or skills) function differently for relevant student groups.</b></p> <p>See Grade 3-8 Technical Report and Regents Equating and Scaling Reports</p>	
<b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:                      Validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of the current English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8 tests 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. How did changes from 2014 to 2015 effect validity? Please submit the 2015 technical manual for the English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8 tests.</p>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p><b>Reports of analyses that demonstrate positive correlations between State assessment results and external measures that assess similar constructs, such as NAEP, TIMSS, assessments of the same content area administered by some or all districts of the State, and college readiness assessments.</b>            Evidence #118: SAT Suite of Assessments: Alignment to New York Standards, The College Board, 2015</p> <p>Evidence #119: Mapping State Proficiency Standards Onto NAEP Scales: Results From the 2013 NAEP Reading and Mathematics Assessments, NAEP, 2015</p> <p>Evidence #120: Proficient vs Prepared: Disparities Between State Tests and the 2013 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), Achieve, Inc.,2015</p> <p>Evidence #121: New York Linking Study: A Study of the Alignment of the NWEA RIT Scale with the New York State (NYS) Testing Program, NWEA, 2013</p> <p><b>Reports of analyses that demonstrate convergent relationships between State assessment results and measures other than test scores, such as performance criteria, including college- and career- readiness.</b>            Evidence #122: Memo: Relationship of Regents ELA and Math Scores to College Readiness Indicators</p> <p>Evidence #123: Koretz, et al. “Predicting Freshman Grade-Point Average from High-School Test Scores: Are There Indications of Score Inflation?”, August 2014</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results, pp 7 - 14</li> </ul>	<p>Some of the studies presented used an assessment designed using old standards. These studies should be replicated using the more recent assessment.</p> <p>The College Board conducted an alignment study between the updated SAT assessments and the CCLS (listed as “New York State standards” in the report). Analysis specifically examined alignment with college and career anchor standards in ELA, History/Social Science literacy standards, CCLS writing standards, and Math standards for 6<sup>th</sup> grade through high school. The report finds “strong to very strong” alignment between the CCLS and the SAT suite of assessments.</p> <p>The Northwest Education Association (NWEA) conducted a study comparing the test results of over 6,000 New York students who took the Spring 2013 administration of the Grades 3-8 ELA and Math assessments to the Rasch Unit (RIT) scale used on NWEA’s Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) assessment. The purpose of this study was to “to establish performance-level scores on the RIT scale that would indicate a good chance of success on [the New York] tests.” The study found that the tests had a good correlation using the Pearson r coefficient (between 0.7 and 0.8 for each test and grade level) and that the MAP results accurately predicted results on the NYS exams about 80% of the time (the remaining 20% was almost evenly divided between underestimated and overestimated predictions of performance).</p> <p>The difference between the NAEP equivalent reading scores of the states with the lowest and highest proficiency standards, Georgia and New York, respectively.            At grades 4 and 8 in 2013, in reading and math,</p>

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Evidence #124: Website: City University of New York Admissions Requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary Ways to Meet the City University of New York (CUNY) Admissions Requirements for Four-Year Colleges, p 1</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #125: Website: State University of New York Nassau Community College (NCC) Placement Testing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can I be waived from a placement test?, p 2</li> </ul> <p><b>Reports of analyses that demonstrate positive correlation between State assessment results and other variables, such as academic characteristics of test takers.</b></p> <p>Evidence #126: Internal CUNY Research: Grades by Regents</p> <p>Evidence #127: Internal CUNY Research: Math grades by Regents subgroups</p> <p><b>Reports of analyses that show assessment scores at tested grades are positively correlated with teacher judgements of student readiness at entry in the next grade level.</b></p> <p>Evidence #043: Contract C012427 with vendor Questar Assessments, Inc. “Development of State Assessments in Elementary and Intermediate Level English Language Arts and Mathematics”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questar Technical Proposal response to RFP 15-008 -- Continuing the Development of State Assessments in Elementary- and Intermediate-Level ELA and Mathematics Measuring the Common Core State Standards <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Component 1: Project Description; Item 2:</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>NY’s proficiency standards are comparable with NAEP’s. Do these results apply to the current New York State 3-8 tests compared to the NAEP 2015?</p> <p>The 2010 cohort consists of students who graduated from high school in 2010 and entered the CUNY system as a freshman in 2010, 2011 or 2012. The 2011 cohort consists of students who graduated from high school in 2011 and entered CUNY as freshmen in 2011 or 2012.</p> <p>Correlations of FGPA with Regents scores were similar to those with SAT scores. In English, the correlation with Regents scores was slightly higher than that with SAT scores: <math>r = .35</math> compared with <math>r = .31</math>. In mathematics, the two correlations were for all practical purposes the same: <math>r = .36</math> and <math>r = .35</math>, respectively. We found a stronger relationship between the SAT and Regents scores in mathematics (<math>r = .76</math>) than in English/verbal (<math>r = .58</math>) (p.8). May want to repeat this comparison with the more recent assessments.</p> <p>Validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores for Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core) and Algebra 1 (Common Core) are related as expected with other variables. Note: This is convergent validity. Checking divergent validity correlations would strengthen the argument for convergency.</p>

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p>Test Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Range-finding, p 630</li> <li>○ Component 1: Project Description; Item 4: Field Testing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Range-finding Sessions, pp 666 - 667</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Evidence #112: Contract C012340 with Measurement, Incorporated, “Scoring Pilot and Field Tests for select NYS examinations”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rangefinding, pp 25 -26</li> <li>• Attachment 2: Approximate Numbers of Days and Teachers Needed to Conduct Rangefinding for Scoring Pilot and Field Tests, p 36</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #128: NYSED Comparative Analysis of Regents Exam Outcomes</p>	
<b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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

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

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.1 – Reliability</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Results of analyses for alternate-form or, test-retest internal consistency reliability statistics, as appropriate, for each assessment</b></p> <p>Evidence #040: Technical Report, New York State Testing Program 2014: English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 7: Reliability and Standard Error of Measurement, pp 83 - 100</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #116: New York State Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core), 2014 Field Test Analysis, Equating Procedure, and Scaling of Operational Test Forms, Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section II: Field Test Analysis               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Test Reliability, p 4</li> <li>○ Scoring Reliability, p 5</li> <li>○ Table 3. Test and Scoring Reliability, p 5</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Evidence #117: New York State Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core), 2014 Field Test Analysis, Equating Procedure, and Scaling of Operational Test Forms, Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section II: Field Test Analysis               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Test Reliability, pp 4-5</li> <li>○ Scoring Reliability, p 5</li> <li>○ Table 3. Test and Scoring Reliability, p 6</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Evidence #041: New York State Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core) 2015 Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 4: Reliability (Standard 2), pp 13 - 21</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #042: New York State Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core) 2015</p>	<p>Decision consistencies for 2014 are low in grades 3-8 due to examination of each cut point. Suggest look at above and below one point, for example above and below proficient. Consistencies and accuracies appropriate in Algebra I and Regents English Language Arts. Overall this section looks good.</p> <p>“With the new assessments being implemented in 2013, a new scale was established after the data were collected”. The purpose of equating was to place the 2014 item parameters and proficiency estimates on the same scale as those in 2013 (p.62). The results seem appropriate, but are they relevant to the 2015 English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8 tests?</p> <p>For the Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core), both decision consistency and accuracy values are high, indicating very good consistency and accuracy of examinee classifications. Decision consistency ranged from 0.88 to 0.97, and the decision accuracy ranged from 0.91 to .98 (p.21).</p>

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 4: Reliability (Standard 2), pp 14 - 22</li> </ul> <p><b>Report of standard errors of measurement and conditional standard errors of measurement, for example, in terms of one or more coefficients or IRT-based test information functions at each cut score specified in the State’s academic achievement standards.</b></p> <p>Evidence #040: Technical Report, New York State Testing Program 2014: English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 6: IRT Calibration and Equating               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Calibration Sample, pp 52 - 59</li> <li>○ Item Model Fit, pp 60 - 61</li> <li>○ Test Characteristic Curves, pp 67 - 79</li> <li>○ Scoring Procedure, p 80</li> <li>○ Raw Score-to-Scale Score and SEM Conversion Tables, pp 80 - 82</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Evidence #116: New York State Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core), 2014 Field Test Analysis, Equating Procedure, and Scaling of Operational Test Forms, Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section II: Field Test Analysis               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Item Response Theory (IRT) and the Calibration and Equating of the Field Test Items, pp 8 - 12</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Evidence #117: New York State Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core), 2014 Field Test Analysis, Equating Procedure, and Scaling of Operational Test Forms, Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section II: Field Test Analysis               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Item Response Theory (IRT) and the Calibration and Equating of the Field Test</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p style="text-align: center;">Items, pp 9 - 13</p> <p>Evidence #041: New York State Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core) 2015 Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 3: IRT Calibrations, Equating, and Scaling (Standards 2, and 4.10), pp 7 – 12</li> <li>• Chapter 4: Reliability (Standard 2), pp 13 - 21               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Traditional Standard Error of Measurement, pp 14 – 15</li> <li>○ Conditional Standard Error of Measurement, pp 15 - 17</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Evidence #042: New York State Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core) 2015 Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 3: IRT Calibrations, Equating, and Scaling (Standards 2, and 4.10), pp 8 – 13</li> <li>• Chapter 4: Reliability (Standard 2)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Traditional Standard Error of Measurement, pp 15 – 16</li> <li>○ Conditional Standard Error of Measurement, pp 16 - 18</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Results of estimates of decision consistency and accuracy for the categorical decisions (e.g., classification of proficiency levels) based on the results of the assessments.</b></p> <p>Evidence #040: Technical Report, New York State Testing Program 2014: English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 7: Reliability and Standard Error of Measurement, pp 83 - 100</li> <li>• Appendix P: Derivation and Estimation of Classification Consistency and Accuracy, pp 241 - 243</li> </ul>	

