



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Joy Hofmeister  
Superintendent of Public Instruction  
Oklahoma State Department of Education  
2500 North Lincoln Boulevard  
Oklahoma City, OK 73105

October 4, 2018

Dear Superintendent Hofmeister:

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

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

In regard to the assessments that OSDE submitted for review for February 2018, peer reviewers and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that the components of OSDE's assessment system meet many, 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 the Department's analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (Oklahoma State Testing Program (OSTP 3-8 reading/language-mathematics)): **Substantially meets requirements.**
- Science general assessments in grades 5 and 8 (OSTP science): **Substantially meets requirements.**
- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in high school (OSTP high school reading/language arts-mathematics): **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.*

- Science assessment in high school (OSTP-high school science): **Substantially meets requirements.**
- Reading/language arts, mathematics and science alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) in grades 3-8 and high school (Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM)-Year End Model (DLM-YE) for reading/language arts and mathematics: **Substantially meets requirements.**
- Science alternate assessments based on AA-AAAS in grades 5, 8 and high school (DLM-Science)): **Partially meets requirements.**

The components that substantially meet requirements meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. The Department expects that OSDE should be able to provide this additional information within one year. In addition, we know that OSDE recently changed its high school assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics. While I encourage you to use the results of this peer review for your high school assessments, OSDE must submit complete information regarding your new high school assessments for peer review. I know our staff have been in discussion regarding when OSDE will submit this new assessment for peer review later this year.

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

Please note that the assessment requirements for ESEA, as amended by the NCLB, were in effect through the end of the 2016-2017 school year. The OSDE peer review was conducted under the requirements of this statute. Beginning in the 2017-2018 school year, the assessment requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, will apply to State assessments. Department staff carefully reviewed the evidence and peer review recommendations in light of the updated requirements for State assessments under the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. As a result of this additional review, I have determined that the OSDE administration of the DLM assessments needs to meet one additional requirement related to alternate academic achievement standards. This requirement is listed under critical element 6.3. Under the orderly transition authority in section 4(b) of the ESSA, I am granting OSDE until December 15, 2020, to submit evidence of an AA-AAAS that meets this ESSA requirement.

The specific list of items required for OSDE to submit is enclosed with this letter. Because the State has only partially the requirements for the alternate science assessment, the Department is placing a condition on the State's Title I grant award. To satisfy this condition, OSDE must submit satisfactory evidence to address the items identified in the enclosed list. OSDE 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. Additionally, the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) will monitor progress on matters pertaining to requirements in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) related to the participation of students with disabilities in Title I assessments. Insufficient progress to address such matters may lead OSERS to place a condition on OSDE's Federal fiscal year 2019 IDEA Part B grant award.

In addition, the full peer review notes from the review are enclosed. These recommendations to the Department formed the basis of our determination. Please note that the peers' recommendations may differ from the Department's feedback; we encourage you to read the full peer notes for additional

suggestions and recommendations for improving your assessment system beyond what is noted in the Department's feedback.

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 my staff at: [OSS.Oklahoma@ed.gov](mailto:OSS.Oklahoma@ed.gov).

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank T. Brogan  
Assistant Secretary for  
Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Craig Walker, Executive Director of State Assessments

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Additional Evidence Needed</b>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b>	For Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) science: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of an overall test design and test blueprints that measure the full breadth of the State’s grade-level academic content standards in science (e.g., evidence that the test design adequately samples the essential elements in science).</li> </ul>
<b>2.2 Item Development</b>	For DLM science: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that clarifies how the development and review process for Essential Element Concept Maps (EECMs) contributes to a technically sound test item development process.</li> </ul>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b>	For the Oklahoma State Testing Program (OSTP) in grades 3-8 and high school for mathematics: <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 depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity (e.g., evidence of a specific plan and timeline to address the alignment gaps identified in the external alignment studies).</li> </ul> For the DLM science: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a plan and timeline to address recommendations of the external evaluation of alignment of the tests.</li> <li>• Evidence identified in critical element 2.1 relative to addressing the depth and breadth of the content standards for science.</li> </ul>
<b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Process</b>	For OSTP in grades 3-8 and high school for reading/language arts and mathematics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</li> </ul>
<b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b>	For OSTP grades 5, 8 and high school in science: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</li> </ul> For the DLM science: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the science tests are related as expected with similar variables (e.g., other measures of science achievement).</li> </ul>
<b>4.1 -- Reliability</b>	For DLM science: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of updated reliability for its assessments for the student population overall and each student group once evidence identified in critical element 2.1 relative to addressing the depth and breadth of the content standards have been addressed (e.g., expansion of the item pool, increase in number of items per testlet, increase in the number of linkage levels).</li> </ul>
<b>4.2 Fairness and</b>	For DLM science:

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<b>Accessibility</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that the assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments. Such evidence may include the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Once sufficient data exists, additional analysis by student subgroup to analyze test fairness.</li> <li>○ Once sufficient data exists, additional item analysis to examine the effects of certain stimuli (e.g., “fictionalized” science stories) and item response characteristics (response order) on test fairness.</li> <li>○ Specific criteria used for external test reviewers and test item writers regarding fairness and accessibility.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>4.3 Full Performance Continuum</b>	<p>For OSTP grades 3-8 reading/language arts and high school for reading/language arts and mathematics and grades 5, 8 and high school for science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the assessments provide an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students (e.g., conditional standard errors of measurement (CSEM)).</li> </ul> <p>For DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that clarifies the assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum.</li> </ul>
<b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b>	<p>For OSTP grades 3-8 and high school in reading/language arts and mathematics and grades 5, 8 and high school in science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments (specifically, across versions of the online test that are delivered across multiple operating system/hardware platforms in terms of screen resolution, etc.).</li> </ul>
<b>4.7 Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b>	<p>For DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a plan to monitor the science test before, during, and after the inclusion of phase II development items to the test item banks, including clear and technically sound criteria.</li> </ul>
<b>5.1 – Procedures for including students with disabilities</b>	<p>For the DLM reading/language arts, mathematics, and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their students’ achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy.</li> </ul>
<b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</b>	<p>For DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that there are procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the assessment system (e.g., accurate recording of the English learner status of students participating in the assessment).</li> </ul>
<b>5.3 – Accommodations</b>	<p>For OSTP grades 3-8 and high school in reading/language arts and mathematics and grades 5, 8 and high school in science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</p>
<p><b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</b></p>	<p>For DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has formally adopted achievement standards for the test.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b></p>	<p>For DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting alternate academic achievement standards in science to ensure they are valid and reliable. Specifically, a plan and timeline to revisit the achievement standards after the incorporation of phase II development.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards (additional requirement under section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA)</b></p>	<p>For the DLM reading/language, mathematics, and science tests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the DLM alternate academic achievement standards ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. Oklahoma State Department of Education should provide this evidence by December 31, 2020.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p>	<p>For OSTP grades 3-8 and high school in reading/language arts and mathematics and grades 5, 8 and high school in science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that reports are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand.</li> <li>• Evidence that the State has implemented a 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.</li> </ul>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT  
CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## February 2018 State Assessment Combined Peer Review Notes for the DLM Year-End Assessment Consortium RESUBMISSION



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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT  
CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION**

**Contents**

<b>SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4.1 – Reliability.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>4.4 – Scoring .....</b>	<b>9</b>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION**

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results;</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills);</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.</li> </ul>	<p><u>YE 01</u> (Technical Manual Update YE 2015-16)</p>	<p>DLM provides a brief but adequate explanation for why speaking and listening standards (part of CCSS) were not included in the DLM ELA assessment, to the effect that partner states had not assessed these standards in their general assessments. For all students, therefore, including SWSCD, speaking and listening were to be taught and assessed at the local level (YE 01, pp. 9-10).</p> <p>It might have been useful (but not essential) to include participating state’s waiver letters to support this statement.</p> <p>The supplementary submission evidence did not address part of the summary statement request for additional evidence—specifically, an explanation of why Language is not directly addressed. A brief explanation such as that offered for the question about Speaking and Listening would have been helpful—which the reviewers assume is that in their general assessments, all of the partner states assess Language in the context of Reading or Writing (e.g., as is the case with PARCC).</p>
<p><b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement (from August 2017 Peer Review)</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.1 – Reliability</b></p> <p>(from 2016 peer review)</p> <p>For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), WVDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of monitoring and refinement of the diagnostic classification models from subsequent test administrations</li> </ul>	<p>YE 01, pp. 43-46; 48-62.</p> <p>YE 03, pp. 102.</p>	<p>Overall, Peer Reviewers are impressed with the DLM learning and assessment models. Peers are hopeful that the psychometric model, which is less mature, will eventually be refined to a similar level, to capitalize on the advantages of the learning and assessment models.</p> <p>DLM provided detail in the Technical Manual Update YE 2016-17 (YE 01) as evidence of monitoring and refinement of the diagnostic classification models from test administrations subsequent to the initial administration. Given recommendations below, Peer Reviewers would expect that technical manuals in subsequent years continue to address and update evidence of monitoring and refinement of Diagnostic Classification Models.</p> <p>The DLM’s Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) discussed and indicated support for maintaining the current scoring model for 2017-18 while additional research is conducted on different methods for being able to support cross-linkage level inferences (YE 03).</p> <p>On p. 45, there is mention of the fact that non-masters sometimes have a greater than chance likelihood of providing correct responses to items measuring the linkage level, which may indicate that items or LLs as a whole are “easily guessable.” It would be useful to note what is being done to address that. Peer reviewers recommend checking this again with more operational data. If the issue remains, either model or items or both need to be changed.</p> <p>In reference to the issue of Model Fit, peers were satisfied with the methods being followed to ensure that the model fits the data. However, the Peers</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>suggest following the recommendations of the DLM Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to use a Bayesian estimation procedure to help address some of the methodological issues with the current approach to assessing model fit.</p> <p>Peers recommend that DLM continue to be guided by and to take into serious consideration the advice of the TAC in regards to refinement of the model and generation of data to demonstrate Model Fit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION**

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>YE 01 (Technical Manual Update YE 2015-16), pp. 10-11, 13-14</p> <p>Appendix A: ELA Text Photograph Guidelines</p>	<p>DLM provides an adequate explanation of the development and selection of reading passages, including steps taken to ensure passages are accessible to SWSCD.</p> <p>The peers found Table 5 (p. 11) very helpful in clarifying internal and external passage review criteria. While not essential to document attention to this CE factor, it would have been of interest to not only cite a source of more information on p. 10 of YE 01 (“For a complete summary of external review of ELA passages, see Results from External Review During the 2014–2015 Academic Year [Clark, Swinburne Romine, Bell, &amp; Karvonen, 2016]”), but to have provided it among sources of evidence.</p> <p>The explanation of steps taken in the selection and/or creation of graphic components was clear and complete. The reviewers appreciated inclusion of the specific guidelines used in selecting photographs for ELA passages.</p> <p>No additional evidence was required regarding steps taken to ensure that assessments are fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement (2017 review)</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION**

<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>
-------------------------	---	---

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></p> <p>(from 2016 review)</p> <p>For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), WVDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of monitoring procedures used for scoring DLM-YE writing items, including measures of inter-rater reliability.</li> </ul>	<p>Technical Manual Update YE 2016-17 (YE 01), pp. 106-113; 141-142</p>	<p>The sampling for the writing products seems to be small. Peer reviewers urge that an effort be made future studies to increase the number of samples and make sure that they represent the full range of abilities reflected in the underlying population.</p> <p>DLM describes the scoring of writing products by human raters (teachers) using a partially-crossed matrix design (multiple, different raters across products). Agreement was determined to be good to excellent; but see below:</p> <p>To some extent, a conventional treatment of interrater reliability is not applicable to scoring of writing products in DLM because a “high-inference process common in large-scale assessment such as applying analytic or holistic rubrics” is not used (p. 107). Evaluation based on presence of text features requires little/no inference and thus one would expect raters to assign identical scores.</p> <p>Nevertheless, to address questions about interrater reliability, DLM conducted a study in spring 2017 using writing products from that administration. Teachers’ original ratings from the operational administration were compared to the one additional rating or one randomly selected rating from the raters who participated in the study.</p> <p>While DLM points to agreement rates for intraclass correlation (ICC) as falling in the excellent range (<math>\geq .75</math> and Fleiss’s kappa in the good range (.60-.74), these ranges for comparable dichotomous decisions may be modest, but are certainly adequate (typically ICC should be <math>&gt; .80</math> to be considered “excellent”). It would be helpful to compare ranges applied to scoring of low inference items to those more typical</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>of direct assessment of writing. This might be addressed as part of the anticipated continuation of studies on writing score agreement.</p> <p>DLM indicates that they plan to conduct further study of interrater reliability of writing product scoring (p. 142), by expanding the collection and evaluation of written products.</p> <p>It might be useful for DLM to consider including as part of the study of rater agreement those scores assigned by teacher administrators for writing process items (which depend on administrator judgment). Such items were not included in the study in 2017.</p> <p>In addition, peer reviewers recommend some form of real time monitoring of teacher assigned scores by rescoring or second-scoring by a trained administrator of a small sample, rather than relying solely on post-hoc analyses.</p> <p>Raters' demographic may not be representative (YE01 Table 58, p. 110). It is hard to say, since state teacher demographics were not provided, but it seems that the raters in the study were overwhelmingly non-Hispanic white. Peer reviewers would urge that in subsequent studies, in so far as possible, a more diverse pool of raters be identified.</p>
<b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE  
ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## August 2017 State Assessment Combined Peer Review Notes for the DLM Science Assessment Consortium



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE  
ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Contents

<b>SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	3
2.2 – Item Development.....	7
2.3 – Test Administration .....	10
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration.....	10
2.5 – Test Security .....	16
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....	18
<b>SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....</b>	<b>20</b>
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	20
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	23
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure .....	25
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables.....	28
<b>SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER .....</b>	<b>30</b>
4.1 – Reliability.....	30
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	33
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	35
4.4 – Scoring .....	36
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms .....	37
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment .....	38
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance.....	39
<b>SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS .....</b>	<b>40</b>
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities .....	40
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	44
5.3 – Accommodations.....	46
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations.....	48
<b>SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .</b>	<b>51</b>
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students .....	51
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....	53
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards .....	55
6.4 – Reporting.....	56

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Purposes and Intended Interpretations and Uses of Results</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16): pp. 1-13, 20-30, 170-171, 232</p>	<p><b>Purposes and Intended Interpretations and Uses of Results</b></p> <p><b>As a general statement, much of the additional evidence called for throughout this document by reviewers, is a function of the fact that the DLM submission is based on Phase I. Reviewers urge the DLM Consortium to expedite Phase II.</b></p> <p>The Technical Manual Science 2015-16 provides evidence to support a clear statement in the Peer Review Submission of the purpose, and intended interpretations and uses of the results of the DLM Alternative Assessment System in general and as it applies specifically to Science. Figure 2 (SC 06, p.7) helpfully outlines the theory of action for DLM Science.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Test Structure and Blueprints</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 09</u> (Blueprint Science)</p> <p><u>SC 16</u> (Summary of the Science Development Process)</p>	<p><b>Test Structure and Blueprints</b></p> <p>Reviewers understand that the development of the DLM Science Assessment in Phase I occurred without a Learning Map, and that DLM anticipates developing a Learning Map in Phase II (SC 06, p. 136). Since Learning Maps are at the core of assessment development in ELA and mathematics, and at the core of the validity claim for science, it is puzzling to reviewers that the absence of a Learning Map for science is treated in so cursory a fashion, with only a brief reference to its development in the 2016-17 school year (SC 06, p. 3).</p> <p>Test blueprints for Phase I provide detail on the content and structure of the DLM Science testlets; EEs are included at each grade band (Elementary, MS, HS) and Biology end-of-year for all domains:</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 THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
		<p>physical (PS), life (LS), and earth and space science (EES).</p> <p>The reviewers found little evidence to support the claim that the EEs assessed represent a “breadth, but not a depth of coverage” (SC 16, p. 5). While evidence is gathered in each of the three science domains, phase I blueprints do not come close to addressing the full range of NGSS.</p> <p>Reviewers understand that the DLM Science Assessment is in an early stage of development, and that additional Essential Elements and testlets will be added in the future. However, reviewers would like to see more detail about a plan to identify additional Essential Elements aligned with the NGSS, to justify the claim of “breadth”.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills);</li> </ul>	<p><b>Representation of Knowledge and Skills in the Assessment and the Standards</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Representation of Knowledge and Skills in the Assessment and the Standards</b></p> <p>SC 06, pp. 16-17 provides an account of the Phase I process of determining commonalities among partner states’ alternate science standards that linked to content in the Framework, noting that “The state partners did not want to develop EEs for every sub-idea in the <i>Framework</i> in the initial phase of this project. Therefore, participating states’ alternate science standards were reviewed rather than their grade-level science standards, as their alternate standards express their intended foci for SCD. DLM staff with expertise in science education and alternate assessments completed a crosswalk of the seven states’ alternate science standards. This information allowed the DLM Science Consortium to map states’ alternate standards to the <i>Framework</i> and NGSS. The DLM Science Consortium identified the most frequently assessed topics across states in the three</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 THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
		content domains of physical science, life science, and Earth and space science.” Reviewers would have liked an explanation of how that process supports—or in future will be augmented to support—alignment with participating states’ academic content standards.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Item Pool and Selection Procedures (CAA)</b></p> <p><u>SC.06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Item Pool and Selection Procedures (CAA)</b></p> <p>The DLM science assessment is delivered in the form of testlets, either by computer or direct administration by teacher, based on student need. Each testlet contains 3-4 items at the same linkage level for one EE. Adaptation occurs based on performance at linkage level.</p> <p>In Phase I, testlets were written to three linkage levels, with the intent to consider expansion to five levels in the future (to parallel ELA and Mathematics). The reviewers would have liked to have seen more information on how this expansion might occur, and what data has been/is being gathered from the Phase I administration towards that end.</p> <p>At present, it does not appear to reviewers that the size of the item pool is adequate to support the test design, due to a current paucity of items/testlets.</p>
<b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide more detail as to intended processes and timeline to increase the coverage of the NGSS (particularly for MS and HS) sufficiently to support the claim of breadth of coverage.</li> <li>Provide a plan and a timeline to expand the item pool (for coverage of content and expanded linkage levels) to support long-term format/design (beyond Phase I).</li> <li>Preliminary evidence of development of a learning map in science should be submitted in December 2017.</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 THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>2.2 – Item Development</b></p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p><b>Item Development and Selection</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16): Chapters I and III</p> <p><u>SC 15</u> (Science Item Writing Handbook)</p> <p><u>SC 10</u> (External Review Report 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 16</u> (Summary of the Science Development Process)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16— Appendices) Note: not listed in submission document, but useful (e.g., Appendix C2: Item Writer Materials List Documentation and Appendix C4: Sample EECM)</p>	<p><b>Item Development and Selection</b></p> <p>The evidence provided contains a clear and fairly detailed account of the item development process, including—but not limited to—selection and training of item writers (pp. 46-50), item and testlet format (pp. 40-45), and delivery modes.</p> <p>DLM included as evidence the Science Item Writing Handbook (SC 15), which captures in some detail aspects of item development to which item writers must attend. The reviewers found Figure 2 (p. 6) helpful as a means of clarifying the content of concept maps (EECMs); it would have been helpful to reference the completed sample EECM in Appendix C 4.</p> <p>Similarly, when resources such as prototypes are mentioned, it would be helpful in this section to include one or more examples (and/or examples of released items to illustrate compete testlets).</p> <p>There appears to be only minimal information on the process used to develop and review EECMs (06, p. 45) and there is no mention of EECM as part of the external review process addressed in SC 10. Persons involved in EECM development are identified only as “science content teams” and those in review as “staff with student population expertise”. Although SC 06 p. 45 also includes the detail that the “EECM science templates were adopted by states in the DLM Science Alternate Assessment Consortium,” there is no mention in that evidence document or any other that the reviewers examined to explain what activities comprised that review and adoption process. Any judgment about sound procedures should include more detail to expand upon that information.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>DLM Science has addressed the need for alternate testlets (BVI forms) for students unable to participate in online assessment due to visual impairment (see, e.g., SC 15 Appendix F).</p> <p>The accounts of both the initial review processes and those that followed the pilot and field test administrations of Phase I testlets provide sufficient evidence of a thoughtful and rigorous process for identifying and remedying problems amenable to revision as well as those that should lead to rejection of a specific item/task or testlet as a whole.</p>
<b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide additional information to clarify the process of developing and reviewing EECMs for use by item writers to demonstrate that these processes contribute to a technically sound item/testlet development process.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Standardized Administration Procedures</b></p> <p><u>SC 05</u> (Test Administration Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 02</u> (Assessment Coordinator Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 03</u> (Data Steward Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 04</u> (Technical Liaison Manual 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Standardized Administration Procedures</b></p> <p>The evidence provided makes clear all of the steps necessary to conduct standardized test administration of DLM Science (including administration with accommodations). Resources to communicate those steps are role-specific for each of three district-level support roles (Assessment Coordinator, Data Steward, Technical Liaison).</p> <p>The Test Administration Manual (evidently intended for all DLM administrations, not only science) is well organized and contains numerous screen-shots to support instructions and explanations. Periodic “hints” show purposeful attention to the audience. The reviewers noted, however, that while references are made to ELA testlets (e.g. pp. 41-42, 57-59) and mathematics testlets (e.g. pp. 43, 59), and all examples are drawn from these two content areas, there are <u>no</u> references to science. Linkage level descriptions fit those for ELA and M but not science. DLM has not provided any evidence that any addendum to, or revised version of, this document was used for the administration of science testlets. The reviewers did note that in SC 06 (Technical Manual Science 2015-16), p. 109, there is mention of a <i>Science Supplement to the Test Administration Manual</i>. This resource would have been helpful to reviewers.</p> <p>Role-specific resources were also well organized with screen-shots and “hints” to facilitate use. The issue noted above regarding references only to ELA and mathematics also applies to the Assessment Coordinator 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 THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Training</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16 Appendices)</p> <p>SC 13 (Facilitator Guide for Required Test Administrator Training)</p> <p><u>SC 02</u> (Assessment Coordinator Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 03</u> (Data Steward Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 04</u> (Technical Liaison Manual 2015-16)</p> <p>SC 14 (Supplemental Evidence Related to Test Administration)</p>	<p><b>Training</b></p> <p>SC 06 includes general information on training in 2015-2016, including formats (facilitated training and self-directed training) and qualifying (completion of four modules for new, and one module for returning, administrators, with a requirement of 80% on post-tests before being allowed to proceed with test administration). The peer reviewers were unable to find any information on consequences if a trainee failed to reach that score on one or more post-tests. More detail would be helpful on how training ensures that all teachers of SWSCD will be able to administer DLM (all content areas) to their students.</p> <p>In addition to the four required modules, there is a supplemental science module that available but not required for TAs in states administering science (Appendix H, pp. 421-439). Particularly based on the content of that module, including “important features of Science that are different from other DLM assessments,” the reviewers are puzzled as to why that module was optional.</p> <p>One key difference noted in the Science training module is that most of the supports for ELA and Mathematics are also available for science (and TAs are referred to the support list in Allowable Practices section of TAM, where exceptions are noted). Some explanation of the basis for those exceptions would have been helpful to the reviewers, to evaluate the sufficiency of information provided to TAs.</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 THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Technology Requirements</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16 Appendices)</p> <p><u>SC 04</u> (Technical Liaison Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 05</u> (Test Administration Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 02</u> (Assessment Coordinator Manual 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Technology Requirements</b></p> <p>The submission includes adequate information on technology requirements.</p> <p>Attention to technology challenges was illustrated in the 2016 Incident Summary (pp. 143-5 in SC 07, Appendix D13). However, beyond SC 06, Chapter IV p. 114 (Monitoring Testlet Delivery), there was little detail provided in evidence listed in the submission to make clear established contingency plans at the consortium level to address possible technology challenges.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DLM must provide an updated Test Administration Manual, modified or augmented for the science assessment.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

<p align="center"><b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p><b>Appropriate test administration monitoring procedures</b></p> <p>1) SC 06 Technical Manual Science 2015-16  a) Chapter IV: Test Administration  i) Monitoring Assessment Administration (pp. 112-114)  ii) Consortium Test Administration Observation Protocol (pp. 112-113)  iii) Formative Monitoring Techniques (pp. 113-114)  iv) Monitoring Testlet Delivery (p. 114)  b) Chapter IX: Validity Studies  i) Observations of Test Administration (pp. 202-205)</p> <p>2) SC 07 Technical Manual Science 2015-16 - Appendices  a) Appendix D.3: Test Administration Observation Protocol  b) Appendix D.5: Test Administration Observation Guidance for Local Observers  c) Appendix D.6: Monitoring Assessments</p> <p><b>See also additional State evidence</b></p> <p><b>Test administration monitoring</b></p> <p>1) SC 06 Technical Manual Science 2015-16  a) Chapter IV: Test Administration  i) Administration Errors (p. 128)  b) Chapter VII: Assessment Results  i) Data Files (pp. 166-167)  c) Chapter IX: Validity Studies  i) Observations of Test Administration (pp. 202-205)</p> <p><b>See also additional State evidence.</b></p>	<p>DLM has developed and made available to States a protocol to monitor test administration (1.a.i, 1.b.i). DLM has also made guidance resources available to states for this purpose.</p> <p>DLM and SEAs collected a sample (37 observations) of science assessment administration in 2015-2016 and found evidence of high fidelity of test administration protocols and procedures.</p>
---	--	--

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

**Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY**

No additional evidence is required from the consortium

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>2.5 – Test Security</b></p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Prevention of Irregularities</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16- Appendices)</p> <p><u>SC 05</u> (Test Administration Manual)</p> <p><u>SC 02</u> (Assessment Coordinator Manual)</p>	<p><b>Prevention of Irregularities</b></p> <p>Various sources of evidence outline procedures for keeping test materials secure at various phases of test development and administration, including but not limited to required security agreements for individuals serving in any related role, and storage of materials. The reviewers were unable to find any reference to appropriate disposition of materials (hard copy and/or electronic files) when no longer needed/required (e.g., paper copy of text; SC 05 p. 77).</p> <p>The KITE system is designed to insure access only by authorized users.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detection of test irregularities;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Detection of Irregularities</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16- Appendices)</p>	<p><b>Detection of Irregularities</b></p> <p>Evidence from DLM is sufficient for now in this section, based on limited available data. The reviewers anticipate that DLM will provide an update when more data are available.</p> <p>The planned-for forensic analyses mentioned are all worthwhile/appropriate. The reviewers note, however, that there do not appear to be any planned-for analyses that look specifically at results for evidence of irregularities coming out of the teacher-administered testlets (in which administrator must make judgment about student response).</p> <p>Participating States may provide more evidence.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Remediation Following Incidents</b></p> <p>This portion of the Critical Element is addressed in individual State submissions</p>	<p><b>Remediation Following Incidents</b></p> <p>N/A for DLM</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 THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Investigation of Irregularities</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16-Appendices)</p>	<p><b>Investigation of Irregularities</b></p> <p>Appendix D.9 of the Technical Manual Science 2015-16 provides detailed procedures agreed upon by the members of the DLM Consortium to identify and respond to data security breaches.</p> <p>The submission addresses alleged security breaches detectable through the KITE system (SC 06, 122-124).</p> <p>It is possible that participating States may provide more evidence.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required from the consortium</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</b></p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Integrity of Test Materials</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Integrity of Test Materials</b></p> <p>See comments under 2.5.1 (first bullet): <b>Prevention of Irregularities</b> and 2.5.4 (fourth bullet): <b>Investigation of Irregularities</b></p> <p>Although DLM has carefully considered and implemented means of protecting test materials and data stored/accessed through KITE, more information would be helpful to confirm that there are policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of hard-copy materials and resources related to test development and administration</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Security of Student Data</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16-Appendices)</p>	<p><b>Security of Student Data</b></p> <p>Partner States must submit a Data Use Agreement, which may be modified to include state-specific data security requirements. Besides this “up-front” action, DLM staff review state testing policies during service desk training and provide updates during the state testing windows.</p> <p>It is possible that participating States may provide more evidence.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Protection in Reporting</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Protection in Reporting</b></p> <p>DLM explains in their submission that for results described in technical reports, the consortium does not use a minimum reporting rule. All disaggregated data represents subgroups of students across states.</p> <p>DLM notes that each state has its own set of rules that govern the distribution and use of aggregated score reports.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		Participating States may provide more evidence.
<b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required from the consortium		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Validity Framework and Overall Evaluation</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Validity Framework and Overall Evaluation</b></p> <p>DLM is an alternate assessment system intended for SWSCD; therefore, comments regarding linkage to content standards appear below, under the second factor (bullet 2), rather than the first (which applies to assessments of the general student population).</p> <p>DLM’s submission breaks down the wording of CE 3.1 such that they first respond to the matter of documentation of overall validity evidence for its assessments. This section of their submission is detailed and examines the DLM validity framework in the context of their Theory of Action. Concerns about this CE appear below.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated 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>Linkage to Academic Content Standards</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16- Appendices): Appendix G1: CETE Response to External Evaluation</p> <p><u>SC 08</u> (Essential Elements Science)</p> <p><u>SC 10</u> (Eternal Review Report 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 12</u> (External Alignment Study Technical Report)</p> <p><u>SC 20</u> (TAC Materials 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Linkage to Academic Content Standards</b></p> <p>Through multiple phases of review (content team members, external evaluators from member states, etc.), the alignment of EEs (and their related items/testlets) with the <i>Framework</i> and NGSS was verified—in terms of fidelity to the content of the NGSS, including Disciplinary Core Idea and Science and Engineering Practice.</p> <p>For Phase I, the reviewers have concerns that references to the breadth of coverage ignore many of the States’ academic content standards and do not adequately address a balance of content within/across the domains in science.</p> <p>DLM Science utilizes the <i>Framework</i> and NGSS to organize and identify science standards developed into EEs. They indicate in their submission that,</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 THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>“state partners did not want to develop EEs for every sub-idea in the <i>Framework</i> in the initial phase of this project. Therefore, participating 2015-16 states’ alternate science standards were reviewed rather than their grade-level science standards, as their alternate standards express their intended foci for SCD.” (SC 06, pp. 16-17). They also indicate (p. 15) that, “While some of these states had already adopted the NGSS after their publication in 2013, others had not and did not intend to do so.” DLM must demonstrate alignment with a single set of identified standards, and states can choose to participate or not.</p> <p>DLM indicates in a number of evidence documents that the initial set of EEs included in Phase I was based upon those alternate assessment standards in Science which were a focus common to partner states and that their intent is to expand EEs in Phase II. While their account of the crosswalk of existing alternate standards for partner states done in Phase I yielded the EEs assessed in 2015-16, it is unclear how they plan to proceed to reach agreement on other standards appropriate for assessment in Science of SWSCD.</p> <p>The DLM Consortium need to clarify the decision to use only Grade 5 to represent the elementary grade band 3-5. While the NGSS present middle and high school grade band standards, they identify elementary standards under each elementary grade (K through 5). The reviewers would have liked to see more justification for using only Grade 5 standards rather than incorporating some of the standards for earlier grades as part of that grade band (perhaps in the form of items in a testlet for the same EE at grade 5).</p> <p>Another of the reviewers’ concerns/questions regarding reported alignment comes from the CETE</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 THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		Response to External Evaluation. CETE evidently re-analyzed results from the alignment study (originally reported as individual ratings) to “reflect more traditional alignment statistics about pools of EEs” and “remove rater variability.” (p. 3). CETE applied a decision rule that if a majority of panelists rated a relationship in a category that was consistent with the criterion, it was considered met. Thus, if 3 of 5 panelists judged “partial” or “full” alignment, the CE would be designated as aligned. To protect against the perception that data were “massaged” to yield more promising results, it would be helpful to reference specific details in SC 12.
<b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DLM must demonstrate alignment with a single set of identified standards.</li> <li>• A plan and timeline for using the results of the HumRRO study to improve the alignment of testlets and EEs.</li> <li>• A justification for basing the elementary assessment only on grade 5 standards.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 15</u> (Item Writing Handbook July 2015)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16- Appendices)</p> <p><u>SC 21</u> Chapter IX Technical Manual YE 2014-15</p>	<p>Information provided to item writers contributed to ensuring that test content covered the intended cognitive processes. Subsequently, items/testlets were reviewed by multiple teams and at multiple points in time to confirm match between item and intended cognitive process(es) in linkage level.</p> <p>DLM includes in its discussion of validity assumptions, students’ ability to interact with assessment as intended (as independently as they are able), and regardless of health, behavioral, or other constraints. DLM notes that the observation protocol did not capture the reason that the test administrator chose to navigate for the students, and that could not always be inferred from observation (SC 06, p 203). DLM might consider ways to explore this matter further in the future.</p> <p>In addition, some of the test administrator actions deemed “neutral” may or may not be, given that pitch and pace of wording can cue—intentionally or unintentionally. This is an aspect of observational study that should be considered in the future.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p>SC 07 (Technical Manual Science 2015-16— Appendices)</p>	<p>The data provided are suitable for accountability and school improvement purposes. The Performance Profile for each student includes performance level results in science (overall and by domain) and highest linkage level mastered for each EE.</p> <p>It is unclear to the reviewers why aggregate reports (for schools, districts, etc.) do not report by domain.</p> <p>Consortium members decided upon four performance levels (PLDs). Given that the highest LL for science at present is Target, this appears to mean differentiating PLDs by the frequency at which students responded at target LL. This is different than for DLM Reading/Math. There was no discussion about redoing the standard setting if and when the number of linkage levels is expanded. Reviewers believe that it is imperative to accomplish this. The sample student report provided (p. 169, Figure 40) seems misleading, since it implies that it is possible for students to reach advanced level (but not given opportunity to demonstrate that in 2015-16).</p> <p>The DLM submission (SC 06, p.144) indicated that, “Essential Elements (EEs) were designed to be targets reached by the end of the grade band. However, states in the DLM Science Consortium require assessment of science at different grade levels within the grade bands. As such, expectations for students in lower grades within a grade band could reasonably be lower than expectations for students at higher grades within the same band. Therefore, grade-specific achievement standards were the desired outcome. Based on TAC recommendation and a vote by state partners, cut points were set at tested grade levels within the elementary and middle school grade bands (cut points in grades 4, 5, 6, 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 THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>8).” The reviewers believe that a rationale is needed for establishing grade level performance standards from results based only on items written to Grade 5 content standards.</p> <p>Table 60 on p. 161 (SC 06) provides breakdown of student participants by grade, and shows that students from across grade bands were included for each. The footnote explains inclusion of grades not part of accountability testing, but reviewers were unable to find evidence that only the grades tested for accountability were included as data sources for standard-setting.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that only the grades tested for accountability were included as data sources for standard-setting.</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 THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p>	<p>As evidence for this critical element, DLM cites two types of correlational analyses conducted (SC 07, p. 210). For the first, inter-correlations were calculated between DLM content areas for students assessed in English language arts, mathematics and science using total number of linkage levels mastered (with the explanation that while relationships across content areas can provide an indication of how consistently students perform across the different constructs of interest, since these constructs are inherently different (and therefore assessed separately), only moderate relationships are expected. For the second, correlations between student demographic characteristics and assessment results were calculated for students assessed in science, to demonstrate that how students performed on the test was unrelated to demographic characteristics such as gender and race.</p> <p>Evidence of the relationship between student responses on the assessment and other measures is limited, given the scope of Phase I.</p> <p>Recognizing that the submission reflects only the Phase I administration in 2015-16, the reviewers would like to see included other evidence such as the correlations between student performance on DLM science and participating States’ previous alternate assessment or other measure such as teacher ratings, classroom assessments, etc. (for those who have such data available). Future plans include creation of professional development models, and some instructional resources (including practice testlets) already exist and will continue to be augmented. The reviewers would have liked to see discussion of possible analyses of the relationship between use of practice and instructional materials and performance on DLM science, as well as descriptions of possible</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 THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		future studies to look at the impact of professional development as well as possible impact of teacher administration on student performance.
<b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify the external measures to be used in external validity studies and submit a plan and timeline for accomplishing this.</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 THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.1 – Reliability</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Reliability for Student Population</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Reliability for Student Population</b></p> <p>DLM establishes “up front” their “relatively uncommon operational psychometric methods to provide feedback about student performance” (SC 06, p. 136).</p> <p>As in the DLM R/M submission, for DLM Science all items were assumed to be fungible, or exchangeable, within a linkage level, but the reviewers are unable to find any evidence that this assumption was tested (although DLM refers to their account of item review procedures to support this assumption as well as field test results that provide preliminary supporting evidence. Future students intended to continue to evaluate the fungibility assumption are mentioned in the Technical Manual Science 2015-16.</p> <p>Since one way to demonstrate mastery is to provide correct responses to at least 80% of the items measuring the EE and linkage level (e.g., within one testlet), why would developers create testlets with only 3-4 items for science?</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Overall and Conditional Standard Error of Measurement</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Overall and Conditional Standard Error of Measurement</b></p> <p>DLM indicates that due to the model chosen, they will report classification consistency instead of overall and conditional standard error. Reviewers are concerned that high reliabilities in Table 65 on p. 182 may be an artifact of the low number of items per testlet.</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 THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Achievement Levels</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Achievement Levels</b></p> <p>See earlier question/concern about number of performance levels in relation to linkage levels and standard-setting process for determining cut-points for those performance levels</p> <p>Analyses need to be extended to subgroups as more data are available.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Computer Adaptive Tests</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Computer Adaptive Tests</b></p> <p>Analyses need to be extended to subgroups as more data are available.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Updated reliability estimates when DLM expands the item pool, expands the number of items per testlet, and increases the linkage levels.</li> <li>By December 2017, DLM must submit results of model evaluation.</li> <li>Analyses need to be extended to subgroups as more data are available.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