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:  Measures of reliability based on the State’s student population overall and each student group for the 2015 English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8 tests. How did changes from 2014 to 2015 effect reliability? Please submit the 2015 technical manual for the English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8 tests.</p>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</b></p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<p><b>Documentation of steps the State has taken in the Analysis of its assessments, such as results of empirical analyses that identify possible bias or inconsistent interpretations of results across student groups</b></p> <p>Evidence #040: Technical Report, New York State Testing Program 2014: English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Passage Selection and Item Criteria Documents, pp 9 - 12</li> <li>• Detection of Bias, pp 22-23</li> <li>• Differential Item Functioning, pp 48-50</li> <li>• Appendix D: Universal Design Item Checklist, pp 144-146</li> <li>• Appendix E: Criteria for Item Acceptability, pp 147-148</li> <li>• Appendix F: Psychometric Guidelines for Operational Item Selection, p 149</li> <li>• Appendix N: Items Flagged for DIF, pp 206-207</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #043: Contract C012427 with vendor Questar Assessments, Inc. “Development of State Assessments in Elementary and Intermediate Level English Language Arts and Mathematics”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix D: Work Plan               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Attachment A: Specifications for Large Type</li> <li>○ Attachment B: Specifications for Contractor/Subcontractor Transcribing Braille</li> <li>○ Attachment J: Passage Review Criteria, pp 142 - 145</li> <li>○ Attachment J1: Draft Enhanced Review Criteria for Passages Intended for Use with Grade 6 ELA Multiple-Choice Items, pp 146 - 483</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>There was no documentation that experts in the assessment of students with disabilities, English learners and individuals familiar with the needs of other student populations in the State were involved in item development and review.</p> <p>The Technical Report, New York State Testing Program 2014: English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8 describes the following steps that NYSED has taken to ensure that the Grade 3-8 Tests are fair and free of bias:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Passage Selection and Item Criteria section indicates that the 3-8 Tests are designed using the principles of Universal Design in order “to create tests that [are] as equitable as possible for students” (p11) by working to identify and eliminate bias at all stages of the item and test development process.</li> <li>• DIF analyses were conducted for seven student subgroups</li> <li>• The Universal Design Item Checklist listed in Appendix D is a tool that prompts item developers to examine items against more than 40 separate criteria for fairness before submitting them for review.</li> <li>• Bias and fairness reviews for all regular assessments were extensive and included DIF analysis as well and expert review panels</li> </ul> <p>NYSED is particularly excited about the greater numbers of teachers of English language learners and students with disabilities who will be involved in the development of these assessments.</p> <p>Educator Involvement Opportunities for Grades English Language Arts and Mathematics Tests</p>

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Attachment J2: New York State Passage Review Criteria—English Language Arts Grades 3-8, pp 215-483</li> <li>○ Attachment K: Review Criteria for Potential Grades 3-5 and 6-8 ELA Items, pp484-505</li> <li>○ Attachment K1: Item Review Criteria for Potential Grades 3-8 ELA Items, pp 506-548</li> <li>○ Attachment L Review Criteria for Potential Grades 3-8 Math Items, pp 225 - 230</li> <li>● Component 1: Project Description; Item 2: Test Development               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Item Writer Training, pp 620-621</li> <li>○ Universal Design, pp 624-626</li> <li>○ Operational Forms Construction, pp 630-635</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Evidence #047: Independent Review of Item Development Processes and Alignment Verification for the New York State Testing Program (NYSTP): Final Report, HumRRO, February 21, 2014</p> <p>Evidence #041: New York State Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core) 2015 Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Chapter 5: Validity               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Item Development Process, pp 24 – 26</li> <li>○ Administration and Scoring, pp 27 – 28</li> <li>○ Differential Item Functioning, p 30</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Evidence #042: New York State Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core) 2015 Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Chapter 5: Validity               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Item Development Process, pp 24 – 27</li> <li>○ Administration and Scoring, pp 27 – 29</li> <li>○ Differential Item Functioning, p 30</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Evidence #064: Multiple-Choice Item Review</p>	<p>(Grades 3-8) and for Regent Exams were advertised.</p>

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Checklist, New York State Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core)</p> <p>Evidence #060: Guidelines for Text Selection, Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Text Content, p 2</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #129: Regents Exams: Mathematics – Item Criteria Checklist (web site)</p> <p>Evidence #054: Review Criteria Checklist for Potential Math Items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sensitivity/Bias, p 2</li> </ul> <p><b>Documentation that experts in the assessment of students with disabilities, English learners and individuals familiar with the needs of other student populations in the State were involved in item development and review</b></p> <p>Evidence #030: Memo--Changes for the 2016 Grades 3-8 English Language Arts and Mathematics Tests</p> <p>Evidence #130: Educator Involvement Opportunities for Grades 3-8 English Language Arts and Mathematics Tests (website)</p> <p>Evidence #072: Educator Involvement Opportunities for Regents Exams (website)</p>	
<b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>Evidence that 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 or evidence that the submitted fairness and accessibility evidence applies to the 2015 English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8 tests.</p> <p>Documentation that experts in the assessment of students with disabilities, English learners, and individuals familiar with the needs of other student populations in the State were involved in item development and review.</p>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b></p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p><b>Description of the distribution of cognitive complexity and item difficulty indices that demonstrate the items included in each assessment adequately cover the full performance continuum.</b></p> <p>Evidence #043: Contract C012427 with vendor Questar Assessments, Inc. “Development of State Assessments in Elementary and Intermediate Level English Language Arts and Mathematics”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attachment J2: New York State Passage Review Criteria—English Language Arts 3-8, pp 215 - 483</li> <li>• Attachment M: Revised Enhanced Test Development Criteria, pp 559 - 570</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #131: New York State Testing Program Grade 3 Common Core English Language Arts Test Annotated Passages November 2014</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quantitative Measures of Text Complexity, pp 2 - 3</li> <li>• Qualitative Measures of Text Complexity, pp 3 - 5</li> <li>• Appendix A: Text Complexity Grade Ranges for Quantitative Measures, pp 6 - 7</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #132: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State English Language Arts Test, Grade 3</p> <p>Evidence #133: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State English Language Arts Test, Grade 4</p> <p>Evidence #134: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State English Language Arts Test, Grade 5</p> <p>Evidence #135: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State English Language Arts Test, Grade 6</p>	<p>NYSED documents assessment design to adequately estimate student performance across the range of student performance and item curves to document that they were successful in providing adequately precise estimates of student performance across the continuum in 2014.</p> <p>There was no documentation that experts in the assessment of students with disabilities, English learners and individuals familiar with the needs of other student populations in the State were involved in item development and review.</p> <p>The Grade 5 Mathematics Test Blueprint indicates the distribution of items that meet the lower and higher complexity ranges on the 2015 Test. The descriptions of these complexity levels can be found in the Grade 5 Mathematics Test CRI Writing Criteria and the Grade 5.NBT Mathematics Test MC Criteria documents. This distribution demonstrates that the test is designed to measure student achievement at every level along the performance continuum. Comparable documents are produced for ELA and Math tests at each grade level. <b>This is helpful, but the State only provides a minimum number of internal test blueprints. All internal test blueprints are needed along with explanations of key components (e.g., tiers)</b></p>

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p>Evidence #136: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State English Language Arts Test, Grade 7</p> <p>Evidence #137: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State English Language Arts Test, Grade 8</p> <p>Evidence #138: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Mathematics Test, Grade 3</p> <p>Evidence #139: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Mathematics Test, Grade 4</p> <p>Evidence #140: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Mathematics Test, Grade 5</p> <p>Evidence #141: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Mathematics Test, Grade 6</p> <p>Evidence #142: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Mathematics Test, Grade 7</p> <p>Evidence #143: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Mathematics Test, Grade 8</p> <p>Evidence #144: Grade 5 Mathematics Test Blueprint</p> <p>Evidence #145: Grade 5 Mathematics Test CRI Writing Criteria</p> <p>Evidence #146: Grade 5.NBT Mathematics Test MC Criteria</p> <p>Evidence #147: Grade 4 ELA Item Writing Criteria</p> <p>Evidence #148: Grade 4 ELA Standard Interpretations for Multiple-Choice Questions</p> <p>Evidence #149: New York State Regents</p>	

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p>Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core): Literature Text Complexity Rubric and Informational Text Complexity Rubric</p> <p>Evidence #108: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core)</p> <p>Evidence #109: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core)</p> <p>Evidence #044: Educator Guide to the 2014 Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guide for CCLS Grade Band Text Difficulty Indices, p 5</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #055: Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core): Passage Selection Criteria</p> <p>Evidence #150: Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core) Internal Blueprint</p> <p>Evidence #046: Internal Blueprint Alignment-- Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core)</p> <p><b>Analysis of test information functions (TIF) and ability estimates for students at different performance levels across the full performance continuum or a pool information function across the full performance continuum.</b></p> <p><b>AND</b></p> <p><b>Table of CSEMs at various points along the score range.</b></p>	