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><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 01</u> (Accessibility Manuel 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 15</u> (Science Item Writing Handbook 2015)</p> <p><u>SC 21</u> (Chapter IX Technical Manual YE 2014-15)</p> <p><u>SC 05</u> (Test Administration Manual 2015-16)</p>	<p>External review of testlets for accessibility is described in the Technical Manual Science 2015-16 (pp. 58-63). Accessibility review criteria for external reviewers seem somewhat limited (e.g., does not include high word-load, confounding reading and science; avoids multiple-meaning words (e.g., “sets” in released Elementary testlet).</p> <p>DLM does not indicate if any direction is given to item writers in regard to the ordering of response options or inadvertent cuing. These are matters that can potentially impact fairness and accessibility.</p> <p>The EE Concept Maps include accessibility flags indicating that content may require an alternate approach for some students. This demonstrates attention at an early stage in the item development process to accessibility.</p> <p>Training delivered through KITE includes a module devoted to accessibility.</p> <p>The reviewers question if any research has been done into the impact of the fictionalization of “science stories” on fairness and accessibility. Do students uniformly understand and identify with person(s) represented in a fictional situation? (See 06, p 43 for explanation of “science story”). It would be worthwhile to compare performance on items that are story/scenario-based versus those that are not.</p> <p>The section of the Technical Manual Science 2015-16 on Observations of Test Administration (pp. 202-205) is cited as evidence of data collection to evaluate whether students were able to respond to tasks irrespective of constraints (sensory, mobile, etc.); however, there is nothing in this section to link</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 THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>frequencies to students with such constraints, making use of this as evidence of attention to fairness and accessibility questionable. The reviewers would like to see such information collected in the future.</p> <p>The submission also mentions the use of cognitive labs to evaluate whether students were able to respond to tasks irrespective of constraints; however, the reviewers were unable to find any documentation of cognitive labs for science—only those done in 2014-15 for ELA/Mathematics (Chapter IX Technical Manual YE 2014-15). It would be desirable to collect data from cognitive labs on science testlets in the future.</p>
<b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Justification of the adequacy of accessibility review criteria for external reviewers.</li> <li>• Evidence of direction to item writers regarding the ordering of response options or inadvertent cuing.</li> <li>• A plan for research on the impact of fictionalization of science stories for this population, and study of performance on items that are story/scenario based and those that are not.</li> <li>• As the number of test takers increases, the disaggregation by groups (other than gender) needs to be included in reporting.</li> <li>• Report on Cognitive Lab results for science testlets.</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 THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.3 – 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><u>SC.06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p>	<p>Insofar as Phase I of DLM Science included only three linkage levels, the reviewers are not sure how to respond to assertions that the assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum—that is, the continuum represented by Linkage Levels from initial to successor OR merely initial to target (performance levels of emerging-approaching target-at target-advanced) that were developed for ELA and Mathematics. See comments under Section 3.3.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.4 – 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><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 05</u> (Test Administration Manual 2015-16)</p>	<p>Linkage level mastery is determined based on percentage of items correct in a given testlet; answer keys are screened for accuracy as part of item development and scoring is automated for computer-delivered items. Support for fidelity in recording responses to teacher-administered responses is intended to ensure accurate assignment of responses (and the evidence those item-level responses collectively provide of mastery of the linkage level).</p>
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</b></p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16-- Appendices)</p>	<p>Rather than utilizing multiple assessment forms, DLM Science assessments are customized (based on an entry-level screening—the “First Contact Survey”—and then adjusting based on linkage level performance testlet by testlet. The adaptive delivery method is designed to ensure coverage at different linkage levels of the nine EEs at each grade band in Phase I (10 for Biology EOY). It is not clear how this will be modified once an expanded science blueprint is available and supported by a larger pool of testlets across more EEs (such that not every student will be assessed in the same EEs or with the same testlet at a given linkage level). Reviewers will want to see an explanation of content coverage under an expanded blueprint.</p> <p>DLM indicates in their submission that “comparability of inferences across administration years is ensured by maintaining consistent scoring methods and item review procedures from year to year.” However, the reviewers are unclear how routing among more EEs within the 3 domains even though they may be at the same LL allows, without further investigation, the assertion of comparability of inferences. DLM should update evidence of comparability after increasing the number of EEs and linkage levels.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b></p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Design &amp; Processes to Support Comparability</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Design &amp; Processes to Support Comparability</b></p> <p>The submission provides a clear and adequate explanation of the assessment design, such that students are routed through a series of testlets rather than taking a fixed form of the assessment. This is the same process, regardless of modality.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Evidence of Comparability</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Evidence of Comparability</b></p> <p>DLM makes note of various studies that are not yet feasible based on insufficient sample sizes. The reviewers agree more evidence of comparability of meaning and interpretation of assessment results is desirable and should be forthcoming in the future.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b></p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p><u>SC 19</u> (Scope of Work)</p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16); see especially p. 125 and pp. 250-51</p> <p><u>SC 12</u> (External Alignment Study Technical Report)</p> <p><u>SC 20</u> (TAC Materials 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 17</u> (Science External Alignment Study RFP)</p>	<p>DLM identifies a number of important and meaningful technical analyses that will be ongoing for future administrations. There was no mention made of analyses of the relationship between instructional practice in science for SWSCD and the results of DLM science, which might be conducted through educator responses to surveys around the time of the testing window. Are there any plans for such?</p> <p>It is only here, in this section of the DLM submission, that the reviewers found mention of the fact that “Phase II development work is not expected to impact operational assessments for several more years.” Given that, it would be helpful for DLM to include as evidence a timeline of intended future activities and the likely consequences/impacts for the assessment program. Specifically, for how many additional years beyond the first operational year will the assessment include the same testlets/same EEs (and/or the same EEs but with existing testlets augmented with additional items, something that was indicated by DLM as a possible future endeavor)?</p> <p>What steps, if any, have been considered to avoid “teaching to the test” since specific content will be known by teachers administering the assessment?</p> <p>Which future studies can take place simply on the basis of a widening group of participating students (leading to sufficient numbers in subgroups) as more states elect to implement DLM Science?</p>
<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include as evidence a timeline of intended future activities and the likely consequences/impacts for the assessment program.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards;</li> </ul>	<p>DLM indicates that this portion of the Critical Element is addressed in individual State submissions</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs;</li> </ul>	<p>DLM indicates that this portion of the Critical Element is addressed in individual State submissions</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Guidelines for choice of general or alternate assessment</b></p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16— Appendices)</p> <p><u>SC 01</u> (Accessibility Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual 2015-16)</p> <p>There may be additional evidence of state-specific guidance in individual state submissions.</p>	<p><b>Guidelines for choice of general or alternate assessment</b></p> <p>The DLM Consortium provides clear participation guidelines/criteria (Technical Manual Appendix D.7). The submission goes on to elaborate upon extraneous factors that should not guide a participation decision. This information is included in test administrator training modules.</p> <p>DLM notes that States are encouraged to use DLM guidelines and resources in conjunction with others</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 THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		describing their general assessment options (with/without accommodations) to promote appropriate assessment assignment for each student.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Information on Supports and Accommodations</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16— Appendices)</p> <p><u>SC 01</u> (Accessibility Manual 2015-16)</p> <p>There may be additional evidence of state-specific guidance in individual state submissions</p>	<p><b>Information on Supports and Accommodations</b></p> <p>DLM clearly and substantially addresses supports and accommodations in the Technical Manual Science 2015-16 (pp. 114-121) and Module 2 of required test administrator training (SC 07, Appendix H.1). Their submission provides an explanation of how teachers use the Accessibility Manual to familiarize themselves and the IEP team with available accommodations.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Guidance on Selection of Accommodations</b></p> <p><u>SC 01</u> (Accessibility Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16— Appendices)</p> <p><u>SC 05</u> (Test Administration Manual 2015-16)</p> <p>There may be additional evidence of state-specific guidance in individual state submissions</p>	<p><b>Guidance on Selection of Accommodations</b></p> <p>The reviewers note well documented guidance regarding the selection of accommodations (particularly the SC 01 Accessibility Manual pp. 17-21) and training Module 2 (SC 06 Technical Manual Science 215-16 Appendix H.1)</p> <p>DLM makes clear in their submission the opportunity for test administrators to change PNP selections to ensure effective administration.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Disability Categories for Alternate Assessment</b></p> <p>SC 07 (Technical Manual Science 2015-16— Appendices)</p> <p>There may be additional evidence of state-specific guidance in individual state submissions</p>	<p><b>Disability Categories for Alternate Assessment</b></p> <p>Participation Guidelines are provided in Appendix D.7.</p> <p>The reviewers were unable to locate any explicit instructions that students eligible to be assessed based</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 THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>on alternate academic standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in IDEA; however, besides the three necessary participation criteria, Appendix D.7 lists factors not allowed as a consideration for determining participation in DLM Alternate Assessment, the first of which is “a disability category or label.”</p> <p>DLM also indicates that participating states will determine whether IEP teams must select alternative assessment for all subjects or separately for each subject.</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> </ul>	<p>DLM indicates that this portion of the Critical Element is addressed in individual State submissions</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Promote Access to the General Curriculum</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16— Appendices)</p> <p><u>SC 14</u> (Supplemental Evidence Related to Test Administration)</p> <p><u>SC 08</u> (Essential Elements Science)</p> <p>There may be additional evidence of state-specific</p>	<p><b>Promote Access to the General Curriculum</b></p> <p>The submission includes evidence that the design of the alternate assessment promotes access to grade level content standards. However, given the limited number of EEs identified for Phase I of DLM Science (which reflected the somewhat limited scope of science instruction common to the member states), the reviewers question the adequacy of that access. The reviewers understand that plans are underway to identify additional EEs that align with academic achievement standards for general education students and that one of innumerable goals of DLM science is to expand instructional opportunities in science for SWSCD (which, based on survey data from field test administrators</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	guidance in individual state submissions	<p>presented in the SC 06 Technical Manual (pp. 199-200; Opportunity to Learn Survey) was quite limited at the time those data were collected. While this assessment has increased, and will continue to increase the opportunity of SWSCD to demonstrate what they know about science content, reviewers believe that at present, DLM Science does not go far enough in promoting access to the general education curriculum, and thus limits the efficacy of these procedures.</p> <p>It is commendable that science instructional activities were developed for educators beginning to use the DLM Science EEs (see Technical Manual Science 2015-16 pp. 228-229). These eight activities were made available to teachers on the DLM science resources page (3 for elementary, 3 for MS, and 2 for HS).</p> <p>In evidence submitted under Section 5.4, the DLM Consortium does not elaborate on issues/concerns related to what--in the submission—is referred to as “the gap that exists for some students between assessment and instruction.” While there are plans by DLM to monitor this in future years (SC 06, pp. 250-251), the reviewers question whether it might be advisable for DLM to play a more direct role in monitoring to ensure this.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement There may be additional evidence of state-specific guidance in individual state submissions</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required from the consortium.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> </ul>	<p><b>Determining Appropriateness of Accommodation for ELs</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 01</u> (Accessibility Manual 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Determining Appropriateness of Accommodation for ELs</b></p> <p>DLM has procedures in place for determining accommodations appropriate for all SWSCD including ELs.</p> <p>Participating ELs eligible/monitored account for less than 1% of SWSCD consortium-wide (based on state-specific eligibility criteria for ELs) (SC 06, p. 162). However, the DLM Consortium acknowledges that for 97% of the tested population, EL status is “Unknown”. An explanation for the absence of students’ EL status, particularly in light of the fact that these data were provided for 99.99% of participants in ELA/Math (2014-15 Technical Manual), and a plan for addressing this in the future is necessary. Also, reviewers urge that the DLM Consortium provide guidance on the collection of these data.</p> <p>ELs who meet criteria to participate in DLM Science may have translation provided outside the system (01, p. 14).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Information on Supports and Accommodations for all students/ELs</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 01</u> (Accessibility Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 05</u> (Test Administration Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16—Appendices)</p>	<p><b>Information on Supports and Accommodations for ELs</b></p> <p>Evidence provided is adequate for this factor (in particular SC 05 p. 54).</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 THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Guidance on Selection of Accommodations for ELS</b></p> <p><u>SC 01</u> (Accessibility Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16—Appendices)</p> <p><u>SC 05</u> (Test Administration Manual 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Guidance on Selection of Accommodations for ELS</b></p> <p>Test administrators are instructed to make sure that supports provided during assessment are consistent with those provided during instruction and make clear that for ELs, this includes linguistic supports.</p> <p>DLM notes that test administrators are able to change PNP selections based on changing needs and preferences.</p> <p>Consortia-level evidence provided in the submission is adequate for this factor; states will provide additional evidence if there are state-specific policies on translation for ELs with significant cognitive disabilities.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An explanation for the absence of 97.39% of students' EL status (information required under Section 612 of the IDEA), and a plan for addressing this in the future.</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 THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>5.3 – Accommodations</b></p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Ensuring Availability of Appropriate Accommodations</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 01</u> (Accessibility Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 05</u> (Test Administration Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16— Appendices)</p>	<p><b>Ensuring Availability of Appropriate Accommodations</b></p> <p>DLM makes a wide range of supports (which in the context of peer review guidance are referred to as accommodations) based on decisions made by IEP teams for individual students.</p> <p>DLM provides adequate documentation of availability of accommodations as well as flexible features of administration.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);</li> </ul>	<p><b>Availability of Accommodations for ELs</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 01</u> (Accessibility Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 05</u> (Test Administration Manual 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Availability of Accommodations for ELs</b></p> <p>DLM provides an adequate explanation of their approach to assessment of ELs with significant cognitive difficulties (noting in their submission that approximately 1% of students who take DLM science assessments are also EL, although 97.39% of the data are missing). Following TIP guidelines (allowable/not allowable translation), the test administrator may provide translation (SC 06, p. 110) as a permissible support outside of the KITE system.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Appropriateness and Effectiveness of Accommodations</b></p> <p><u>SC 01</u> (Accessibility Manual 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 18</u> (First Contact: A Census Report)</p> <p><u>SC 05</u> (Test Administration Manual 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Appropriateness and Effectiveness of Accommodations</b></p> <p>DLM accommodations derived from multiple sources including feedback from partner states and expert judgment, such that these accessibility features and supports enable access to assessment content while avoiding altering the construct being assessed (SC 06, pp. 114-121). Other sources of information included results from over 50,000 First Contact Survey responses and test administration observation studies (SC 01, p. 16). DLM notes in their submission the lack of published research on accommodations for SWSCD and the added challenge of computer-</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 THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>based assessment for that student population.</p> <p>Attention to individual needs is reflected in the expectation that students will be assessed using their normal response mode, and that tools/manipulatives may be modified (e.g., replacing image with physical object) as appropriate. Student familiarity with delivery via KITE is aided by availability of simulated student accounts with various PNP features enabled, and via practice testlets (SC 05, pp. 32-34).</p> <p>Evidence that accommodations allow for meaningful interpretation of results and comparison of scores for students participating with/without accommodations comes from teacher survey (SC 06, pp. 205-06).</p> <p>DLM indicates that research is ongoing on use and effectiveness of accommodations and validity of inferences that may be made about test scores under accommodated conditions (SC 06, pp. 250-51).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Exceptional Accommodation Requests</b></p> <p>DLM indicates that this portion of the Critical Element is addressed in individual State submissions</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required from the consortium</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b></p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Accommodations and Participation Decisions are Consistent with State Policy</b></p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16— Appendices)</p> <p><u>SC 01</u> (Accessibility Manual 2015-16)</p> <p>DLM notes: THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC PROCEDURES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS</p>	<p><b>Accommodations and Participation Decisions Are Consistent with State Policy</b></p> <p>Although the DLM provides adequate information on participation and accommodations, the consortium does not monitor these aspects of test administration, but instead leaves to each state to use DLM guidelines (as well as any supplementary guidelines they may have) to design and implement a monitoring process.</p> <p>The reviewers suggest it might be appropriate/advisable for member states to report back to the Consortium the results of state-level monitoring to ensure that inclusion and accommodations decisions are consistent with their own state policies. Sharing such information could usefully inform the practices of all member states and strengthen the program.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Inclusion and Accommodation Decisions Are Appropriate to Address Student Needs</b></p> <p><u>SC 01</u> (Accessibility Manual 2015-16)</p> <p>DLM notes: THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC PROCEDURES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS</p>	<p><b>Inclusion and Accommodation Decisions Are Appropriate to Address Student Needs</b></p> <p>DLM provides guidance on the selection of accommodations based on student needs and preferences to which states may refer when developing their own plans and standards for monitoring to ensure appropriateness of participation and accommodations.</p> <p>See reviewers’ suggestion under 5.4.1 above.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Accommodations are Consistent with Those During Instruction/Practice</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Accommodations are Consistent with Those During Instruction/Practice</b></p> <p>DLM recommends that accommodations used during the assessment are consistent with those provided</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>DLM notes: THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC PROCEDURES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS</p>	<p>during instruction (SC 01, pp. 17-21). States develop their own plans for monitoring this practice.</p> <p>The Consortium also collects indirect evidence of consistency between accommodations for assessment and instruction through a teacher survey (SC 06, pp. 132-134). It appears that this survey only involved collection of responses to three items using a 4-point Likert-type scale (strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree) with no evidence that teachers had the opportunity to provide elaboration (e.g., comments that could be coded/collated). Given the results of the survey (nearly 74% agree/strongly agree that student was able to use accessibility features, 71.3% agree/strongly agree that accessibility features during assessment were similar to those used in instruction), the reviewers are not comfortable with DLM’s statement on p. 134 that, “These data support the conclusions that the accessibility features of the DLM alternate assessment were effectively used by students, emulated accessibility features used during instruction, and met student needs for test administration.” The reviewers would like to see further inquiry into these matters to ascertain why the for the approximately one in four teachers indicated that accommodations and accessibility features did not meet students’ needs.</p> <p>DLM identifies three categories of support, the first of which is supports activated by PNP and delivered via KITE system. Although the DLM Consortium makes no mention of this option for further research to demonstrate monitoring of accommodations, it seems to the reviewers that it would not be difficult to track use of those supports.</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 THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> </ul>	<p><b>Accommodations are Consistent with IEP or 504 Team</b></p> <p>SC 02 (Assessment Coordinator Manual 2015-16)</p> <p>DLM notes: THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC PROCEDURES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS</p>	<p><b>Accommodations are Consistent with IEP or 504 Team</b></p> <p>While DLM does not directly monitor consistency of assessment accommodations with those identified by students IEP Team or 504 team, the KITE Educator Portal offers two mechanisms (extracts) for creation of reports that can facilitate such monitoring.</p> <p>Given the importance of ensuring compliance with this guidance, it might be useful for DLM to strongly encourage use of those extracts.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Fidelity of Test Administration</b></p> <p>SC 06 Technical Manual Science 2015-16</p> <p>DLM notes: THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC PROCEDURES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS</p>	<p><b>Fidelity of Test Administration</b></p> <p>Evidence appears to be adequate for this section.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The reviewers would like to see further inquiry into these matters to ascertain why approximately one in four teachers indicated that accommodations and accessibility features did not meet students’ needs, and plans to address this.</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 THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</b></p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities;</li> </ul>	<p>This critical element (all factors) is addressed in individual state submissions</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply;</li> </ul>		<p>N/A</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</li> </ul>		<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required from the consortium (N/A for consortium).</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b></p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p><u>SC 11</u> (Standard Setting Technical Report 2016)</p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p>	<p><u>Method</u>: For Science, DLM utilized the same methodology (rangefinding and pinpointing) used to set standards for DLM in ELA and mathematics in 2014-15.</p> <p>Vertical articulation was conducted to ensure cut points progressed logically as content expectations increased by grade level.</p> <p>DLM developed and implemented a multi-phased training process for panelists including online training prior to the standard setting workshop, additional training onsite, staff guidance and monitoring.</p> <p>Not included in listed evidence, but worth noting as a commendable practice is that panelists had access to sample testlets for any EE/linkage level assessed in a grade and upon request, these could be displayed in the online content management system (SC 11, p. 28).</p> <p>The reviewers have some question/concern about implications for standard setting in 2015-16 of the introduction of additional EEs in the future, as well as the possible shift from three to five linkage levels. It would be useful to include information about any discussion that may have taken place in that regard.</p> <p>SC 11, p. 9 contains the statement that, “Although science state partners voted on acceptance of final cut points, individual states had the option to adopt the consortium cut points or develop their own independent cut points.” This does not appear to be discussed further in the submission, raising a question about the methods/process that partner states might use to develop cut points (thus satisfying Department guidance).</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p><u>Panelists:</u> DLM panelist recruitment ensured representation from member states, all with considerable experience in science and/or special education; it was noted that nearly half of those involved had prior experience with standard setting activities (SC 11, pp. 23-24).</p> <p>Although reviewers recognize that panel membership may reflect teaching populations from member states, reviewers suggest that the Consortium endeavour to balance representation by race and gender better.</p>
<b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide justification for the make-up of the standard-setting panel, and a plan to improve representation by race and gender in future standard-setting activities.</li> <li>• Provide a plan and timeline for future standard-setting that may be necessitated by an increase in EEs and/or linkage levels.</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 THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 12</u> (External Alignment Study Technical Report)</p>	<p>DLM’s alternate academic achievement standards are based on Essential Elements, which parallel performance expectations set forth in the NGSS. Performance descriptors incorporate both disciplinary core ideas and science and engineering practices.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required from the consortium .</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Reporting Results</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16— Appendices)</p> <p>DLM notes: THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC REPORTING IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS</p>	<p><b>Reporting Results</b></p> <p>Participating states are provided with student data files in a timely manner. States are then responsible for reporting results on student achievement and participation (e.g., those students who were eligible but did not participate in testing). DLM also provides to states a guide to scores and reports (SC 07, Appendix F.2)</p> <p>Resources related to scoring and reporting are available to on the DLM website (including report prototypes for individual score reports and class, school, district, and state aggregated reports (SC 06, p. 170).</p> <p>DLM submission also indicates that streamlined quality control procedures and automated data checks have been taken to deliver results in a timely manner in non-standard setting years.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Reports to Districts and Schools</b></p> <p><b>Assessment results reported to support appropriate uses of results</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16— Appendices)</p> <p><b>Interpretive Guides</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p><u>SC 07</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16— Appendices)</p>	<p><b>Reports to Districts and Schools</b></p> <p><b>Assessment results reported to support appropriate uses of results</b></p> <p>The individual student reports for science used the same template as used for ELA and mathematics; these were developed with input from all stakeholder groups who will need/want to understand and use results. Sample reports are included in evidence (Appendix F.3, F.4)</p> <p>As part of their validity studies during development of the ELA and mathematics assessments, DLM conducted a study of design and use of score reports (SC 06, pp. 211-217). There was no indication of any intention to repeat this study or conduct a related</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 THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>DLM notes: THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC REPORTING AND INTERPRETIVE GUIDES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS</p>	<p>study based on the score reports for science. Although changes in the report content/format were small ones intended to accommodate differences between subjects, the reviewers imagine that such a study would be useful, if only to verify/validate the clarity and effectiveness of DLM Science reports.</p> <p>Even more critical may be a repeat of survey reported for ELA/mathematics on use of reports to inform instruction. The survey referenced in the submission is based on DLM ELA/mathematics, not science. Given the reported paucity of attention to science instruction for SWSCD, the ability of teachers to use assessment results to inform instruction would seem to be an important concern that should be addressed.</p> <p>DLM does mention a survey planned for the 2017 administration of the science assessment (SC 06, p. 220) that will serve as a source of consequential validity data—but this is a survey of test administrators regarding their perceptions of the assessment contents (whether the test measures important academic skills/high expectations)—and not their anticipated uses of assessment data to drive instruction.</p> <p><u>Interpretive Guides</u></p> <p>DLM notes that while in 2015-16, science state partners chose to utilize the guides developed previously for ELA and mathematics, additional versions of guides are being developed to include science-specific examples of reports. This ties into issues/concerns raised immediately above.</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 THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> </ul>	<p><b>Delivery of Student Reports</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p>	<p><b>Delivery of Student Reports</b></p> <p>Overall, DLM provides sufficient evidence to address most aspects of this factor. As noted above, it will be helpful to provide as soon as feasible, science-specific information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret test results and address academic needs of students.</p> <p>The submission does not explicitly address the availability of student reports in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request. However, while in 2015-16 Individual Student Score Reports were produced in English, the Parent Interpretive Guide was available on the DLM website in a Spanish version. The DLM Consortium notes that all consortium scoring and reporting resources were provided in MS Word so member states can edit/provide resources in alternate formats, as necessary.</p> <p>Although the DLM Consortium did not direct peer reviewers to individual state submissions here, the reviewers would expect individual states to elaborate on this topic further, for example, how the reports are provided in other languages as needed.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Process and Timeline</b></p> <p><u>SC 06</u> (Technical Manual Science 2015-16)</p> <p>DLM notes: THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC PRACTICES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS</p>	<p><b>Process and Timeline</b></p> <p>Process and Timeline information in the submission reflects the process for 2014-15—that is, only for ELA and mathematics. More information, related specifically to the science assessment, is needed to confirm that participating states followed a practical process/timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals.</p> <p>The DLM Consortium mentions that they have taken</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM SCIENCE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		steps to support states in the timely reporting during non-standard setting years (SC 06, pp. 171-174). Some elaboration on when/on what basis standard setting would be conducted again would be helpful.
<b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Particularly in light of the fact that the DLM Consortium identifies “improving instruction” as one of three key purposes of the assessment, as soon as possible the DLM staff should conduct a survey on the use of science reports to inform instruction and submit the results by December 2017.</li> </ul>		