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Evidence #040: Technical Report, New York State Testing Program 2014: English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 6: IRT Calibration and Equating, pp 51 - 82</li> <li>• Appendix O: Item Response Theory Statistics, pp 208 - 240</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #116: New York State Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core) 2014 Field Test Analysis, Equating Procedure, and Scaling of Operational Test Forms Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Item Response Theory (IRT) and the Calibration and Equating of the Field Test Items, pp 9 – 12</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #041: New York State Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core) 2015 Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3.4. Item Difficulty-Student Performance Maps, p 8</li> <li>• 3.5 Checking Rasch Assumptions, pp 9 - 12</li> <li>• Conditional Standard Error of Measurement, pp 15 – 17</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #117: New York State Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core), 2014 Field Test Analysis, Equating Procedure, and Scaling of Operational Test Forms Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Item Response Theory (IRT) and the Calibration and Equating of the Field Test Items, pp 8 – 12</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #042: New York State Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core) 2015 Technical Report</p>	

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3.4. Item Difficulty-Student Performance Maps, p 9</li> <li>• 3.5 Checking Rasch Assumptions, pp 10 – 13</li> <li>• Conditional Standard Error of Measurement, pp 16 - 18</li> </ul>	
<b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:  Evidence that the State has ensured that each 2015 English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8 assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students or evidence that the submitted evidence applies to the 2015 English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8 tests. Submission could include the internal blueprints and the 2015 Technical Manual for the grade 3-8 assessments.</p>		

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p><b>Procedures for constructing scales used for reporting scores and the rationale for these procedures.</b></p> <p>Evidence #151: Technical Report, New York State Testing Program 2013: English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 6: IRT Calibration and Scaling               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Scaling, pp 59 – 61</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Evidence #116: New York State Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core), 2014 Field Test Analysis, Equating Procedure, and Scaling of Operational Test Forms, Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section IV: Scaling of Operational Test Forms, pp 17 - 19</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #117: New York State Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core), 2014 Field Test Analysis, Equating Procedure, and Scaling of Operational Test Forms, Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section IV: Scaling of Operational Test Forms, pp 20 - 21</li> </ul> <p><b>Scale, measurement error, and descriptions of test scores.</b></p> <p>Evidence #040: Technical Report, New York State Testing Program 2014: English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 6: IRT Calibration and Equating               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Equating and Scaling, pp 62 – 65</li> <li>○ Test Characteristic Curves, pp 67 - 79</li> <li>○ Scoring Procedure, pp 80 – 82</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Section 7: Reliability and Standard Error of Measurement               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Test Statistics and Reliability for Total Test, pp 83 - 96</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>NYSDE has established and document standardized scoring procedures for assessments that are designed to produce reliable results. Results are reported in terms of the state’s achievement standards. Calculations are monitored by multiple stakeholders.</p> <p>The calibration of NYSTP 2013 Grades 3–8 Common Core ELA and Mathematics Tests did not exhibit any test-level issues. The estimated parameters were in the original theta metric, and all the items were well within the prescribed parameter ranges. For both the Grades 3–8 Common Core ELA and Mathematics Tests, all calibration estimation results were reasonable. Consider replications of raw scores to standard score calculations.</p>

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix Q: Raw Score-to-Scale Score and Scale Score Frequency Tables, pp 244 - 278</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #152: Chart for Converting Total Weighted Raw Scores to Final Exam Scores (Scale Scores), Regents Examination in Algebra 1 (Common Core) – June 2015</p> <p>Evidence #041: New York State Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core) 2015 Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.2 Standard Error of Measurement, pp 14 - 17</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #042: New York State Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core) 2015 Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.2 Standard Error of Measurement, pp 15 - 18</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence that the scoring of constructed-response items includes adequate procedures and criteria for ensuring and documenting inter-rater reliability (e.g., clear scoring rubrics, adequate training for and qualifying of raters, evaluation of inter-rater reliability, and documentation of quality control procedures)</b></p> <p>Evidence #153: Grades 3–8 Common Core English Language Arts and Mathematics Tests Scoring Leader Handbook</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preparation for Training, pp 10 – 15</li> <li>• Training for Scoring, pp 18 - 19</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #040: Technical Report, New York State Testing Program 2014: English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality Control Process, p 26</li> </ul>	

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Evidence #019: School Administrator’s Manual, New York State Testing Program (NYSTP) Common Core English Language Arts and Mathematics Tests Grades 3-8 2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appendix O: Scoring Operations Certificate, p A-23</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #154: Regents Examination Scoring Certificate</p> <p>Evidence #020: School Administrator’s Manual, 2015 Edition Secondary Level Examinations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rating Regents Exams, p 3-2</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #104: Scoring Key and Rating Guide, June 2015 Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core)</p> <p>Evidence #105: Scoring Key and Rating Guide, June 2015 Regents Examination in Algebra 1 (Common Core)</p> <p>Evidence #155: Information Booklet for Scoring the Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core)</p> <p>Evidence #156: Training Presentation-Scoring the Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core)</p> <p>Evidence #157: Information Booklet for Scoring the Regents Exam in Algebra I (Common Core)</p> <p>Evidence #041: New York State Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core) 2015 Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5.2 Evidence Based on Response Processes, pp 27 - 29</li> </ul>	

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Evidence #042: New York State Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core) 2015 Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5.2 Evidence Based on Response Processes, pp 27 - 29</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #112: Contract C012340 with Measurement, Incorporated, “Scoring Pilot and Field Tests for select NYS examinations”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for Developing Training Materials, p 50</li> <li>• Selection of Scoring Staff, pp 53 – 54</li> <li>• Reader Training and Qualifying, pp 54 – 55</li> <li>• Quality Control and Reliability Scoring, pp 63 - 68</li> </ul> <p><b>Results of inter-rater reliability of scores on constructed-response items.</b></p> <p>Evidence #040: Technical Report, New York State Testing Program 2014: English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Field Testing, p 14</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #116: New York State Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core), 2014 Field Test Analysis, Equating Procedure, and Scaling of Operational Test Forms, Technical Report</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Section II: Field Test Analysis; Classical Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Scoring Reliability, p 5</li> <li>○ Inter-rater Agreement, p 6</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section IV: Scaling of Operational Test Forms, pp 17 – 19</li> <li>• Appendix B: Inter-rater Consistency – Point Differences Between First and Second Reads, p</li> </ul>	

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p align="center">31</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix C: Additional Measures of Inter-rater Reliability and Agreement, p 32</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #117: New York State Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core), 2014 Field Test Analysis, Equating Procedure, and Scaling of Operational Test Forms, Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section II: Field Test Analysis; Classical Analysis               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Scoring Reliability, p 5</li> <li>○ Inter-rater Agreement, p 6</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Appendix B: Inter-rater Consistency – Point Differences Between First and Second Reads, p 31</li> <li>• Appendix C: Additional Measures of Inter-rater Reliability and Agreement, p 32</li> </ul> <p><b>Documentation that the system produces student results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards</b></p> <p>Evidence #106: Definitions of Performance Levels for the 2015 Grades 3-8 ELA Tests</p> <p>Evidence #107: Definitions of Performance Levels for the 2015 Grades 3-8 Mathematics Tests</p> <p>Evidence #158: Performance Levels on Common Core Regents Exams (presentation to the Board of Regents)</p> <p><b>Documentation that the State has rules for invalidating test results when necessary and appropriate procedures for implementing these rules</b></p> <p>Evidence #091: Report Educator Test Fraud (website cover sheet to Incident Report Form)</p>	

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	Evidence #092: Test Security Incident Report Form  Evidence #019: School Administrator’s Manual, New York State Testing Program (NYSTP) Common Core English Language Arts and Mathematics Tests Grades 3-8 2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reporting Irregularities and/or Misadministrations</li> </ul> Mandatory Reporting of Testing Improprieties by Adults	
<b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b>		
__X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Documentation that the submitted evidence applies to the 2015 English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8 tests. Submission could include the internal blueprints to support items development and the 2015 Technical Manual.		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</b></p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years. Evidence that the State has ensured that each 2015 English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8 assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students or evidence that the submitted evidence generalizes to the 2015 English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8 tests. Submission could include the internal blueprints support items development over the full performance range.</p>	<p><b>Documentation of year-to-year equating procedures and results, such as a section of a technical report for assessments that provides detailed technical information on the method used to establish linkages and on the accuracy of equating functions.</b></p> <p>Evidence #040: Technical Report, New York State Testing Program 2014: English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 6: IRT Calibration and Equating               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Calibration Process, pp 58 – 59</li> <li>○ Equating and Scaling, pp 62 – 65</li> <li>○ Anchor Set Evaluation, pp 65 – 67</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Evidence #116: New York State Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core), 2014 Field Test Analysis, Equating Procedure, and Scaling of Operational Test Forms, Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section IV: Scaling of Operational Test Forms, pp 20 - 21</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #159: New York State Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core), 2013 Field Test Analysis, Equating Procedure, and Scaling of Operational Test Forms, Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section III: Equating Procedure, pp 17 – 20</li> <li>• Appendix D: Partial-Credit Model Item Analysis, pp 45 – 57</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #117: New York State Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core), 2014 Field Test Analysis, Equating Procedure, and Scaling of Operational Test Forms, Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section III: Equating Procedure, pp 15 – 17</li> <li>• Section IV: Scaling of Operational Test Forms,</li> </ul>	<p>Multiple forms are not used within school years, but do change across years. Anchor items and IRT calibration were used to equate assessments.</p> <p>A new scale was established in the initial 2013 administration of the Grades 3-8 Tests. The equating procedures were to place the 2014 item parameters and proficiency estimates on the same scale using the common item design as described in Critical Element 4.4. This procedure is described in the IRT Calibration and Equating section of the Technical Report, New York State Testing Program 2014: English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8.</p> <p><b>NYSED psychometricians and a senior scientist from HumRRO independently verified, the results generated by Pearson psychometricians. Item parameter estimates were equated to the base scale established in Spring 2013.</b></p> <p>Students participating in the 2014 field test administration for the New York State Regents Examination in Common Core-based English Language Arts received one of 21 test forms. Each form included an embedded anchor form composed of 10 items that had been administered in previous administrations. Because the items had been previously administered they had known parameters on the operational scale. Rasch common item design for forms within year.</p> <p>Across Algebra I test forms, most of the items fell within the moderate –2.0 to +2.0 difficulty range, and there were no items with an INFIT statistic outside the range most productive for measurement.</p>