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

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## February 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma

Contents

**SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS . 4**  
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students .... 5  
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards ..... 8  
1.3 – Required Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 10  
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 11  
1.5 – Participation Data (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 13

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS ..... 14**  
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 15  
2.2 – Item Development..... 20  
2.3 – Test Administration ..... 24  
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)26  
2.5 – Test Security ..... 28  
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 33

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 35**  
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 36  
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 39  
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure ..... 41  
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables ..... 45

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER ..... 48**  
4.1 – Reliability..... 49  
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 52  
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... 55  
4.4 – Scoring ..... 59  
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms ..... 65  
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment ..... 68  
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance ..... 71

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS ..... 74**  
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities ..... 75  
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 79  
5.3 – Accommodations..... 85  
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations ..... 89

**SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 91**  
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students ..... 92  
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 95  
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards ..... 98  
6.4 – Reporting..... 101

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma

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

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</b></p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State.</p>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b>            SBE Meeting Minutes – Science Adoption.pdf, page 114            Science standards press release.pdf, page 731            In 2016, the State Board of Education formally adopted new ELA &amp; Math, page 92</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b>            SBE Meeting Minutes – Science Adoption.pdf, page 114            Science standards press release.pdf, page 731            In 2016, the State Board of Education formally adopted new ELA &amp; Math, page 92            · See SBE Meeting Minutes – ELA &amp; Math Adoption.pdf            Documentation that explicitly states the State’s academic content standards apply to all public schools and students in accordance with ESSA.            o News_ Oklahoma Academic Standards adopted for state.pdf            · See State Statute &amp; Administrative code            o 70 O.S. § 11-103.6a (OSCN 2017), page 99: Oklahoma State Statute            Academic Standards directing all districts to implement state standards.            o Oklahoma Administrative Code (OAC) 210:15-3-70, page 88            o 70 O.S. § 1210.508 (OSCN 2017), page 102, Oklahoma School Testing Act</p>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b>            The state needs to provide evidence that the science standards apply to all Oklahoma elementary and secondary schools for the general and alternate assessments.</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b>            The Science standards press release.pdf, page 731 mentions the adoption of the science standards but does not explicitly state that they apply to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State.</p> <p>The press release (News_ Oklahoma Academic Standards adopted for state.pdf (3/23/2016)) addresses the challenging nature of the standards for ELA and math: “These new standards are rigorous, user-friendly and, most importantly, created by Oklahomans for Oklahomans to address the particular needs of our state. “            “They strengthen expectations of what our students can achieve and set a high bar to ensure that our schoolchildren will graduate prepared for college or the workforce...”</p> <p>Oklahoma Administrative Code (OAC) 210:15-3-70 addresses the challenging nature of the standards for science: “This integrated approach will provide students with a coordinated, coherent understanding of the necessary skills and knowledge to be sufficiently literate citizens.            ...they provide a framework for schools and teachers to develop an aligned science curriculum...”</p> <p>There is evidence that the state formally adopted math, science and ELA standards. However, it is</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 Oklahoma**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		unclear whether the science standards apply to all public elementary and secondary school. Applicability was provided in 70 O.S. 11-103.6a for ELA and math. The state needs to provide evidence that the science standards apply to all Oklahoma elementary and secondary schools for the general and alternate assessments.
<b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the science standards for both the general and alternate assessments apply to all Oklahoma elementary and secondary schools.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>1.2 – 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><b>Alternate Assessment – AA-AAAS</b> HumRRO alignment study</p> <p><b>General Assessments</b> <b>State Submitted Evidence</b> The press release (News_ Oklahoma Academic Standards adopted for state.pdf (3/23/2016)) Evidence the standards contain coherent and rigorous content and encourage the teaching of advanced skills: · ELA &amp; Math Standards Development Process (pp. 117-225) · Science Standards Process – OASS Development Process (pp. 226-237) Evidence the standards were developed with broad stakeholder involvement: · ELA &amp; Math Stakeholder involvement (pp. 227-389) · Science Standards Stakeholder involvement – (pp. 215-226) Endorsements and certification letters provided by Oklahoma State Regents and Oklahoma Career Tech validating Oklahoma State Standards represent the knowledge and skills students need to succeed in college and the workforce. · See OK State Regents Certification Letter.pdf (pp. 394 &amp; 187-192) · See Okla CareerTech Support Letter.pdf &amp; Commerce (pp. 404-406) In addition, please see the three external reviewers of the OAS: OEWI Review, SC3 Review, and Oklahoma Technical Advisory Committee. The Rubric used to Review Standards for coherence and rigor.</p>	<p><b>Alternate Assessment – AA-AAAS</b> There is no evaluation of linkage for science, as provided for ELA and Math</p> <p><b>General Assessments</b> The press release (News_ Oklahoma Academic Standards adopted for state.pdf (3/23/2016)) addresses the challenging nature of the standards for ELA and math: “These new standards are rigorous, user-friendly and, most importantly, created by Oklahomans for Oklahomans to address the particular needs of our state... They strengthen expectations of what our students can achieve and set a high bar to ensure that our schoolchildren will graduate prepared for college or the workforce...”</p> <p>There is evidence of broad stakeholder involvement and feedback in the standards development process. However, it is unclear how feedback/input from the state’s stakeholders, TAC, and other external reviewers (e.g. OEWI and South Central Comprehensive Center) was used in the final version of the ELA, Math, and Science standards. (ELA &amp; Math Standards Development Process (p. 122); Science Standards Process – OASS Development Process (pp. 226-237))</p> <p>The state looked at previous standards, but there was a lack of evidence of rigor supported by research and theory in ELA and math. Although letters of endorsement are provided, research and theory would be helpful in determining how the state standards are preparing students for post secondary possibilities.</p> <p>The evidence, based on reviews of the standards and comments by the OEWI and SC3, does not encourage the teaching of advanced skills.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		Technical assistance/best practice notes/comments from one or more peer reviewers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The state may also want to consider the relationship between the assessment design and the adopted content standards. If the design of the assessments allows for test preparation practices that lead to score inflation, it can undermine the state’s efforts to ensure that educators are continuously encouraged to teach advanced skills. For example, if the sampling of specific strands is narrow it could lead to reallocation of instructional time that focuses only on those standards that are included in the sampling of the strand. Additionally, if the content standards would typically be assessed using a single item response format it may incentivize instruction that focuses to heavily on the response format at the expense of the conceptual knowledge/understanding detailed by the content standard.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A description/discussion of foundational information (e.g., guiding principles, research, resources) used in the development of the ELA and Math standards, similar to those described for the Science standards, would strengthen evidence of rigor.</li> <li>A description of how and the process by which OSDE addressed stakeholder feedback and concerns raised by the external reviewers would strengthen evidence of coherence and rigor.</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 Oklahoma**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p align="center"><b>1.3 – 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>The ESSA-compliant assessment system included the following required OSTP assessments for the 16-17 SY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> English Language Arts (Grades 3-8 &amp; 10)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Mathematics (Grades 3-8 &amp; 10)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Science (Grades 5, 8 &amp; 10)</li> </ul> <p>Please see the Oklahoma State Statute mandating these assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> 70 O.S. § 1210.508 (OSCN 2017), Oklahoma School Testing Program Act</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Office of Assessment, OSDE Assessment Update 16-17 (pp. 27-85)</li> </ul>	<p>Evidence submitted meets the requirements for this critical element.</p> <p>Department staff notes that, in the State’s Consolidated ESSA Plan (approval pending) the State indicated that high school assessments in R/LA and mathematics would be an LEA choice of two assessments (SAT OR ACT). If State moves forward to implement a high school assessment that is based on LEA choice, then State will not have met this requirement.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p><u>_x_</u> No additional evidence is required if assessments in high school conform to evidence submitted. State must clarify that the same high school test is required of all students in R/LA and mathematics.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p align="center"><b>1.4 – 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>The OSDE consistently messages required inclusion of all students in state assessments, please see the following evidence to support this claim:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> LEA Agreement.pdf (District superintendents are required to assure the OSDE that all students with disabilities will be included in state assessments, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools.)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> OSTP 2017 Test Preparation Manual</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> OSTP 2017 Test Administration Manual G3-5</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> OSTP 2017 Test Administration Manual G6-8</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> OSTP 2017 Test Administration Manual G10</li> </ul> <p>General Assessment Information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> 2016-2017 OSTP FAQs, pp. 9; 12-14, describes which tests must be administered and when they should be administered. Questions concerning testing students who have transferred from out of state or from a private school and students with disabilities are addressed.</li> </ul> <p>English Learners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> State Does Not Administer Native Language Assessments.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> ELL Exempt Flowchart is used to determine whether EL students may or may not be exempted from the OSTP ELA assessment. (Please note: ELs will not be exempt from taking any state assessments beginning in the 17-18 SY)</li> </ul>	<p>Evidence submitted meets the requirements for this critical element.</p> <p>Department staff notes that, in the State’s Consolidated ESSA Plan (approval pending) the State indicated that high school assessments in R/LA and mathematics would be an LEA choice of two assessments (SAT OR ACT). If State moves forward to implement a high school assessment that is based on LEA choice, then State will not have met this requirement.</p>
<p align="center"><b>Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p>_x_ No additional evidence is required if assessments in high school conform to evidence submitted. State must clarify that the same high school test is required of all</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

<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>
students in R/LA and mathematics.		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

<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 style="text-align: center;"><b>1.5 – Participation Data</b></p> <p>The State’s participation data show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system. In addition, if the State administers end-of-course assessments for high school students, the State has procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates on each required assessment and provides the corresponding data.</p>	<p>Please see the following spreadsheet providing preliminary participation data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> OSTP 16-17 Preliminary Participation rates by grade and subgroup.pdf</li> </ul>	<p>Evidence submitted meets the requirements for this critical element.</p> <p>Department staff notes that, in the State’s Consolidated ESSA Plan (approval pending) the State indicated that high school assessments in R/LA and mathematics would be an LEA choice of two assessments (SAT OR ACT). If State moves forward to implement a high school assessment that is based on LEA choice, then State will not have met this requirement.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p>_x_ No additional evidence is required if assessments in high school conform to evidence submitted. State must clarify that the same high school test is required of all students in R/LA and mathematics.</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma

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

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>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>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAS: State Submitted Evidence AA-AAS</b> Oklahoma’s alternate assessments were developed by the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) assessment consortium. Evidence for the assessments was submitted on Oklahoma’s behalf by the State of West Virginia. State specific information/evidence Oklahoma performed an alignment study between the Oklahoma academic standards and the DLM EEs in ELA and Math.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attachment 30 – Alignment report Peer Submitted Evidence – AA-AAAS</li> </ul> <p>Attachment 30 - Alignment Report Evidence Located in File - CE Sections (1-6) Alternate Assessments.pdf (page(s) 985) HumRRO alignment study</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b> Statements of Purpose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Oklahoma School Testing Program scope and general Administration OAC Section 210:10-13-2</li> <li>· Assessment Requirements HB 3218.pdf (pp. v-ix)</li> </ul> <p>The assessments were built according to the structures outlined in the Test and Item Specifications. Each document outlines the testing blueprint and reflects the inclusion of challenging content knowledge and skills.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Test and Item Specifications</li> <li>o Evidence of the usability of the technology-based presentation of the assessments, including the usability of accessibility</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAS:</b> The DLM panel will review evidence.</p> <p>Evidence that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the state’s content standards and identified for the alternate assessment.</p> <p>There is no evaluation of linkage for science, as provided for ELA and Math</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b> The statements of the purposes of the assessment in the test item specifications are very general and it is not clear whether the assessments are intended to serve additional purposes such as those recommended by the Task Force (e.g., The purposes of the grade 3 test is to measure OK students’ levels of proficiency over the OK Academic Standards.)</p> <p>It is unclear whether these purposes are being addressed by the assessment system: The members of the Task Force agreed to the following goals for OSDE to consider for Oklahoma’s assessment system:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide instructionally useful information to teachers and students with appropriate detail (i.e., differing grain sizes for different stakeholder groups) and timely reporting;</li> <li>2. Provide clear and accurate information to</li> </ol>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>parents and students regarding achievement and progress toward college- and career-readiness (CCR) using an assessment that is meaningful to students;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Provide meaningful information to support evaluation and enhancement of curriculum and programs; and</li> <li>4. Provide information to appropriately support federal and state accountability decisions.</li> </ol> <p>There are state laws defining secondary uses of test results that are not addressed in the statement of purposes.</p> <p>Elements in the test blueprint do not support technical quality and interpretations of the test results (e.g., The student’s raw score is converted to a scale score using the number correct scoring. There is not an operational definition provided of “reasonably reliable”.)</p> <p>There appears to be inconsistency in specifications related to the assessment design and structure. For example, the blueprints state that item types are not limited to one particular type of response format, and it also states that multiple choice is the only type of response format used.</p> <p>The blueprints should be reviewed for accuracy and consistency. This might be a service that the assessment vendor could assist with.</p> <p>Only in writing prompts is there any inclusion of challenging content that requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>Technical assistance/best practice notes/comments from one or more peer reviewers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state may want to consider longitudinal considerations in the development of test blueprints. While the degree to which the content/sampling within the content domains is constrained, developing a longer-term strategy to incorporate sampling variance for the items will still maintain alignment to the standards while reducing the predictability of the test content. As tests become increasingly predictable, the state needs to consider and evaluate the likelihood that variance in test scores is the result of bad test preparation practices that lead to score inflation.</li> <li>• It may be useful to develop a workflow diagram that illustrates the test development process from start to finish as a way to organize/communicate the information and orient end-users to the ways that the different activities all fit into the larger test-development process.</li> <li>• It may be possible to include short-constructed response items in the operational test that can be reliably machine scored – particularly in mathematics – to cover a broader range of cognitive complexity and difficulty.</li> <li>• The state may also want to consider including details related to the range of difficulty and/or DOK represented by the items contained in the test blueprints.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A statement of the full range of purposes and/or intended uses for the assessments (e.g., any formally adopted goals, such as those from the Task Force or from legislation) needs to be provided.</li> <li>• Operational definitions of key terms used throughout the submission (e.g., reasonably reliable, sufficiently small) necessary to evaluate the technical soundness</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 Oklahoma**

<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>
of the test design and development process.		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>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>Alternate Assessment – AA-AAAS</b>  Oklahoma’s alternate assessments were developed by the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) assessment consortium. Evidence for the assessments was submitted on Oklahoma’s behalf by the State of West Virginia</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Item Writers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Resumes</li> </ul> </li> <li>• ELA: Jim Kroening, Deborah Hamilton, Nandita Dangoria</li> <li>• Math: David Harrison, Robert Hodgman, Richard Sedillo</li> <li>• Science: David Harrison, Veronica Zonick, Paul Richie</li> </ul> <p>Item/stimulus writers and reviewers received sound training on bias, accessibility, and fairness (including incorporation of accessibility tools) and procedures/criteria were followed. Experts for various demographic populations (e.g., Special Education, English Learners) were included in Item Development and Item Review Committees. Oklahoma teachers were trained on bias, sensitivity and depth of knowledge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Bias and Sensitivity Guidelines for all subjects</li> <li>· Oklahoma Item Review Committee Guidelines</li> <li>· Criteria for Evaluating Science Items</li> <li>· Universally Designed Assessment Items</li> <li>· Criteria for Evaluating ELA items</li> <li>· Criteria for Evaluating Math items</li> <li>· ELA &amp; Math IRC Agenda &amp; Training</li> <li>· High School ELA IRC Meeting</li> <li>· Math IRC Item Results</li> <li>· Science Item Review</li> <li>· Science Item Writer Workshop (End-to-End</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate Assessment – AA-AAAS</b>  Evidence of Critical Element 2.2, 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, for the Alternate Science Assessment needs to be submitted by the state.</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b>  The state provides evidence that item writers and reviewers that have expertise in the content area.</p> <p>The item writing process seems sound, but somewhat inconsistent across content areas.</p> <p>The training of the item writers and reviewers varied related to the specification in the blueprint.</p> <p>Based on the evidence submitted, it is not clear that the state has adopted reasonable and technically sound procedures to evaluate the quality of items and select (i.e., approve/reject) items for operational use when flagged for review based on DIF and other factors.</p> <p>The evidence shows that there are few DOK 3 items and no DOK 4 items in the item banks. The state should consider using the current process to develop and select items that encourage the application of higher-order thinking skills.</p> <p>Evidence needs to be provided that shows a process for accepting/rejecting flagged items during item review.</p> <p>Although review and criteria documents were</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 Oklahoma**

<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>
	project information) · Math Data Review · Science Data Review · ELA Data Review	<p>submitted, no evidence was provided for item alignment or for the work flow for the development and selection of items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills. Documentation of the process of development and selection of items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards is needed.</p> <p>Evidence that the previously developed ELA and math items that are being used have been subject to a process that ensures alignment to the current standards needs to be submitted.</p> <p>Technical assistance/best practice notes/comments from one or more peer reviewers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state may want to include provisions to ensure that the item content/formatting is not highly predictable between forms/years. While the state will want the items to align with the adopted standards, if the format of the items is too predictable it can lead to test preparation practices that lead to score inflation (e.g., teaching students about Pythagorean triples could lead students to answer items related to the Pythagorean theorem based only on memorization).</li> <li>• The state should also consider taking proactive steps to prevent and reduce the effects of score inflation. The state may want to consider reviewing items with high pseudo-guessing parameters</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 Oklahoma**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>as a way to identify items that may be particularly susceptible to practices that lead to score inflation (e.g., coaching about item format/contents). Items with large pseudo-guessing parameters (e.g., values that indicate guessing probabilities greater than chance) could share common features that could be guarded against in later iterations of the assessments.</p>
<b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p>___x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of the process of development and selection of items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills, this may also include information about the state’s strategy to ensure item development and selection allows for test designs that are more robust to test preparation strategies that would lead to score inflation.</li> <li>• Evidence needs to be provided for the general assessment that shows a process for accepting/rejecting flagged items during item review.</li> <li>• Evidence of Critical Element 2.2, 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, for the Alternate Science Assessment.</li> <li>• Evidence that the previously developed ELA and math items that are being used have been subject to a process that ensures alignment to the current standards.</li> <li>• Evidence of stakeholder involvement in the development and adoption of alternate academic standards and their application to the selection and development of items for the alternate assessment.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>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>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS:</b>  OSDE_SES provides in-person trainings every fall across the state focusing on test procedures, tasks, and requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attachment 6 - OAAP In-person Training Schedule</li> <li>• Attachment 16 – OAAP Training Ppt 2016-17</li> </ul> <p>This training also provides direction concerning needed technology updates and other required test administration tasks indicated in DLM system to assess students until they have agreed to the security agreement and completed the required tasks and trainings. A schedule for trainings are posted on the OSDE-SES website.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attachment 17 – DLM Test Administration Manual (pg 32)</li> <li>• Attachment 11 – Snapshot of OSDE-SES website (DLM training and resources)</li> </ul> <p>Training schedules, required training reminders, and assessment program updates are emailed to district staff on a regular basis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attachment 7 – OAAP Weekly Update-OAAP Training Requirements (9-6-16)</li> </ul> <p><b>General Assessments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Test Administration Manuals</li> <li>o IEP/504 Accommodations Manual</li> <li>o ELL Accommodations Manual</li> <li>o Vendor Web site link to documents</li> <li>o OSDE Web site link to documents</li> <li>o Test Irregularity</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Process – Districts report any test irregularity to SDE using the test irregularity form. The SDE reviews to determine whether a breach form is necessary or re-administration of the test form will</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments - AA-AAAS:</b>  The evidence provided seems to be missing access to all available accommodations for the EL population.</p> <p>The evidence provided for technology does not include minimum requirements for hardware, software, and bandwidth in sufficient detail.</p> <p>There is not a contingency plan for possible technology challenges during test administration (e.g., the loss of internet connection).</p> <p>There is a question about the security of the test irregularities reporting form.</p> <p><b>General Assessments</b>  The evidence provided seems to be missing access to all available accommodations for the EL population.</p> <p>The evidence provided for technology does not include minimum requirements for hardware, software, and bandwidth in sufficient detail.</p> <p>There is not a contingency plan for possible technology challenges during test administration (e.g., the loss of internet connection).</p> <p>There is a question about the security of the test</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 Oklahoma