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	pp 17 - 19 Appendix D: Partial-Credit Model Item Analysis, pp 33 – 41	
<b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Evidence that the State ensures that all forms (within a content area and grade level, within or across school years) adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years or evidence that the submitted documentation applies to the 2015 English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8 tests. Submit the 2015 Technical Manual.</p>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b></p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Description of the State’s procedures for translation or trans-adaptation for native language assessments</b></p> <p>Evidence #043: Contract C012427 with vendor Questar Assessments, Inc. “Development of State Assessments in Elementary and Intermediate Level English Language Arts and Mathematics”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appendix D: Work Plan               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Translations of Math Tests and Liquidated Damages Related to Translations, pp 83 – 84</li> <li>Attachment A: Specifications for Large Type, p 102</li> <li>Attachment B: Specifications for Contractor/Subcontractor Transcribing Braille, p 103</li> <li>Translated Materials, p 643</li> <li>Braille and Large-print Versions, pp 643 - 645</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Evidence #160: Contract C012046 with Transperfect Translations International, Inc. “Translations of New York State Examinations and Related Materials”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appendix D: Program Workplan               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Translation Requirements, p 19</li> </ul> </li> <li>Work Plan, pp 24 - 25</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #161: Contract C010941 with gh, LLC, “Transcribing New York State Exams and Related Materials into Braille”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appendix D: Program Workplan               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Deliverable Specifications, p 23</li> </ul> </li> <li>2.0 Work Plan, pp 27 - 32</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #052: Procedural Validity for Regents Exam in English Language Arts (CC)</p>	<p>Contract C012046 with Transperfect Translations International, Inc. describes the process for developing native language versions of the high school Regents Exams. Specific requirements of the contract include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Translation Requirements section of the contract’s Appendix D: Program Workplan explicitly states that the translation process and quality control must comport to industry standards and be performed by qualified professionals approved by NYSED. This section also explains details such as how to handle graphical elements of the exam in the translation.</li> <li>The Work Plan section of the contract describes the step-by-step process the vendor uses to conduct translations. The process includes a minimum of two internal quality control reviews before drafts are submitted to NYSED for a final review. Suggest including transadaptation.</li> <li>The translations of math tests and Liquidated Damages Related to Translations section indicates that native language translations must be completed both forward and backward and verified by a “third party independent translator.”</li> </ul> <p>Contract Algebra 1 (5 languages—Spanish, Korean, Chinese, Haitian-Creole, and Russian). Procedures appear appropriate, but would like to review follow up reports or much more detailed description of the translation procedures. Suggest additional procedures are delineated. Comparability studies particularly of the different language versions of the assessments are warranted (e.g., are the factor structures similar across versions, do the items perform the same way across versions)</p>

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Step 32B: Translation-Braille-Large Type, p 13</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #053: Procedural Validity for Regents Exam in Algebra I (Common Core)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Step 29: Translation-Braille-Large Type, pp 14 – 17</li> </ul> <p><b>Report of results of a comparability study of different versions of the assessments that is technically sound and documents evidence of comparability generally consistent with expectations of current professional standards</b></p> <p>Evidence #162: Participation and Performance of Students Using Accommodations on the New York State Testing Program</p>	
<b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of assessment results across the language versions and English for 2015 English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8 tests, Algebra I, and English Language Arts.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Production and maintenance plan for the language versions of the 2015 English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8 tests, Algebra I, and English Language Arts.</p>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b></p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p><b>The most recent technical reports for the State’s assessments that present technical analyses of the State’s assessments.</b></p> <p>Evidence #043: Contract C012427 with vendor Questar Assessments, Inc. “Development of State Assessments in Elementary and Intermediate Level English Language Arts and Mathematics”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of Field Tests, pp 77 - 78</li> <li>• Field Test Technical Report, p 78</li> <li>• Operational Test Technical Report, p 86 - 87</li> <li>• Attachment F: Technical Manual Outline for New York State Assessments, pp 110 – 113</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #040: Technical Report, New York State Testing Program 2014: English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8</p> <p>Evidence #047: “Independent Review of Item Development Processes and Alignment Verification for the New York State Testing Program (NYSTP): Final Report” HumRRO, February 21, 2014</p> <p>Evidence #163: Contract C012450 with NCS Pearson, Inc. “Scaling and Scale Maintenance, Standard Setting, and Reliability/Validity Analyses of the New York State Regents Examination and Grades 4 and 8 Science Test Programs”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overview of Required Services, p 40</li> <li>• Field Tests, pp 43 – 44</li> <li>• Technical Reports, pp 45 – 46</li> <li>• Standard Setting Technical Reports, p 51</li> <li>• Service 3: Reliability/Validity Analysis, pp 52 - 53</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #116: New York State Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common</p>	<p>Would like more documentation about the TAC including notes and membership.</p> <p>New York State’s Contract C012427 with Questar Assessment, Inc. clearly describes the specific analyses that must be included in technical reports for the Grades 3-8 ELA and Mathematics Field Tests and Operational Tests. As shown in Attachment F of that report, statistics for both the Field Tests and Operational Tests are to be included in a single report, the most recently published example of which is provided in the New York State Testing Program 2014: English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8 Technical Report. NYSReviewed by Department staff onlys and works with the vendor to address any issues that arise as a result of these analyses.</p> <p>In its 2014 Independent Review of Item Development Processes and Alignment Verification for the New York State Testing Program (NYSTP): Final Report the Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) conducted an independent study of NYSED’s Grades 3-8 Tests success in “assessing the Common Core with fidelity through content alignment, and how well items match the intended complexity of the standards through depth-of-knowledge (DOK).”(p1) As reported in Critical Element 3.1, determined there to be “clear evidence for the validity of the interpretation of test scores as indicators of students’ mastery of the CCSS.” p1 NYSED psychometricians and a senior scientist from HumRRO independently verified, the results generated by Pearson psychometricians.</p> <p>Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) found that NYSTP development</p>

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Core) 2014 Field Test Analysis, Equating Procedure, and Scaling of Operational Test Forms Technical Report</p> <p>Evidence #117: New York State Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core), 2014 Field Test Analysis, Equating Procedure, and Scaling of Operational Test Forms, Technical Report</p> <p>Evidence #164: New York State Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core) and English Language Arts (Common Core) 2015 Standard Setting Technical Report</p> <p>Evidence #165: Contract 012057 with Data Recognition Corporation, “Standard Setting, Data Analysis, and Technical Reports for Regents Exams”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Service 2: Data Analysis and Annual Operational Exam Technical Reports, pp 27 – 29</li> <li>• Attachment 3: Sample Table of Contents for the Annual Operational Exam Technical Reports, p 119</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #041: New York State Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core) 2015 Technical Report</p> <p>Evidence #042: New York State Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core) 2015 Technical Report</p> <p><b>Documentation of the alignment of the State’s assessments to the State’s academic content standards (e.g., evidence submitted under Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content).</b></p> <p>Evidence #048: Review of Math Content Verification</p>	<p>process meets or exceeds the industry standards indicated in the <i>Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing</i> (1999). HumRRO also evaluated the degree to which the <b>2014 Grades 3–8 Common Core ELA and Mathematics Tests measured the CCLS</b>. HumRRO concluded that the 2014 Grades 3–8 Common Core ELA and Mathematics Tests do assess the content described by the CCLS. Additionally, HumRRO found that NYSTP measured the CCLS at the intended Depth of Knowledge (DOK). This is a good example of what is needed to meet this requirement.</p> <p>External reviews--Review of Math Content Verification Checklist conducted by external consultant Darren Burris and Odell Education Feedback—June 2014 Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core).</p> <p>TAC Minutes/good and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Guidelines (Evidence #169)</p> <p>In December 2013, a Work Group of the Board of Regents P-12 Committee was charged with reviewing the feedback the Board of Regents and the State Education Department have received from various constituencies, including educators, parents, community leaders, among others. The Board received the report of the Work Group, which includes nineteen options to continue to improve the implementation of the Common Core State Standards at the State and district level.</p>

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p>Checklist conducted by external consultant Darren Burris</p> <p>Evidence #098: Odell Education: Regents Review</p> <p>Evidence #049: Odell Education Feedback—June 2014 Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core)</p> <p><b>Presentations of assessments results (e.g., to the State’s TAC)</b>            Evidence #166: TAC Minutes, December 2015: Score Release: Grades 3-8 Assessments and Regents Exams</p> <p>Evidence #167: TAC Minutes, March 2015: Score Release: Regents Exams</p> <p><b>Evidence that the State has established and implemented clear criteria for the analysis of its assessment system (see above).</b>            See evidence above</p> <p><b>Documentation of regular internal and external technical review of components of the State’s assessment system, such as State Board of Education minutes, minutes from TAC meetings, and documentation of roles and responsibilities of TAC members.</b></p> <p><b>AND</b></p> <p><b>Outline of a deliberate cycle for reviewing and updating the State’s academic content standards and assessments (e.g., provides for logical transitions such that the assessments are aligned</b></p>	

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p><b>to the standards on which instruction is based in the relevant school year).</b></p> <p>Evidence #168: Minutes of February 2014 New York State Board of Regents Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adjustment Options to Common Core Implementation, pp 7 - 11</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #029: AimHighNY Common Core State Standards Review</p> <p>Evidence #169: Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Guidelines</p>	
<b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b>		
__X_ No additional evidence is required		

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

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

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards;</li> <li>• States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs;</li> <li>• Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment;</li> <li>• Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities;</li> <li>• Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;</li> <li>• Includes instructions that students eligible to be</li> </ul>	<p><b>Guidance for IEP Teams and IEP templates for students in tested grades</b>  Evidence #170: The Role of the Committee on Special Education in Relation to the Common Core Learning Standards</p> <p>Evidence #171: Guide to Quality Individualized Education Program (IEP) Development and Implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Testing Accommodations, pp 47 – 48</li> <li>• Participation in State and District-wide Assessments, p 53</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #172: Questions and Answers on Individualized Education Program (IEP) Development, the State’s Model IEP Form, and Related Requirements</p> <p>Evidence #173: Questions and Answers on IEP Form - Testing Accommodations (web page)</p> <p><b>Training materials for IEP teams</b>  Evidence #174: Individualized Education Program (IEP) Powerpoint Module #1</p> <p>Evidence #175: Individualized Education Program (IEP) Powerpoint Module #2</p> <p>Evidence #176: Individualized Education Program (IEP) Powerpoint Module #3</p> <p>Evidence #177: Developing a Quality Individualized Education Program (IEP) Training Brochure</p> <p>Evidence #178: Testing Accommodations Training</p>	<p>The New York State Alternate Assessment has been redesigned for the 2015-16 school year. As such, NYSED intends to submit evidence for peer review regarding this exam and the State’s alternate academic achievement standards in the spring of 2017.</p> <p>The field advisory document the Role of the Committee on Special Education in Relation to the Common Core Learning Standards provides guidance to the Committees on Special Education (CSE), the bodies within New York State schools and districts responsible for developing IEP’s, must follow to align student plans with the State’s CCLS. In addition to outlining roles and responsibilities, the document provides a list of steps to be followed in developing a student’s IEP including “Step 7: Determine the most appropriate assessment option.” (p8)</p> <p>The Guide to Quality Individualized Education Program (IEP) Development and Implementation serves to “provide guidance on developing, documenting and implementing recommendations for each student’s IEP”(p19) to the CSE’s. Specific guidance is provided in preparation of the IEP documentation, setting goals for the student, reporting student progress and needs, and identifying need for services such as test accommodations or participation in alternate State-wide assessments.</p> <p>The School Administrator’s Manual, New York State Testing Program (NYSTP) Common Core English Language Arts and Mathematics Tests Grades 3-8 2016 states that students with disabilities should receive accommodations as indicated on their IEP’s or 504 Plans in the Students to Be Tested and School Administrator Responsibilities sections and in the</p>

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments);</li> <li>The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.</li> </ul>	<p>Brochure</p> <p><b>Accommodations manuals</b> Evidence #026: Test Access &amp; Accommodations for Students with Disabilities: Policy and Tools to Guide Decision-Making and Implementation</p> <p><b>Test administration manuals</b> Evidence #019: School Administrator’s Manual, New York State Testing Program (NYSTP) Common Core English Language Arts and Mathematics Tests Grades 3-8 2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students to Be Tested               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students with Disabilities, pp 10-11</li> </ul> </li> <li>School Administrator Responsibilities, p 20</li> <li>Appendix G: Testing Accommodations for Students with Disabilities, pp A-9 – A-10</li> <li>Appendix H: Specific Testing Accommodations, pp A-11 – A-15</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #075: Teacher’s Directions, 2015 Common Core English Language Arts Tests, Grades 3, 4, and 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Step Two: Plan Your Testing Schedule               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Testing Accommodations for Students with IEPs and 504 Plans, pp 8-9</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Evidence #076: Teacher’s Directions, 2015 Common Core English Language Arts Tests, Grades 6, 7, and 8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Step Two: Plan Your Testing Schedule               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Testing Accommodations for Students with IEPs and 504 Plans, pp 8-9</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Evidence #077: Teacher’s Directions, 2015 Common Core Mathematics Tests, Grades 3, 4, and 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Step Two: Plan Your Testing Schedule               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Testing Accommodations for Students with</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>manual’s Appendix: Testing Accommodations for Students with Disabilities. An abridged list of the different types of accommodations featured in the Test Access &amp; Accommodations guide, and instructions on their application, are provided.</p> <p>Section Two of the 2015 Edition: School Administrator’s Manual, Secondary Level Examinations provides information and directions on how to request special editions of exams (large type and Braille) and administer exams with accommodations as outlined on a student’s IEP or 504 Plan.</p> <p>All students with disabilities must be included in State or district-wide assessment programs. If the Committee determines that the student will participate in an alternate assessment on a particular State or district-wide assessment of student achievement, the IEP must provide a statement of why the student cannot participate in the regular assessment, and why the particular alternate assessment selected is appropriate for the student (p.53, #171).</p> <p>The Committee on Special Education (CSE) must decide for each student, on a case-by-case basis, whether the student will participate in a particular general State test or in the New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA) for students with severe disabilities. The CSE’s decision must be documented in the student’s Individualized Education Program (IEP) (p.10).</p> <p>Information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general was not located in the documentation.</p>

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>IEPs and 504 Plans, p 8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Use of Mathematics Spatial Boards with Large Type or Braille Editions, p 8</li> <li>○ Use of Calculators and Other Devices, p 8</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #078: Teacher’s Directions, 2015 Common Core Mathematics Tests, Grades 6, 7, and 8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Step Two: Plan Your Testing Schedule               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Testing Accommodations for Students with IEPs and 504 Plans, p 8</li> <li>○ Use of Mathematics Spatial Boards with Large Type or Braille Editions, p 8</li> <li>○ Use of Calculators and Other Devices, p 8</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Evidence #020: School Administrator’s Manual, 2015 Edition Secondary Level Examinations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exams for Students with Visual Disabilities, p 2-2</li> <li>• Administering Exams to Students with Disabilities, pp 2-16 to 2-18</li> <li>• Rating Exam Papers for Students with Disabilities, p 3-3</li> </ul> <p><b>Documentation that the implementation of the State’s alternate academic achievement standards promotes student access to the general curriculum.</b></p> <p>The New York State Alternate Assessment has been redesigned for the 2015-16 school year. As such, NYSED intends to submit evidence for peer review regarding this exam and the State’s alternate academic achievement standards in the spring of 2017.</p>	
<b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:            Information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general.</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW YORK

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The New York State Alternate Assessment has been redesigned for the 2015-16 school year. Other Critical Element 5.1 subparts must be submitted when NYSED submits evidence for peer review regarding the New York State Alternate Assessment and the State’s alternate academic achievement standards including how students are placed in the Alternate Assessment.</p>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> <li>• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;</li> <li>• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Guidance in key documents that indicates all accommodation decisions must be based on individual student needs and provides suggestions regarding what types of accommodations may be most appropriate for students with various levels of proficiency in their first language and English.</b></p> <p>Evidence #179: English Language Learners (ELLs) Screening, Identification, Placement, Review, and Exit Criteria</p> <p>Evidence #180: Guide to the New York State Identification Test for English Language Learners (NYSITELL)</p> <p>Evidence #181: New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT) School Administrator’s Manual</p> <p><b>Accommodations manuals or other key documents that provide information on accommodations for English Language Learners.</b></p> <p>Evidence #182: Blueprint for English Language Learners (ELLs) Success</p> <p><b>Test administration manuals, or other key documents that provide information on available accessibility tools and features.</b></p> <p>Evidence #019: School Administrator’s Manual, New York State Testing Program (NYSTP) Common Core English Language Arts and Mathematics Tests Grades 3-8 2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students to Be Tested <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o English Language Learners, p 9</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The School Administrator’s Manual, New York State Testing Program (NYSTP) Common Core English Language Arts and Mathematics Tests Grades 3-8 2016 describes accommodations provided to English Language Learners, including those who have recently arrived to the United States, in its Students to Be Tested section and its Appendix F: Testing Accommodations for English Language Learners. Teachers who are preparing to administer the Tests to English Language Learners are referred to these sections of the manual in the Teacher’s Direction guides so that they are aware of the accommodations their students may receive.</p> <p>The 2015 Edition: School Administrator’s Manual, Secondary Level Examinations describes accommodations provided to English Language Learners, including those who have recently arrived to the United States, in its Exams for English Language Learners section and its Administering Exams to English Language Learners section.</p> <p>English language learners may take State Regents exams in mathematics, science, and social studies either in an alternative-language edition or in English; whichever is more appropriate to the student’s reading skills. During the January and June exam periods, the Regents Examinations in Integrated Algebra, Algebra I (Common Core), Global History and Geography, United States History and Government, Living Environment, and Physical Setting/Earth Science are available in five languages other than English: Chinese (Traditional), Haitian Creole, Korean, Russian, and Spanish.</p> <p>Does not address whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); or provide information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; or provide guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</p>