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	maintain the fidelity of the test administration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Form</li> <li>• Samples</li> <li>o Parent, Student, and Teacher Guides (PSTGs)</li> <li>· Training                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o State District Test Coordinator Training</li> <li>o Test Administrator Training</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Test Administrator Quiz</li> <li>• Training Modules Webpage</li> <li>o Test Proctor Training</li> <li>• Test Proctor Quiz</li> <li>• Training Modules Webpage</li> <li>o Test Preparation Manual (DTC Responsibilities for training)</li> <li>o Test Administrator/Test Proctor Security Forms</li> <li>· Technology-based assessments                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Technology Guide</li> <li>o Test Preparation Manual</li> <li>o Contingency Plan</li> <li>o Screenshot of Online Practice Tests accessible to the public</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	irregularities reporting form.  Technical assistance/best practice notes/comments from one or more peer reviewers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state may want to consider evaluating whether or not administrations split over two days are comparable to administrations that start and end within the span of a single school day.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b>		
__X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for the test administration should include:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A clear definition of the minimum requirements for hardware (e.g., amount and speed of wired and available RAM, screen resolution requirements), software (e.g., minimum version requirements that specify major, minor, and/or patch release versions), and bandwidth per student in sufficient detail needs to be provided.</li> <li>• A contingency plan for possible technology challenges during test administration (e.g., the loss of internet connection, loss of packets during transmission, verification of transmitted packets, data corruption).</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 Oklahoma**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p align="center"><b>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>Academic Assessment Monitoring Program (AAMP)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> OAC Section 210:10-13-21</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> AAMP Brief Description</li> <li>o AAMP FAQ</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> AAMP Web site</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Desk Monitoring Checklist</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> AAMP 16-17 Monitoring List</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> On-site Monitoring Checklist</li> <li>o Onsite Monitoring Guidelines</li> <li>o AAMP Presentation</li> <li>o AAMP Onsite Calendar 2017</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> AAMP Summary Results</li> <li>o Detail of AAMP Results</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Evidence used for onsite monitoring/additional desk monitoring</li> <li>o Person Fit Analyses Results</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> HS</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> 3-8</li> <li>o Scale Score Change Analyses Results</li> <li>o Accountability High Delta Change</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Samples of monitoring. These files contain: A letter of notice for monitoring, a monitoring checklist completed by SDE, supporting documents submitted by the district, and a letter of monitoring results.</li> <li>o Sayre (onsite and desk compliant)</li> <li>o Tulsa Central (onsite non-compliant)</li> <li>o Owasso 6th Grade Center (desk non-compliant)</li> </ul>	<p>State statute mandates that all public school districts will be monitored at least once during the five (5) year cycle. School districts are scheduled for monitoring using a random selection process. Of the districts to be monitored within a particular year, five (5) percent are randomly selected for site monitoring. The remaining ninety-five (95) percent are monitored using a desk monitoring procedure.</p> <p>Additional school districts may receive a special desk or on-site monitoring and compliance review based on any of the following criteria:</p> <p>(A) Observed statistical irregularities or discrepancies with student assessment data (e.g., statistical improbable growth in the percentage of student scoring proficient, questionable erasure analysis, and/or unusual change in student demographics);</p> <p>(B) An established pattern of testing violations or irregularities as reported to the OSDE (e.g., vendor reports, invalidations, improper test administration, failure to attend or conduct yearly training);</p> <p>(C) Documented concerns (e.g., parent and community, noncompliance issues from prior years, other technical assistance requests), and/or;</p> <p>(D) Testing irregularities discovered through previous annual random monitoring.</p> <p>ample evidence of implementation of monitoring program.</p>
<b>Section 2.4 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 Oklahoma

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

<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 style="text-align: center;"><b>2.5 – Test Security</b></p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS:</b>                      The Oklahoma State Department of Education – Special Education Services (OSDE-SES) provides in-person trainings every fall across the state focusing on testing procedures, test security, and other requirements.                      · Attachment 16 - OAAP Training 2016-17.                      · Attachment 27 – DLM Security Agreement. The OSDE monitors school districts for implementation of the required testing procedures.                      · Attachment 4- Oklahoma Administrative Code (OAC)- Section 21010-13-21-Academic Assessment Monitoring Program (AAMP).                      In addition, investigations regarding any alleged or factual test irregularities are performed by OSDE staff.</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b>                      Maintaining test security is critical to the success of the OSTP. The 2016–17 OSTP Test Administrator Manual &amp; Test Preparation Manual explains in detail all test security measures and test administration procedures. The SDE takes the matter of test security very seriously and has implemented stringent procedures to protect the security of the OSTP.                      Each district test coordinator, building test coordinator, test administrator, and test proctor is responsible for all secure test materials received and for returning all secure test materials (see Section 210:10-13-4 of the Oklahoma Administrative Code).                      Violation of regulations may result in revocation of a person’s teaching, counseling, administrative, and/or other certificates. The tests, and all the materials associated with these tests, are secure materials. It is important to prevent an opportunity for any student</p>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments - AA-AAAS:</b>                      The test security evidence is missing adequate irregularity detection techniques for technology-based assessments (e.g., time stamping of responses, response changes, use of seating charts), unless provided by the DLM consortium.</p> <p>While the state provided a test irregularity form, the state should provide evidence that the information contained in the form is appropriately secure.</p> <p>Evidence of test prep guidelines and administration procedures vis-à-vis the prevention of assessment irregularities and maintaining the security of test materials for the alternate assessments need to be provided, unless provided by the DLM consortium.</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b>                      The test security evidence is missing adequate irregularity detection techniques for technology-based assessments (e.g., time stamping, response changes, use of seating charts).</p> <p>While the state provided a test irregularity form, the state should provide evidence that the information contained in the form is appropriately secured.</p> <p>Evidence of the process for ensuring that there is proper disposal of paper materials (i.e., scratch paper) should be included in the onsite checklist for test administration.</p> <p>Evidence that the amount of space reserved by AAMP per year is sufficient for monitoring/investigating and that a contingency plan</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 Oklahoma**

<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>to have access to the tests and thus have an advantage over other students before the administration of the tests. Prior exposure to the tests or individual items would invalidate scores. The materials associated with these tests may not be photographed, photocopied, or reproduced in any other fashion, including paraphrasing—to do so is in violation of copyright law. All test items have been copyrighted by the SDE. In addition, students are not permitted to have cell phones on their person during testing, to help prevent them from taking pictures of items.</p> <p>The 2016–17 OSTP Test Administration Manual describes in detail the policy and procedures for nondisclosure of test content, securing test materials, use of proctors, use of security forms, test administrator responsibilities, and reporting test irregularities. The SDE also conducts site visits during test administration to assure compliance to policies. Materials were inventoried when returned to Measured Progress at the end of the test administration. A materials discrepancy report was provided after all secure materials were scanned. Measured Progress used this report to contact District Test Coordinators (DTCs) whose schools appeared on the list to have them conduct a search for any missing materials to ensure they were returned. Measured Progress also conducted a physical box search on site at their facilities to search for materials. For the materials found by the DTC, Measured Progress arranged for the return of the materials. If materials were not located by Measured Progress or the DTC, a spreadsheet was maintained to document the missing materials.</p> <p>AAMP retention policy &amp; Test Security Procedures Please see one tool used for detecting test irregularities:</p>	<p>is in place in the event that space is insufficient was not submitted.</p> <p>Evidence that administration procedures address the prevention of assessment irregularities and maintain the security of test materials for the general assessments need to be provided.</p> <p>Evidence of the final report from the State Auditor’s Office, which may include further evidence of prevention, detection, remediation, and investigation, needs to be submitted when available (expected spring 2018) and that the state has a plan to address any deficiencies.</p> <p>Evidence of how the state has addressed testing irregularities and security issues is needed (i.e., remediation)</p> <p>Evidence that there is a documented policy and procedure for districts and schools to address secure test administration challenges related to hardware, software, internet conductivity and internet access is needed.</p> <p>Technical assistance/best practice notes/comments from one or more peer reviewers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State should consider the development and adoption of standardized guidance for test preparation practices that will not be likely to affect the validity of the results. This guidance could include information that school and district leaders could use to identify practices that are likely to lead to score inflation (e.g., between/within subject area reallocation of instructional time,</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 Oklahoma**

<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>· Aberrant Response Pattern Analysis The State Auditor’s Office recently conducted an audit on our state test security policies, procedures and practices. The final report will be provided in late Spring 2018.</p>	<p>coaching).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The integrity of the results can be severely compromised if they reflect test preparation practices that inflate scores instead of reflecting actual comprehension and mastery of content standards. Helping local education professionals monitor and avoid test preparation practices that undermine the integrity of the test results is a low cost way to strengthen the assessment system overall.</li> <li>• The state may also want to consider evaluating the accuracy of the current practices/procedures for detecting abnormal score gains/accountability system gains in terms of the number of false positives/false negatives that are generated.</li> <li>• Detection related to changes in the accountability system results for schools (e.g., letter grade changes) may be driven by compositional effects and/or the volatility of the student population between grades and/or between schools/districts. Evaluating the sensitivity of the current practices, based on compositional effects, could be a way of fine-tuning the current processes to yield fewer false positives.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that administration procedures are in place to address the prevention of assessments irregularities and maintain the security of the general assessment.</li> <li>• Evidence that prevention, detection, remediation, and investigation policies and procedures are implemented (e.g. state auditor’s office report, expected spring 2018).</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 Oklahoma

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>• Evidence of a plan for irregularity detection techniques in technology-based assessments (e.g., time stamping, response changes, use of seating charts).</li> <li>• Evidence of how testing irregularities and security incidents are addressed (i.e., remediation).</li> <li>• Evidence of test prep guidelines and administration procedures that ensure the integrity of test results need to be provided (e.g., test preparation that does not lead to score inflation, proper room/area preparations prior to and during testing, restrictions on electronic devices during testing).</li> <li>• Evidence that there is a documented policy and procedure for districts and schools to address secure test administration challenges related to hardware, software, internet conductivity and internet access is needed.</li> </ul>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

<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>2.6 – 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>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b>            See submission evidence, including state law regarding data privacy, for Oklahoma’s general assessments detailing internal OSDE practices for all assessment data. In addition to internal OSDE practices for OSDE staff, school districts have the ability to access student demographic data and scores through the DLM system if they have been allowed access from their school district. The OSDE grants access to one individual at each school district who then determines who else within their district should have access to the DLM system. Data released by OSDE to KUCR is limited to data points specifically listed in the contractual agreement between KUCR and OSDE. If KUCR determines a need to receive or access additional student data/information, KUCR must submit a written request to OSDE detailing the information needed including the purpose of the disclosure. This is evidenced in Attachment 10 - Education Record Release and Data Sharing Agreement</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b>            SDE &amp; Assessment Vendor: All secure testing materials will be shared only through a secure file transfer protocol (SFTP). All secure paper materials are confined in locked filing cabinets and behind a locked door only accessible by the Executive Director of State Assessments, Assistant Executive Director of State Assessment, and Assessment Specialists. Evidence of policies and procedures to protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting are provided in the pieces of evidence below. In addition to internal OSDE practices for OSDE staff, school districts have the ability to access student demographic data and scores through the OSTP Portal if they have</p>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b>            There is some concern about the minimum cell size (ten) used for reporting of results and its vulnerability in terms of the possibly of identifying individual PII, especially when combined with data that is not protected under FERPA.</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b>            There is some concern about the minimum cell size (ten) used for reporting of results and its vulnerability in terms of the possibly of identifying individual PII, especially when combined with data that is not protected under FERPA (e.g., student rosters) and/or other publicly available data sources (e.g., common core of data public school universe).</p> <p>Technical assistance/best practice notes/comments from one or more peer reviewers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State may want to consider including additional details regarding the approved technologies for data transfer, encryption, and authentication. Some versions of the SFTP</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 Oklahoma**

<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>been allowed access from their school district. The OSDE grants access to one individual at each school district who then determines who else within their district should have access to the OSTP Portal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Assessment Contract Security Protocols, Rules, Procedures</li> <li>· FERPA Screenshot from OSTP Portal</li> <li>· State Law regarding data privacy</li> <li>· State Rules specific to student data accessibility</li> </ul> <p>Defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for a student group, complementary suppression, and other pertinent rules are contained in the following memo:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· OSTP Data Memo</li> </ul>	<p>protocol have known severe security vulnerabilities and that the authentication methods used with SFTP may not provide the most secure manner to establish a connection to a secure host for the transfer of data. Similarly, some encryption technologies/algorithms (e.g., SHA-1) may not be suitable to protect the contents of the data during transfer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It may also be useful to provide more explicit evidence regarding procedures for monitoring and maintaining chain-of-custody for hard copy materials and/or other securable materials in the guidance provided to schools and districts.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 2.6 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 Oklahoma