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix F: Testing Accommodations for English Language Learners, pp A-7 – A-8</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #020: School Administrator’s Manual, 2015 Edition Secondary Level Examinations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section Two: Requesting and Administering Regents Examinations and Regents Competency Tests                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Exams for English Language Learners, p 2-2</li> <li>○ Administering Exams to English Language Learners, p 2-15</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Evidence #075: Teacher’s Directions, 2015 Common Core English Language Arts Tests, Grades 3, 4, and 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Step Two: Plan Your Testing Schedule                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Testing Accommodations for English Language Learners, p 9</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Evidence #076: Teacher’s Directions, 2015 Common Core English Language Arts Tests, Grades 6, 7, and 8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Step Two: Plan Your Testing Schedule                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Testing Accommodations for English Language Learners, p 9</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Evidence #077: Teacher’s Directions, 2015 Common Core Mathematics Tests, Grades 3, 4, and 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Step Two: Plan Your Testing Schedule                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Testing Accommodations for English Language Learners, p 8</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Evidence #078: Teacher’s Directions, 2015 Common Core Mathematics Tests, Grades 6, 7, and 8</p>	

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Step Two: Plan Your Testing Schedule Testing Accommodations for English Language Learners, p 8</li> </ul>	
<b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>The New York State Alternate Assessment has been redesigned for the 2015-16 school year. As such, NYSED intends to submit evidence for peer review regarding this exam and the State's alternate academic achievement standards including application to EL students with disabilities.</p> <p>Expanded guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. Address whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s) or provide information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners.</p>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.3 – Accommodations</b></p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504;</li> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);</li> <li>Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> <li>Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>	<p><b>of accommodations available for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504 and English Language Learners that are appropriate and effective for addressing barrier(s) faced by individual students and appropriate for the assessment mode such as lists of types of available accommodations in an accommodations manual, test coordinators manual, or test administrators manual.</b></p> <p>Evidence #026: Test Access &amp; Accommodations for Students with Disabilities: Policy and Tools to Guide Decision-Making and Implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chapter IV: Testing Accommodations, pp 15 – 22</li> <li>Chapter VII: Special Considerations, pp 33 – 35</li> <li>Chapter IX: Frequently Asked Questions, pp 37 – 48</li> <li>Appendix A: Types of Testing Accommodations and Questions to Consider, pp 50 - 54</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #019: School Administrator’s Manual, New York State Testing Program (NYSTP) Common Core English Language Arts and Mathematics Tests Grades 3-8 2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students to Be Tested <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English Language Learners, p 9</li> <li>Students with Disabilities, p 10</li> </ul> </li> <li>Appendix F: Testing Accommodations for English Language Learners, pp A-7 – A-8</li> <li>Appendix H: Specific Testing Accommodations, pp A-11 – A-15</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #020: School Administrator’s Manual, 2015 Edition Secondary Level Examinations</p>	<p>The Test Access &amp; Accommodations for Students with Disabilities: Policy and Tools to Guide Decision-Making and Implementation manual includes the following specific information about test accommodations. May consider reviewing this document to be sure it is up-to-date.</p> <p>The reviewers could not find evidence of the reasonable and appropriate bases for the set of accommodations offered on assessments, consider a literature review, empirical research, recommendations by advocacy and professional organizations, and/or meaningful consultations with the State’s TAC, as documented in a section on test design and development in the technical report for the assessments. <b>As NYS revisits their accommodations manual, taking computer-based testing into consideration, what kind of feedback can the TAC provide?</b></p> <p>The School Administrator’s Manuals indicate that principals have the authority to provide accommodations to students who are injured or who were newly diagnosed with a disability within 30 days prior to test administration. Principals are directed to use their professional judgement in making this determination, and may choose from a limited list of available accommodations. These provisions must be reported to NYSED.</p> <p>As described on the Mediation Services for Special Education website, “parents who disagree with the delivery of special education programs and services their child is receiving [including test accommodations] may use [NYSED’s] mediation process to address and resolve disputes.” The mediation is administered by an independent agency.</p>

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exams for Students with Visual Disabilities, p 2-2</li> <li>• Exams for English Language Learners, p 2-2</li> <li>• Administering Exams to English Language Learners, p 2-15</li> <li>• Administering Exams to Students with Disabilities, pp 2-16 to 2-18</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #090: Administration of the June 2015 Regents Exams (Memo)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Testing Accommodations, pp 7 – 8</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #183: Testing Accommodations for Students with Disabilities for the Spring 2016 Grades 3-8 English Language Arts and Mathematics Tests (memo)</p> <p>Evidence #184: Testing Accommodations for Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners (memo)</p> <p><b>Description of the reasonable and appropriate bases for the set of accommodations offered on assessments, such as a literature review, empirical research, recommendations by advocacy and professional organizations, and/or consultations with the State’s TAC, as documented in a section on test design and development in the technical report for the assessments.</b></p> <p>Evidence #026: Test Access &amp; Accommodations for Students with Disabilities: Policy and Tools to Guide Decision-Making and Implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix C, pp 63 - 64</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #185: TAC Agenda, December 2015</p>	<p>Mediation requests can be submitted using the Request for Special Education Mediation form, which is available online in English and five translated versions. Parents who disagree with the delivery of special education programs and services their child is receiving may use the mediation process to address and resolve disputes. Districts may also initiate a request that a parent go to mediation. Mediations are conducted at no cost to either the parent or school district.</p>

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Evidence #186: TAC Agenda, March 2016</p> <p><b>Evidence that the State has a process to review and approve requests for assessment accommodations beyond those routinely allowed, such as documentation of the State’s process as communicated to district and school test coordinators and test administrators</b></p> <p>Evidence #019: School Administrator’s Manual, New York State Testing Program (NYSTP) Common Core English Language Arts and Mathematics Tests Grades 3-8 2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix G: Testing Accommodations for Students with Disabilities, pp A-9 – A-10</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #020: School Administrator’s Manual, 2015 Edition Secondary Level Examinations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administering Exams to Students with Disabilities, p 2-16</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #187: Mediation Services for Special Education (website)</p> <p>Evidence #188: Request for Special Education Mediation (website)</p> <p>Evidence #189: New York State Complaint Procedures - Sample Complaint Form (website)</p>	

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>Evidence that the State has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</p> <p>The New York State Alternate Assessment has been redesigned for the 2015-16 school year. As such, NYSED intends to submit evidence for peer review regarding this exam and the State’s alternate academic achievement standards.</p>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b></p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Summary of results of monitoring for the most recent year of test administration in the State.</b>  Evidence #080: Test Security Unit Update presented to the Board of Regents Meeting September 2014</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Case Resolutions OSA Transfers (Pre-Aug 2012 Reports to SED), p 7</li> <li>• Case Resolutions OSA Transfers (Pre-Aug 2012 Reports to SED), p 8</li> <li>• TSU Part 83 Actions, pp 9 – 10</li> <li>• TSU Monitoring of Testing, page 12</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #026: Test Access &amp; Accommodations for Students with Disabilities: Policy and Tools to Guide Decision-Making and Implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter V: Documentation of Testing Accommodations, pp 23 - 24</li> <li>• Chapter VI: Implementation of Testing Accommodations, pp 25 - 32</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #019: School Administrator’s Manual, New York State Testing Program (NYSTP) Common Core English Language Arts and Mathematics Tests Grades 3-8 2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School Administrator Responsibilities, p 20</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #020: School Administrator’s Manual, 2015 Edition Secondary Level Examinations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administering Exams to Students with Disabilities, pp 2-16 – 2-18</li> </ul> <p><b>Description of procedures the State uses to monitor that students with disabilities are placed by IEP Teams in the appropriate assessment.</b></p>	<p>Since accommodations impact students in all districts throughout the State, NYSED engages school administrators to assist in monitoring the appropriateness and proper provision of test accommodations.</p> <p>The Test Security Unit Monitoring Plan documents show TSU’s schedule for monitoring the Grades 3-8 tests and two administrations of Regents Exams in 2015. These plans provide the specific schools that were visited by TSU staff members and the times the visits took place. When possible, monitors observed exams in more than one school within each district they visited. Add information on monitoring accommodation administrations of the assessment. Five monitors in 24 elementary or middle schools over six days. Also about 39 high schools were monitored. A complete monitoring plan (basis for school selection) with a complete report of results is recommended.</p> <p>No details were given about the TSU monitoring methods—only this very brief presentation report.</p>

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p>Evidence #082: Checklist for Monitoring Test Security for 2014-15 English Language Arts and Math Tests</p> <p>Evidence #083: Checklist for Monitoring Exam Security and Testing Accommodations Provided for Eligible Students Taking Regents Exams</p> <p>Evidence #087: Letter of Introduction for Monitors of Regents Examinations</p> <p>Evidence #084: Test Security Unit Monitoring Plan, Grade 3-8 ELA and Math, April 2015</p> <p>Evidence #085: Test Security Unit Monitoring Plan, Regents Examinations, January 2015</p> <p>Evidence #086: Test Security Unit Monitoring Plan, Regents Examinations, June 2015</p>	
<b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is needed.</p>		

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

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</b></p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities;</li> <li>• The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply;</li> <li>• The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Evidence of adoption of the State’s academic achievement standards</b></p> <p>Evidence #190: Proposal to Board--Performance Level Labels and Performance Level Definitions for Elementary-Middle-Level and Secondary-Level Assessments</p> <p>Evidence #191: Proposal to Board--Workgroup on Common Core Regents Exams</p> <p><b>State statutes, regulations, policy memos that clearly state that the State’s academic achievement standards apply to all public elementary and secondary school students in the State</b></p> <p>Evidence #014: Education Laws of New York, Title 1: General Provisions, Article 5: University of the State of New York, Section 209: Academic examinations; admission and fees</p> <p>Evidence #192: Education Laws of New York, Title 1, General Provisions, Article 7: Commissioner of Education, Section 305: General Powers and Duties</p> <p>Evidence #008: NYSED Regulations of the Commissioner 100.1(t)(2)</p> <p>Evidence #193: NYSED Regulations of the Commissioner 100.18(b)(14)</p> <p>Evidence #018: NYSED Regulations of the Commissioner 100.2(p)</p> <p><b>Evidence regarding the academic achievement standards regarding (a) at least three levels of achievement, including two levels of high</b></p>	<p>The NYSED <i>Regulations of the Commissioner 100.18(b)(14)</i> provides a comprehensive description of the general and alternate achievement standards as they apply to students enrolled at all grade bands. Will the same Achievement Standards be used for the next assessment?</p> <p>The New York State Board of Regents adopted achievement standards measured by the New York State assessments as described in the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Proposal to Board--Performance Level Labels and Performance Level Definitions for Elementary-Middle-Level and Secondary-Level Assessments outlines the history of the Board of Regents’ approval of achievement standards for the Grades 3-8 Tests. The Regents approved the names and high-level descriptions of the standards on an emergency basis in November 2013 (p2) and made those changes permanent in February 2014.</li> <li>• The Proposal to Board—Workgroup on Common Core Regents Exams describes the history of the secondary-level achievement standards stating that “in fall 2013, Department staff recommended to the Board that the Common Core Regents Exams...maintain a partial proficiency cut score...to meet current graduation requirements” as well as the definitions of higher and lower cut scores for the exams. The document continues, stating that “the Board adopted regulatory amendments...to implement this recommendation.” (p1)</li> </ul> <p>The NYSED Regulations of the Commissioner 100.18(b)(14) defines four performance levels of</p>

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) description of the competencies associated within each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among achievement levels</b></p> <p>Evidence #193: NYSED Regulations of the Commissioner 100.18(b)(14)</p> <p>Evidence #132: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State English Language Arts Test, Grade 3</p> <p>Evidence #133: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State English Language Arts Test, Grade 4</p> <p>Evidence #134: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State English Language Arts Test, Grade 5</p> <p>Evidence #135: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State English Language Arts Test, Grade 6</p> <p>Evidence #136: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State English Language Arts Test, Grade 7</p> <p>Evidence #137: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State English Language Arts Test, Grade 8</p> <p>Evidence #138: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Mathematics Test, Grade 3</p> <p>Evidence #139: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Mathematics Test, Grade 4</p> <p>Evidence #140: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Mathematics Test, Grade 5</p> <p>Evidence #141: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Mathematics Test, Grade 6</p>	<p>achievement for students taking the Grades 3-8 Tests and five performance levels of achievement for students taking the Regents Exams.</p> <p>The specific Performance Level Descriptions (PLDs) are provided for each grade level in ELA and mathematics. These documents define the four performance levels measured by the Grades 3-8 Tests and the five performance levels measured by the Regents Exams and provide extensive rubrics for how each level applies to the anchor standards (for 3-8 PLDs) and standard domains (for high school PLDs).</p> <p>No reference to alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities were found.</p>

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Evidence #142: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Mathematics Test, Grade 7</p> <p>Evidence #143: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Mathematics Test, Grade 8</p> <p>Evidence #108: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core)</p> <p>Evidence #109: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core)</p> <p>Evidence #194: 2015 Raw Score to Scale Score Conversion Charts Grades 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments</p> <p>Evidence #195: Chart for Converting Total Weighted Raw Scores to Final Exam Scores (Scale Scores), June 2015 Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core)</p> <p>Evidence #152: Chart for Converting Total Weighted Raw Scores to Final Exam Scores (Scale Scores), January 2016 Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core)</p>	
<b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b>		
__X__ No additional evidence is required		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b></p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Evidence #151: Technical Report, New York State Testing Program 2013: English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appendix P: Standard-setting Technical Report, pp 237 - 288</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #132: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State English Language Arts Test, Grade 3</p> <p>Evidence #133: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State English Language Arts Test, Grade 4</p> <p>Evidence #134: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State English Language Arts Test, Grade 5</p> <p>Evidence #135: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State English Language Arts Test, Grade 6</p> <p>Evidence #136: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State English Language Arts Test, Grade 7</p> <p>Evidence #137: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State English Language Arts Test, Grade 8</p> <p>Evidence #138: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Mathematics Test, Grade 3</p> <p>Evidence #139: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Mathematics Test, Grade 4</p> <p>Evidence #140: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Mathematics Test, Grade 5</p> <p>Evidence #141: Performance Level Descriptions,</p>	<p>Appendix P presents the full standard-setting report that describes the general process, composition of the committees, ratings from the various rounds, evaluation forms, and other materials.</p> <p>The standard-setting activities occurred over a five-day period from June 29 to July 3, 2013. There were two components: grade-level committees and vertical-articulation committees. Altogether, ninety-five committee members from across the state participated in the standard setting committee meetings.</p> <p>The standard-setting methodology employed was designed in collaboration with NYSED and its Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). An evidence-based, standard-setting process was used that included both external benchmark data to empirically define college readiness, as well as a content-driven standard-setting methodology called the Bookmark Method (p.237).</p> <p>Will these achievement standards be applied to the 2016 English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8?</p> <p>No evidence was submitted for the alternate assessment; State plan to submit at a later date.</p>

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p>New York State Mathematics Test, Grade 6</p> <p>Evidence #142: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Mathematics Test, Grade 7</p> <p>Evidence #143: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Mathematics Test, Grade 8</p> <p>Evidence #164: New York State Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core) and English Language Arts (Common Core) Standard Setting Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance Level Description Development Meeting, pp 6 – 8</li> <li>• Bookmark Standard Setting Meeting, pp 9 – 15</li> <li>• Appendix E: Training Slides, pp 72 - 73</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #072: Educator Involvement Opportunities for Regents Exams (website)</p>	
<b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p><b>A description of steps taken to vertically articulate the performance level descriptors across grades</b></p> <p>Evidence #151: Technical Report, New York State Testing Program 2013: English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 8: Standard-Setting, pp 97 - 98</li> <li>• Appendix P: Standard-setting Technical Report, pp 237 – 288</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #196: Overview of PLDs &amp; Training on Drafting Range PLDs , Grades 3-8 Tests</p> <p>Evidence #164: New York State Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core) and English Language Arts (Common Core) Standard Setting Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance Level Description Development Meeting, pp 6 – 8</li> <li>• Appendix A: Range Performance Level Descriptions, Algebra 1, pp 31 – 43</li> <li>• Appendix B: Range Performance Level Descriptions, English Language Arts, pp 44 – 61</li> <li>• Appendix C: Performance Level Description Pre-Meeting Assignment, pp 62 – 68</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #197: Overview of PLDs &amp; Training on Drafting Range PLDs, Regents Examinations</p> <p>Evidence #132: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State English Language Arts Test, Grade 3</p> <p>Evidence #133: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State English Language Arts Test, Grade 4</p>	<p>The 2013 External Benchmarking Studies Summary &amp; External Benchmarking for NYSED Tests Using College Board Criteria report describes external benchmarking that was conducted to inform standard setting for the Common Core Grade 3-8 Tests and Regents Exams. The College Board performed an analysis of New York State student performance on the PSAT/NMSQT and SAT exams as predictors of college readiness. This analysis “helped to set the context for considering college-ready cut scores on the NYS Common Core Grades 3-8 ELA and Math Tests by establishing a benchmark on another test with which the standard setting panelists were already familiar.”(p3)</p> <p>The National Assessment of Educational Progress’ report Mapping State Proficiency Standards Onto NAEP Scales: Results from the 2013 NAEP Reading and Mathematics Assessments found that New York State’s performance standards are at or above NAEP’s proficient level in reading and math at grade 4 and grade 8. The NAEP study supports the rigor of the State’s achievement standards.</p>

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Evidence #134: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State English Language Arts Test, Grade 5</p> <p>Evidence #135: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State English Language Arts Test, Grade 6</p> <p>Evidence #136: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State English Language Arts Test, Grade 7</p> <p>Evidence #137: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State English Language Arts Test, Grade 8</p> <p>Evidence #108: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core)</p> <p>Evidence #138: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Mathematics Test, Grade 3</p> <p>Evidence #139: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Mathematics Test, Grade 4</p> <p>Evidence #140: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Mathematics Test, Grade 5</p> <p>Evidence #141: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Mathematics Test, Grade 6</p> <p>Evidence #142: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Mathematics Test, Grade 7</p> <p>Evidence #143: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Mathematics Test, Grade 8</p> <p>Evidence #109: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Regents Examination in Algebra 1 (Common Core)</p>	