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

<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 style="text-align: center;"><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> <li>• If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b>                      Oklahoma’s alternate assessments were developed by the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) assessment consortium. Evidence for the assessments was submitted on Oklahoma’s behalf by the State of West Virginia</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Evidence of overall assessment validity is found in the following chapters of the 2017 Technical Report from Measured Progress.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Chapter 3 - Test Design and Development</li> <li>o Chapter 10 – Validity</li> </ul> </li> <li>· Evidence of Validity Based on Content and evidence of alignments of assessments and Oklahoma Academic Standards (OAS) in Mathematics, English Language Arts, and Science can be found in the Assessment blueprints—See Appendix C                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Math 3-8 &amp; 10</li> <li>o ELA 3-8 &amp; 10</li> <li>o Science 5, 8 &amp; 10</li> </ul> </li> <li>· Further Evidence of Alignment to state standards are found in the HumRRO Independent Alignment OSTP Report. The review utilized the Webb 2005 alignment model and analyzed the following indicators: categorical concurrence, range-of knowledge correspondence, balance of knowledge representation, and depth-of knowledge consistency. Indicators used for alignment include: the range-of-knowledge indicator that analyzes specific content expectations assessed within each content strand and categorical concurrence that evaluates the extent to which assessment items cover the Oklahoma Academic Standards. Evaluation was based on the Webb recommendation of 6 items and at least 50% of the content expectations per strand. Alignment results for each subject area can be found where</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b>                      The State needs to provide evidence that the science alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match in science, including the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b>                      To address the concern that the assessment measures the full range of the State’s ELA, math, and science academic content standards and has a balance of content and cognitive complexity, the state needs to provide evidence of how the state has addressed shortcomings highlighted by the alignment study.</p> <p>Evidence that the ELA and math items that were previously developed and are being used have been subject to a process that ensures alignment to the current standards and assessments needs to be submitted.</p> <p>Evidence that the standards in place will facilitate student college and career readiness and that the assessments measure this is needed.</p> <p>Evidence that the dimensionality requirements of the test blueprints are supported 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 Oklahoma**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>indicated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o ELA Webb Alignment Results-               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ Categorical Concurrence</li> <li>§ Range-of-knowledge (Please note only Reading/ELA standards 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 are assessed to meet ESSA requirements.)</li> <li>§ Summary &amp; Discussion of Results</li> </ul> </li> <li>o Math Webb Alignment Results-               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ Categorical Concurrence</li> <li>§ Range-of-knowledge</li> <li>§ Summary &amp; Discussion of Results</li> </ul> </li> <li>o Science Webb Alignment Results               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ Categorical Concurrence</li> <li>§ Range-of-knowledge</li> <li>§ Summary &amp; Discussion of Results</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The cumulative results provide validity evidence to support that the content of OSTP ELA, mathematics, and science test items match the intended content as specified in the standards, however; both science and ELA showed gaps or weaknesses as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o ELA Gaps: Grades 3-6 and 10 fell below the categorical concurrence criterion for both the Language and Research standards. There were also grades and forms that did not meet the DOK criterion for particular standards.</li> </ul> <p><b>Remedy and TimeLine:</b> To address these gaps OSDE will review, evaluate, and revise current item bank items in addition to item writing and development sessions planned for March 2018. Flagged standards will take priority during this process. Items developed will be field tested during 2018-19.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <b>Science Gaps:</b> All of the grade levels exhibited partial to weak alignment on the DOK consistency criterion as many of the science performance expectations targeted higher cognitive complexity</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 Oklahoma**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>levels than the items used to assess them on a number of reporting categories.</p> <p>§ <b>Remedy and Timeline:</b></p> <p>ü To address this concern, OSDE is collaborating with other states and Achieve (who share the same concern) to develop a new evaluation framework that better measures cognitive complexity of 3 dimensional science standards based on A Framework for K-12 Science Education: Practices, Crosscutting Concepts, and Core Ideas. National Academy of Sciences, 2012; National Research Council. HumRRO is also working with Achieve to revise their methodology. A new set of evaluation criteria (under creation) will be used to inform a new independent alignment study with the University of Wisconsin, the results of which will be available in late 2018.</p>	
<b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the science alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards shows adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match in science, including the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities</li> <li>• Evidence that the assessments measure the full range of the State’s ELA, math, and science academic content standards and have a balance of content and cognitive complexity, to include, but not limited how the state has addressed shortcomings highlighted by the alignment study.</li> <li>• Evidence that the dimensionality requirements noted in the test blueprints are empirically confirmed.</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 Oklahoma**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS: State Submitted Evidence – AA-AAAS</b>                      Oklahoma’s alternate assessments were developed by the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) assessment consortium. Evidence for the assessments was submitted on Oklahoma’s behalf by the State of West Virginia</p> <p><b>General Assessments: State Submitted Evidence</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Evidence that assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the OAS is found in the 2017 Technical Report from Measured Progress.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Chapter 3 - Test Design and Development</li> <li>o Science Cognitive Lab Study</li> <li>o The SDE in conjunction with Measured Progress plans to conduct cognitive labs on both ELA &amp; Math items similar to the cognitive labs conducted for science items.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>§ See pp. excerpt from the Measured Progress Technical Proposal/assessment contract.</p>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS:</b>                      Evidence that the assessments for ELA, math and science tap the intended cognitive processes for each grade level of the OK content standards, unless provided by DLM, is needed.</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b>                      Although the Global Cognitive Lab Debrief Summary is provided, specific evidence reflecting cognitive processes for science needs to be provided (e.g., results from the cognitive lab).</p> <p>The results from the proposed ELA &amp; Math cognitive labs need to be submitted when available.</p> <p>Technical assistance/best practice notes/comments from one or more peer reviewers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This aspect of validity is particularly susceptible to test preparation practices that are likely to result in score inflation (e.g., coaching about features of the test design). It may be useful for the state to request its’ research/assessment partners help the State address this issue.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific evidence that the general and alternate (See note in comments box.) assessments for ELA, math and science assessments tap the intended cognitive processes, appropriate to each grade level.</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 Oklahoma**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>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>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS:</b>                      Oklahoma’s alternate assessments were developed by the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) assessment consortium. Evidence for the assessments was submitted on Oklahoma’s behalf by the State of West Virginia</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Evidence that scoring and reporting are consistent with the subdomain structures of the OAS                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o OSTP Technical Report Section 6.2 DIF &amp; 6.3 Dimensionality Analysis</li> <li>o OSTP Technical Report Section 8.3 provides information about Subcategory Reliability</li> <li>o Appendix J – DIF Results shows the extent to which the interrelationships among sub scores are consistent with the State’s academic content standards for relevant student groups.</li> <li>o Appendix P – Classical Reliability provides further information about the performance of difference groups of students on the assessments.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS:</b>                      Evidence that the assessments for ELA, math and science reflect the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments, consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based, unless provided by DLM, is needed.</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b>                      There is a concern that reports of analyses that show the dimensionality of the assessment is inconsistent with the structure of the State’s academic content standards, the intended interpretations of results, and the test blueprints.</p> <p>Evidence of a plan to verify that the State’s standards and assessments measure the knowledge and skills that facilitate student college and career readiness needs to be provided.</p> <p>The evidence provided doesn’t support that the scoring and reporting structures of the state’s 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>It is not apparent, based on the evidence submitted, that the process for approving or rejecting items, based on DIF and other factors, is standardized. There needs to be evidence of a process.</p> <p>The state should provide evidence that the appropriate set of items were used to evaluate the internal structure of the test. For example, if only the “common items” were used to evaluate</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 Oklahoma**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>the internal structure of the test it is possible that other operational items measured content that is outside of the specifications noted in the test blueprints.</p> <p>Technical assistance/best practice notes/comments from one or more peer reviewers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the test blueprints require the use of testlets (i.e., clusters of related items), the calibration of the items should reflect the multidimensional nature of these items. If the evaluation of dimensionality does not support a multidimensional test construction it is unclear whether the forms were constructed to specification or if the dimensionality testing procedures are not sensitive enough to detect these multidimensional structures.</li> <li>• Throughout the technical manual there are cases where there are references to using only the “common items.” If only the anchor items (i.e., items that are common across forms) are used, the information in the test manuals would be based on less than half of the operational items in use.</li> <li>• The structure of the items used in some of the tests also provides additional means by which educators can coach students on construct irrelevant features of the test that would lead to inflated scores. For example, because testlets violate the conditional independence assumption, it is possible that there are instances where students can be coached how to use an answer they determine to be correct to select the correct responses to the other items in the testlet without having sufficient proficiency in the</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		content to answer the item correctly otherwise.
<b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the alternate assessments for ELA, math and science reflect the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments, consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based, unless provided by DLM.</li> <li>• Evidence that the dimensionality requirements of the general assessment ELA and science test blueprints and the dimensionality analysis are consistent (e.g., if the blueprint contains requirements for multidimensionality this should be observed/modeled in the empirical analyses of the data).               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that supports the scoring and reporting structures of the state’s assessments consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</li> </ul> </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 Oklahoma

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>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>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS:</b> Oklahoma’s alternate assessments were developed by the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) assessment consortium. Evidence for the assessments was submitted on Oklahoma’s behalf by the State of West Virginia</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b> · The following reports and studies demonstrate positive correlations between external measures: o Standard Setting Report describes the standard setting process to ensure participants examined the ACT Benchmarks (Grade 10 assessments) and NAEP benchmarks (Grade 4 &amp; 8). o ACT Linking Study for Grade 10 Math/ELA provides a comparison between ACT scores and OSTP grade 10 composite scores. o Lexile Linking Study Grades 3-8 &amp; 10 ELA &amp; Lexile Range Table o Quantile Linking Study Grades 3-8 &amp; 10 &amp; Quantile Range Table In addition, AIR is currently conducting an alignment study between NAEP and Oklahoma’s learning goals. The empirical work by the NAEP Validity Studies Panel will provide evidence of the similarities and differences between NAEP and the OSTP for future release.</p>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS:</b> The state should provide validity evidence that the scores on the alternate assessment for ELA, math, and science are related as expected with other variables, unless it is already been provided by DLM.</p> <p>Evidence that the alternate assessment scores are related as expected to post-secondary success.</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b> Evidence needs to be provided that the standards in place will facilitate student college and career readiness and that the assessments measure this.</p> <p>The state should request that all assessment vendors include information about the amount of measurement error in the linking study – consistent with guidance from the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing - in order to communicate to districts ways in which to appropriately use this comparative information.</p> <p>The state should provide validity evidence that scores on the general state assessments in ELA, math and science are related as expected to other variables such as district benchmark assessments, course grades, performance on IB or AP courses, post-secondary course placement and success.</p> <p>Technical assistance/best practice notes/comments from one or more peer reviewers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It may be useful for the state to make a distinction between a linking study, which attempts to estimate a concordance between two scales, and expected relationships</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 Oklahoma**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>between test scores and other variables (e.g., polyserial correlations, predictive relationships, polychoric correlations between performance levels on multiple measures). For example, based on the linking study from ACT, how many cases of true/false positives/negatives are observed in subsequent administrations of the high school assessments (e.g., does the linking have good out-of-sample properties).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the State’s SLDS grantee has incorporated labor/workforce data into the system it may also be useful to look at the relationship between the high school assessments and earnings, full time employment, duration of employment, and/or other career ready indicators described in some of the supporting evidence provided by the state.</li> <li>• If the assessments are providing inflated results, we would expect to see a non-trivial difference in the slopes between the state assessments and external measures. For example, if the state assessments show score gains of 0.75 SD year over year but external measures show score gains of 0.15 SD year over year, it could indicate score inflation in the state’s assessment program and would require additional investigation/analysis/research.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Validity evidence that scores on the general state assessments in ELA, math and science are related as expected to other variables such as district benchmark assessments, course grades, performance on IB or AP courses, or post-secondary course placement and success.</li> <li>• The state should provide validity evidence that the scores on the alternate assessment for ELA, math, and science are related as expected with other variables, unless it is already been provided by DLM.</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 Oklahoma

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>• Evidence that the general assessment scores are related as expected to college and career readiness.</li> <li>• Evidence that the alternate assessment scores are related as expected to post-secondary success.</li> <li>• Evidence that the state’s assessments support inferences about score and proficiency gains consistent with external measures (e.g., not highly susceptible to score inflation, support consistent inferences across the external measures) as it becomes available.</li> </ul>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

<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 style="text-align: center;"><b>4.1 – Reliability</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and 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>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b> Oklahoma’s alternate assessments were developed by the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) assessment consortium. Evidence for the assessments was submitted on Oklahoma’s behalf by the State of West Virginia</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b> The following reliability evidence collectively addresses the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· OSTP scores have an adequate level of reliability for the State’s population, both overall and for accountability subgroups.</li> <li>· OSTP scores have sufficiently small conditional standard errors of measurement, both overall and for accountability subgroups.</li> <li>· OSTP proficiency level classifications are adequately consistent and accurate, both overall and for accountability subgroups.</li> </ul> <p><b>See Chapter 8 of OSTP Technical Report– Reliability</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· See Section 8.1: Reliability and Standard Errors of Measurement</li> <li>· See Section 8.2: Subgroup Reliability</li> <li>· See Section 8.3: Subcategory Reliability</li> <li>· See Section 8.4: Reliability of Achievement Level Categorization <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o See Section 8.4.1: Accuracy and Consistency</li> </ul> </li> <li>· Appendix K – IRT Parameters</li> <li>· Appendix P – Classical Reliability</li> <li>· Appendix Q – DAC Results</li> </ul> <p><b>Oklahoma does not utilize computer-adaptive tests.</b></p>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b> Evidence for the alternate science assessment that meets this Critical Element is required.</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b> Peers have serious concerns about the performance level classifications based upon the evidence submitted (see results in table 8-1 2016-17 OSTP: Summary of Decision Accuracy (and Consistency) Results by Content Area and Grade – Overall and Conditional on Achievement Level). For example, the accuracy of consistently classifying an 8<sup>th</sup> grade student as proficient in math is 47%.</p> <p>Evidence of a level of reliability consistent with best practices and TAC review, recommendations, and approval should be submitted.</p> <p>The performance level descriptors being used in the reliability evidence (see Table Q-1 2016-17 OSTP: Summary of Decision Accuracy (and Consistency) Results by Content Area and Grade – Conditional on Cutpoint) are not the labels that have been adopted by the State (i.e., Substantially Below Proficient, Partially Proficient, Proficient, and Proficient with Distinction) and this raises concerns about accuracy and applicability of the results.</p> <p>The state should provide evidence from the assessment vendor that the appropriate set of items were used to estimate the reliabilities reported in section 8.3. of the technical manual. For example, if only the “common items” were used to estimate the reliabilities the vendor</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 Oklahoma**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		would have to assume that all of the other items that are unique to a specific form would not affect the reliability of the assessment.
<b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a level of reliability consistent with best practices and TAC review, recommendations, and approval, including whole test/form reliabilities.</li> <li>• Evidence that reflects the performance level labels adopted by the state and Oklahoma data consistent with the labels were used to estimate reliability.</li> <li>• Evidence for the alternate science assessment that meets this Critical Element is required.</li> <li>• Evidence that the appropriate set of items were used to estimate the reliabilities provided in the submitted evidence.</li> <li>• See request under Critical Element 2.1 related to operational definitions of key terms.</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 Oklahoma**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</b></p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b>                      Oklahoma’s alternate assessments were developed by the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) assessment consortium. Evidence for the assessments was submitted on Oklahoma’s behalf by the State of West Virginia</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b>                      Item/stimulus writers and reviewers received sound training on bias, accessibility, and fairness (including incorporation of accessibility tools) and procedures/criteria were followed. Experts for various demographic populations (e.g., Special Education, English Learners) were included in Item Development and Item Review Committees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Bias and Sensitivity Guidelines for all subjects</li> <li>· Oklahoma Item Review Committee Guidelines</li> <li>· Criteria for Evaluating Science Items</li> <li>· Universally Designed Assessment Items</li> <li>· Criteria for Evaluating ELA items</li> <li>· Criteria for Evaluating Math items</li> <li>· ELA &amp; Math IRC Agenda &amp; Training</li> <li>· High School ELA IRC Meeting</li> <li>· Math IRC Item Results</li> <li>· Science Item Review</li> <li>· Science Item Writer Workshop (End-to-End project information)</li> <li>· Math Data Review</li> <li>· Science Data Review</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> ELA Data Review</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b>                      Evidence for the alternate science assessment that meets this Critical Element is required.</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b>                      Based on the evidence submitted, it is not clear what steps the state has taken to make decisions to approve/reject the use of items based on the results of empirical analyses (e.g., DIF and differential test functioning (DTF) analyses) to reduce inconsistent interpretations and bias.</p> <p>The state needs to include results of the state DIF item analyses as evidence for this critical element.</p> <p>The state should provide evidence describing the approaches used in the design and development of its assessments such as the methods the assessment vendor uses to test compliance with the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) and processes used by the assessment vendor to select colors used in the presentation of items that provide sufficient differentiation to individuals with protanopia, deuteranopia, and tritanopia (red, green, and blue color sight impairments, respectively). This evidence is a documentation of the procedures used to maximize accessibility of items.</p> <p>Technical assistance/best practice notes/comments from one or more peer reviewers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Based on the evidence provided, the algorithms used to evaluate differential item functioning (DIF) rely on a strong assumption of unidimensionality. If the</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>test items were constructed to satisfy the multidimensional requirements outlined in the test blueprints it is unclear whether or not these DIF estimates would be sufficient to detect DIF across all of the applicable dimensions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not clear how item review committee members are trained to evaluate DIF in multidimensional space (e.g., if there is DIF along one dimension but not the second dimension how should the committee members evaluate the results).</li> <li>• It may be useful for the state to document the multidimensional DIF processes that are used for others who are unfamiliar with multidimensional DIF.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of the procedures used to maximize accessibility of items, including results from accessibility testing.</li> <li>• The state needs to include results of the state DIF and DTF analyses as evidence for this critical element, including decision rules for addressing items flagged as potentially biased.</li> <li>• Evidence for the alternate science assessment that meets this Critical Element is required.</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 Oklahoma**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>4.3 – 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>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b>                      Oklahoma’s alternate assessments were developed by the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) assessment consortium. Evidence for the assessments was submitted on Oklahoma’s behalf by the State of West Virginia</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b>                      Please see the following evidence that shows test scores are adequately precise across the entire performance continuum (including the extremes). See Chapter 7 - Item Response Theory Scaling and Equating                      See Section 7.1 – IRT                      See Section 7.2 – IRT Results                      See Section 7.5 – Achievement Standards                      See Section 7.6 – Scaled Scores                      See Appendix L – Test Characteristic Curves and Test Information Functions                      See Appendix M – Raw to Scaled Score Look-up Tables                      Section 7.6 – Scaled Scores Appendix L – Test Characteristic Curves and Test Information Functions Appendix M – Raw to Scaled Score Look-up Tables Evidence for DLM submitted by West Virginia on Oklahoma’s behalf</p>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b>                      Evidence for the alternate science assessment that meets this Critical Element is required.</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b>                      Peers expressed concerns that the distribution of item difficulties demonstrates adequate coverage of the full performance continuum. For example, for ELA tests in grades 3-8 more than half of the items have difficulties &lt; 0 (e.g., for students of average skill/ability the items would be easier than optimal to yield the most information about the test taker).</p> <p>Peers raised concerns that the test information functions provided in the evidence show inconsistent coverage between grade-levels across the full performance continuum. For example, the ELA and Math assessments appear to focus on distinctly different areas of the performance continuum between the grade level (lower end of the performance continuum) and end of course/instruction exams (higher end of the performance continuum).</p> <p>It appears there is a need for increased precision of estimates of student performances across the full performance continuum that accurately reflect student proficiency (e.g., conditional standard of error measurements).</p> <p>Technical assistance/best practice notes/comments</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 Oklahoma**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>from one or more peer reviewers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the 3PL model is the most appropriate for the state’s assessment, the state may want to consider investigating whether or not constraining the pseudo-guessing parameter to be equal across items (while still estimated) or constraining the pseudo-guessing parameter to a value <i>a priori</i> (e.g., 0.25 or 0.2) would yield a better fitting model which could increase the precision of the measurement across the performance continuum.</li> <li>• Additionally, as the value of the pseudo-guessing parameter increases, the amount of information provided by an item response decreases. This would affect the reliability of the assessment and could eventually lead to increasing the length of the assessment over time.</li> <li>• The test information functions provided by the state include several cases of multi-modal distributions, systematic differences in test information across forms, and significant shifts in the location parameter of the TIF from the grade level to the high school level assessments.</li> <li>• The distribution of the difficulty parameters across grade levels and content areas indicates sampling of items with difficulty parameters &lt; 0 to</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 Oklahoma**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>be disproportionate in some grades/subject areas. Conversely, the science assessments disproportionately sample items with difficulties &gt; 0.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Including requirements for items that span a broader range of difficulty in the test blueprints and/or increasing the length of the test by a small amount may help to provide the additional information needed to improve the precision of the estimates.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of an updated test design (e.g., blueprints) that include requirements to adequately cover the full performance continuum.</li> <li>• Evidence of updated data assessment analysis (e.g., TIF) that shows adequate coverage of the full performance continuum.</li> <li>• Evidence for the alternate science assessment that meets this Critical Element is required.</li> <li>• See request under Critical Element 2.1 for operational definitions used by the State (e.g., “sufficiently small” standard errors, “adequately precise” estimates)</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 Oklahoma**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b>                      Oklahoma’s alternate assessments were developed by the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) assessment consortium. Evidence for the assessments was submitted on Oklahoma’s behalf by the State of West Virginia</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b>                      The following documentation provides evidence that for both human scoring (Grade 5, 8, &amp; 10 ELA) and machine scoring procedures are clearly documented and followed and validity evidence to support the intended use and interpretation of scores. In addition, procedures and criteria for evaluating inter-rater reliability are well documented for human scored items, including the anchor sets, a QC summary, and Human Scoring Specifications.                      See Chapter 5 - Scoring of 2016-17 OSTP Technical Report                      Section 8.4 Reliability of Achievement Level Categorization                      Appendix H – Interrater Agreement                      OSTP Decision Rules                      OSTP Human Scoring Specs 2017                      Oklahoma QC Summary                      · OK Grade 5 Anchor Scorer                      · OK Grade 5 Anchor Supervisor                      · OK Grade 5 Practice Scorer                      · OK Grade 8 Anchor Scorer                      · OK Grade 8 Anchor Supervisor                      · OK Grade 8 Practice Scorer                      · OK Grade 10 Anchor Scorer                      · OK Grade 10 Anchor Supervisor                      · OK Grade 10 Practice Scorer                      Please see the rules and procedures for requesting test invalidations, handling testing irregularities, emergency exemptions, etc.:</p>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b>                      Evidence for the alternate science assessment that meets this Critical Element is required.</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b>                      The state should provide evidence that describes the process the assessment vendor used to evaluate whether the adopted item calibration model (3PL) would produce reliable results and facilitate valid score interpretations based on the results from the administration of the test to Oklahoma’s student population. For example, did the State test whether or not a Rasch, 1PL, 2PL, 4PL, or test whether models that include explicit modeling of multidimensional items and/or testlets led to a better data-model-fit compared to the 3PL model.</p> <p>The peers raised concerns that item parameters reported in appendix K of the OSTP technical report could indicate that the item calibration models may not have truly converged. The state should provide evidence from the assessment vendor that defines the procedures and protocols they use to determine whether the item calibration model converged on global or local maxima, maintain stability of parameters estimated along the boundary of the solution space, and monitor/adjust the convergence</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 Oklahoma**