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>Evaluation by standard-setting panelists or external expert reviewers that the State’s academic achievement standards are aligned to the grade-level academic content standards and include subject-specific performance level descriptors that meaningfully differentiate across performance levels within grades and are vertically articulated across grades;</b></p> <p>Evidence #151: Technical Report, New York State Testing Program 2013: English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix P: Standard-setting Technical Report, pp 237 – 288</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #132: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State English Language Arts Test, Grade 3</p> <p>Evidence #133: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State English Language Arts Test, Grade 4</p> <p>Evidence #134: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State English Language Arts Test, Grade 5</p> <p>Evidence #135: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State English Language Arts Test, Grade 6</p> <p>Evidence #136: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State English Language Arts Test, Grade 7</p> <p>Evidence #137: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State English Language Arts Test, Grade 8</p> <p>Evidence #108: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core)</p>	

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p>Evidence #138: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Mathematics Test, Grade 3</p> <p>Evidence #139: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Mathematics Test, Grade 4</p> <p>Evidence #140: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Mathematics Test, Grade 5</p> <p>Evidence #141: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Mathematics Test, Grade 6</p> <p>Evidence #142: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Mathematics Test, Grade 7</p> <p>Evidence #143: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Mathematics Test, Grade 8</p> <p>Evidence #109: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Regents Examination in Algebra 1 (Common Core)</p> <p>Evidence #164: New York State Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core) and English Language Arts (Common Core) Standard Setting Technical Report</p> <p><b>Documentation that the State’s academic achievement standards are challenging, such as: Reports of the results of benchmarking the State’s academic achievement standards</b></p>	
<b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<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 NEW YORK**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;</li> <li>• The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;</li> <li>• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;</li> <li>○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;</li> <li>○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The State follows a process and timeline for</li> </ul>	<p><b>Instructions for districts, schools, and teachers for access to assessment results.</b> Evidence #038: 2015 NYS Report Card</p> <p>Evidence #200: Downloads _ NYSED Data Site</p> <p>Evidence #201: Public Notice--Education Department Releases 2015 High School Graduation—website</p> <p>Evidence #202: Public notice--State Education Department Releases Spring 2015 Gr 3-8 Assessment Results-website</p> <p>Evidence #203: Measuring Student Progress in Gr 3-8 ELA and Math--Aug 2015</p> <p>Evidence #204: New York State Testing Program Common Core Tests Analysis of State Test Data</p> <p>Evidence #205: EngageNY Data-Driven Instruction (website)</p> <p>Evidence #031: Assessment 101: An Educator’s Guide to Quality Practices</p> <p><b>Examples of reports of assessment results at the classroom, school, district and State levels provided to teachers, principals, and administrators that include itemized score analyses, results according to proficiency levels, performance level descriptors, and, as appropriate, other analyses that go beyond the total score (e.g., analysis of results by strand)</b></p> <p><b>AND</b></p>	<p>According to State data, approximately 80 percent of eligible test takers participated in the 2015 Grades 3-8 ELA and Math Tests; about 20 percent of eligible test takers did not participate in these tests and did not have a recognized, valid reason for not participating.</p> <p>State should be commended for providing documents available in multiple languages to help students, families, and the public better understand how to interpret the 2015 score reports.</p> <p>The 2015 New York State Report Card provides results for all New York state assessments compiled by grade and subject. Results for each individual assessment reports data in terms of total students tested and proficiency level achievements reported in both raw numbers and percentages. Student data is also broken down into subgroups including English Language Learners, students with disabilities, race, gender, economic status, and migrant status. The reports are generated online from NYSED’s Office of Information Reporting Services website. In addition to this published report, users can download the data in access databases, as described in the Downloads NYSED Data Site document.</p> <p>The New York State Testing Program Common Core Tests Analysis of State Test Data guidance highlights types of analyses that provide reliable inferences about student performance, including some analyses that should only be used with great caution. The document also provides guidelines for analyzing performance at a student, classroom, school, and district level. NYSED has engaged its Technical Advisory Committee to provide guidance in developing comparable documents to accompany</p>

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</p>	<p><b>Instructions for teachers, principals and administrators on the appropriate interpretations and uses of results for students tested that include: the purpose and content of the assessments; guidance for interpreting the results; appropriate uses and limitations of the data; and information to allow use of the assessment results appropriately for addressing the specific academic needs of students, student groups, schools and districts.</b></p> <p><b>AND</b></p> <p><b>Instructions for districts, schools, and teachers for access to assessment results</b>            Evidence #206: Instructional Report 2015 Grades 3-8 Assessment Results</p> <p>Evidence #207: Memo-July 1 Release of Instructional Reports for the 2015 Grades 3-8 ELA and Mathematics Testing Program</p> <p>Evidence #208: Mapping Domains and Reports from the Western New York Regional Information Center</p> <p>Evidence #040: Technical Report, New York State Testing Program 2014: English Language Arts and Mathematics Grades 3–8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 1: Introduction and Overview, pp 1 - 5</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #041: New York State Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core) 2015 Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1.3 Purposes of the Exam (Standard 12.1), pp 1 - 2</li> </ul> <p>Evidence #042: New York State Regents</p>	<p>scores for the secondary-level Regents Exams.</p> <p>As the Regents Examination are pre-equated, their results are released immediately upon the completion of scoring. Interpretive guidance, such as the Mapping Domains and Reports from the Western New York Regional Information Center document, are released as early as the summer following the June administration of the exam.</p>

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p>Examination in Algebra I (Common Core) 2015 Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.3 Purposes of the Exam (Standard 12.1), pp 1 - 2</li> </ul> <p><b>Timeline that shows results are reported to districts, schools and teachers in time to allow for the use of the results in planning for the following school year.</b></p> <p>Evidence #207: Memo-July 1 Release of Instructional Reports for the 2015 Grades 3-8 ELA and Mathematics Testing Program</p> <p>Evidence #201: Public Notice--Education Department Releases 2015 High School Graduation—website</p> <p>Evidence #202: Public notice--State Education Department Releases Spring 2015 Gr 3-8 Assessment Results-website</p> <p><b>Templates or sample individual student reports for each content area and grade level for reporting student performance that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Report on student achievement according to the domains and subdomains defined in the State’s academic content standards and the achievement levels for the student scores (though sub-scores should only be reported when they are based on a sufficient number of items or score points to provide valid and reliable results)</b></li> </ul> <p align="center"><b>AND</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Report on the student’s achievement in</b></li> </ul>	

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>terms of grade-level achievement using the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards and corresponding performance level descriptors;</p> <p><b>AND</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Display information in a uniform format and use simple language that is free of jargon and understandable to parents, teachers, and principals;</b></li> </ul> <p>Evidence #209: Mathematics Score Report 2014-15</p> <p>Evidence #210: English Language Arts Score Report 2014-15</p> <p>Evidence #211: Understanding the Common Core 3–8 Mathematics Score Reports</p> <p>Evidence #208: Mapping Domains and Reports from the Western New York Regional Information Center</p> <p>Evidence #212: Score Report Samples and Understanding Reports—translations (website)</p> <p>Evidence #152: Chart for Converting Total Weighted Raw Scores to Final Exam Scores (Scale Scores), Regents Examination in Algebra 1 (Common Core) – June 2015</p> <p>Evidence #109: Performance Level Descriptions, New York State Regents Examination in Algebra 1 (Common Core)</p> <p><b>Examples of the interpretive guidance that accompanies individual student reports, either integrated with the report or a separate page(s),</b></p>	

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p><b>including cautions related to the reliability of the reported scores</b>  Evidence #212: Understanding the Common Core 3–8 Mathematics Score Reports</p> <p>Evidence #204: New York State Testing Program Common Core Tests Analysis of State Test Data</p> <p>Evidence #213: ELA &amp; Math Scale Scores Presentation</p> <p><b>Samples of individual student reports in other languages and/or in alternative formats, as applicable.</b>  Evidence #212: Score Report Samples and Understanding Reports—translations (website)</p> <p><b>Timeline adhering to the need for the prompt release of assessment results that shows when individual student reports are delivered to districts and schools;</b>  Evidence #207: Memo-July 1 Release of Instructional Reports for the 2015 Grades 3-8 ELA and Mathematics Testing Program</p> <p>Evidence #202: Public notice--State Education Department Releases Spring 2015 Gr 3-8 Assessment Results-website</p> <p>Evidence #208: Mapping Domains and Reports from the Western New York Regional Information Center</p> <p><b>Key documents, such as a cover memo that accompanies individual student reports delivered to districts and schools, listserv messages to</b></p>	

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>district and school test coordinators, or other meaningful communication to districts and schools that include the expectation that individual student reports be delivered to teachers and principals and corresponding expectations for timely delivery to parents (e.g., within 30 days of receipt).</b></p> <p>Evidence #207: Memo-July 1 Release of Instructional Reports for the 2015 Grades 3-8 ELA and Mathematics Testing Program</p> <p>Evidence #202: Public notice--State Education Department Releases Spring 2015 Gr 3-8 Assessment Results-website</p> <p>Evidence #214: Information Booklet for Scoring the Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core) January, June, and August 2016 Administrations</p> <p>Evidence #215: Information Booklet for Scoring the Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core) January, June, and August 2016 Administrations</p>	
<b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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