<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>· Breach Info found in Test Preparation Manual</li> <li>· Procedures &amp; Training for Breach Tests &amp; Irregularities</li> </ul> <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. Please see the following evidence that shows test scores are adequately precise across the entire performance continuum (including the extremes). See Chapter 7 - Item Response Theory Scaling and Equating</p> <p>See Section 7.1 – IRT            See Section 7.2 – IRT Results            See Section 7.5 – Achievement Standards            See Section 7.6 – Scaled Scores            See Appendix L – Test Characteristic Curves and Test Information Functions            See Appendix M – Raw to Scaled Score Look-up Tables</p>	<p>criterion specified in the software used for item calibration and estimation of student’s ability that facilitate valid score interpretations and report reliable results.</p> <p>The state should also request evidence from the assessment vendor describing the rationale of the assessment vendors procedure to use the graded response model (p 869 of section 4 pdf) instead of adopting the recommendation from the TAC (p 1381 of section 4 pdf) to use the partial credit model to calibrate polytomous items and describe to the state what implications their decision has on the reliability of results and facilitating valid score interpretation. This could be an example of where a decision making process could have been used.</p> <p>The state should provide evidence from the assessment vendor describing the methods used to estimate inter-rater reliabilities and to define the rationale for selecting that method instead of using other methods for human scoring (e.g., many facet Rasch models).</p> <p>The assessment vendor must provide evidence to the state that all of the accepted operational items administered to a student were used to compute their raw score (see page 957 of the section 4 pdf for additional information).</p> <p>The assessment vendor must provide evidence to the state for its rationale to deviate from the decision rules on page 957 of the section 4 pdf</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 Oklahoma**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>that would be necessary to compute the tables provided in appendix M of the technical documentation. For example, if only the common items were used to compute raw scores (defined on page 957), individual forms only contain 50 items total, and there are only 18-20 anchor items (items common across the forms), how could the assessment vendor compute a raw score of 50 while still implementing the decision rules?</p> <p>The State should ensure that the definition of a scaled score listed in the test blueprints for ELA and Math is consistent with the requirement to report results in terms of academic achievement standards that facilitate valid score interpretations. For example, the definition contained in the test blueprints “The student’s raw score is converted to a scaled score using the number correct scoring method” is describing a method that is used to compute a raw score and would be inconsistent with the process used by the testing vendor for standard setting (e.g., setting thresholds for performance levels based on estimates of theta).</p> <p>Technical assistance/best practice notes/comments from one or more peer reviewers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the items are truly multidimensional, the IRT results related to those items should be questioned, since the models require a strong assumption of unidimensionality.</li> <li>• The State should also consider taking</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 Oklahoma**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>proactive steps to prevent and reduce the effects of score inflation. The state may want to consider reviewing items with high pseudo-guessing parameters as a way to identify items that may be particularly susceptible to practices that lead to score inflation (e.g., coaching about item format/contents). Items with large pseudo-guessing parameters (e.g., values that indicate guessing probabilities greater than chance) could share common features that could be guarded against in later iterations of the assessments. As an example, the math assessments in grades 4, 6, 7, 8, and 10 contain items where at least 20% have pseudoguessing parameters greater than 25% (e.g., there is a greater than 1 in 4 chance of guessing the item correctly).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state should work with its TAC to understand the effect that score inflation can have on the validity of inferences drawn from test results.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the dimensionality requested under Critical Element 3.3.</li> <li>• Evidence of the reasonable and technically sound process that the state used to evaluate whether the adopted item calibration model (3PL) would produce reliable results and facilitate valid score interpretations based on the results from the administration of the test to Oklahoma’s student population.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence that the procedures and protocols that the state uses to monitor item calibration model convergence (e.g., converging on global or local maxima, maintains stability of parameters estimated along the boundary of the solution space, and monitor/adjust the convergence criterion specified in the software) are reasonable and technically sound and lead to the reporting of reliable results, and</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 Oklahoma**

<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 style="text-align: center;">produce a scale that facilitates valid score interpretations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence defining the methods used to estimate inter-rater reliabilities and the appropriate and technically sound rationale for the selected method.</li> <li>• Evidence that the state’s scoring procedures require the use of all the accepted operational items (e.g., excludes items that are removed for psychometric reasons and items that are being field tested) administered to a student to compute his/her raw score.</li> <li>• Evidence that a standardized scoring process was used to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This evidence should also clarify whether the scaled score processes defined in the technical manual or defined in the test blueprints is used operationally.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Evidence for the alternate science assessment that meets this Critical Element is required.</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 Oklahoma

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</b></p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b>                      Oklahoma’s alternate assessments were developed by the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) assessment consortium. Evidence for the assessments was submitted on Oklahoma’s behalf by the State of West Virginia</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b>                      This was the first year these forms were administered as the new Oklahoma Academic Standards were assessed for the first time, so year-to-year equating results are unavailable—only one form was administered per grade/content area; except, a small number of breach forms were administered for cases of student cheating during 16-17 test administration. The majority of cases were minor test administration issues that allowed the student to be re-administered the same form.                      See Section 7.3 – Equating Breach Forms</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Math Linking Information</li> <li>· Science Linking Information</li> <li>· ELA Linking information</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b>                      Evidence for the alternate science assessment that meets this Critical Element is required.</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b>                      Evidence of the processes and procedures used by the assessment vendor to equate parallel forms within years that includes the accuracy of the equating functions was insufficient.</p> <p>Details of the assessment vendor’s processes and procedures to equate between years that also includes information regarding the detection of parameter drift, correction/adjustment for parameter drift, the effects that uncorrected parameter drift would have on the consistency of score interpretations, and the accuracy of the equating functions (when available) need to be submitted.</p> <p>Peers raised concerns that some of the forms administered appear systematically different within a given content area/grade level. For example, form 3 of the grade 6 math assessment appears to result in a higher score over the entire range of ability compared to the other three test characteristic curves displayed in the graph; the test information function for this form also shows evidence of a bimodal distribution. There are similar, but more pronounced differences in the 8<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> grade science TCC/TIF graphs as well.</p> <p>See comment in critical element 3.4 regarding request to assessment vendors to provide information about measurement error related to</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 Oklahoma**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		linking/equating that follows practices outlined in the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing.  Technical assistance/best practice notes/comments from one or more peer reviewers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State should monitor its item refresh rates to prevent over exposure. In cases where students may retest multiple times per year, it is unclear whether or not there could be non-ignorable item exposure effects that would drive the student's results.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence for the alternate science assessment that meets this Critical Element is required.</li> <li>• Documentation of technically sound equating procedures and results within an academic year, such as a section of technical report for the assessments that provides detailed technical information on the method used or establish linkages and on the accuracy of equating functions (See comments above).</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 Oklahoma

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>4.6 – 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>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b>                      Oklahoma’s alternate assessments were developed by the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) assessment consortium. Evidence for the assessments was submitted on Oklahoma’s behalf by the State of West Virginia</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b>                      Documentation that the State followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results across different versions of the assessments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The same items were administered on both the PBT and CBT forms with the exception of the paper equivalents of the CBT TEIs for Math Grades 6-8 &amp; 10 and Science Grades 8 &amp;10. The paper equivalents were developed to the same standard and DOK of the CBT items and administered in place of TEI on the PBT forms in math grades 6-8 and 10 and science grades 8 and 10.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For math this information is referenced in tables 3-25 and 3-26 of the technical report.</li> <li>For science this information is referenced in section 3.3.3. For clusters containing technology-enhanced items, additional item sets containing equivalent paired multiple-choice items (e.g., TEI vs. PM) were tested on different forms, for future use on paperbased forms.</li> <li>Braille items/forms: items swaps were no necessary for anyitems on the 16-17 test forms.</li> <li>See Section 3.5.4 Alternative Presentations Tech Manual</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The state administers technology-based assessments that are delivered by different types of devices (e.g., desktop computers, laptops, tablets), evidence includes:                      The SDE in conjunction with Measured Progress</p>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b>                      Evidence for the alternate science assessment that meets this Critical Element is required.</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b>                      The State should provide evidence that reports the results of a comparability study of different versions of the assessments (i.e., paper vs computer administrations) that is technically sound and documents evidence of comparability generally consistent with expectations of current professional standards.</p> <p>The State should provide evidence that test administration hardware and software (e.g., screen resolution, interface, input devices) are standardized across unaccommodated administrations.</p> <p>Technical assistance/best practice notes/comments from one or more peer reviewers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State should also carefully monitor its item refresh rates to prevent over exposure. In cases where students may retest multiple times per year, it is unclear whether or not there could be non-ignorable item exposure effects that would drive the student’s results.</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 Oklahoma**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	plans to conduct a comparative study between different hardware and software configurations for its online assessments. · See excerpt from the Measured Progress Technical Proposal/assessment contract.	

**Section 4.6 Summary Statement**

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Evidence for the alternate science assessment that meets this Critical Element is required.
- Evidence supporting comparability of different versions of the assessments (i.e., paper vs computer administrations) that is technically sound and consistent with expectations of current professional standards.
- Documentation that test administration hardware and software (e.g., screen resolution, interface, input devices) are standardized across unaccommodated administrations.

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b></p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b>                      Oklahoma’s alternate assessments were developed by the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) assessment consortium. Evidence for the assessments was submitted on Oklahoma’s behalf by the State of West Virginia</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b>                      Sections from the State’s assessment contract that specify the State’s expectations for analyses to provide evidence of validity, reliability, and fairness; for independent studies of alignment and comparability, and for requirements for technical reports:                      · Assessment Contract (TAC, DTC training, Advisory)                      · Assessment Contract (Technical Assistance and Digest)                      The most recent technical reports for the State’s assessments that present technical analyses of the State’s assessments:                      · See 2016-17 OSTP Technical Report                      Documentation of the alignment of the State’s assessments to the State’s academic content standards:                      · Please see evidence submitted under Critical Element 3.1                      Documentation of regular internal and external technical review of components of the State’s assessment system, including annual debrief of the most recent assessment cycle and suggestions for improvement:  <input type="checkbox"/> Roles and responsibilities of TAC members  <input type="checkbox"/> TAC Meetings (TAC notes March 2014-May 2017)                      · Annual District Test Coordinator Meeting                      Outline of a deliberate cycle for reviewing and updating the State’s academic content standards and</p>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b>                      Evidence for the alternate science assessment that meets this Critical Element is required.</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b>                      The State should provide evidence of clear and technically sound criteria used for the analysis of all of the assessments in the assessment system (e.g., operational definitions for “reasonably reliable”, “sufficiently small”).</p> <p>The State should provided evidence referenced in Critical Element 4.4 as it relates to the monitoring of the quality of the assessment system and setting clear and technically sound criteria for the analysis of the assessment system, including but not limited to testing model-data fit for item calibration models and reporting the technical soundness of the selected calibration model for the assessment data, defining estimation processes for inter-rater reliability, use of all operational items administered to a student to compute raw scores, correctly identifying the set of keyed item responses to use for subgroup reliabilities, and general quality assurance/quality control procedures that are used by the assessment vendor to provide the State with the necessary information to monitor, maintain, and improve the quality of its assessment system.</p> <p>The State should provide evidence describing the decision-making process used to determine whether or not it will adopt recommendations from the TAC as a component of a deliberate cycle to review and update the State’s assessments; define clear and technically sound criteria for the analysis of the assessments in the assessment system; and monitor, maintain, and improve the quality of the State’s</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 Oklahoma**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	assessments · The Oklahoma Academic Standards are on a six-year review cycle. Math and ELA standards were completely revised in 2016 and fully implemented in the 2016-17 school year. The Oklahoma School Testing Program was revised at the same time and operationalized in the Spring 2017. · Science standards were completely revised in 2014 and subsequently adopted. The science standards were implemented in the 2014-15 school year, but the new science assessment was developed over a three-year period and fully implemented in Spring 2017. · This six-year cycle will continue for the foreseeable future with science slated for revision in 2020 and ELA/Math slated for revision in 2022.	assessment system.  Technical assistance/best practice notes/comments from one or more peer reviewers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is important that the State takes proactive measures to ensure that its assessment system results are not corrupted by score inflation. The practices that traditionally lead to score inflation would not result in any testing violations as defined by the state, but still undermine the validity of inferences about student, school, and district performance. Taking steps that can help others identify and prevent these practices will make the results of the assessments more informative to policy and practice decisions.</li> <li>• It would be useful to see what plans the State has to monitor, prevent, and adjust their assessment system plans/designs to avoid the effects of score inflation to the extent possible.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b></p>
<p><u>  </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence for the alternate science assessment that meets this Critical Element is required.</li> <li>• Evidence that 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 so that inconsistencies and irregularities noted throughout the review can be prevented.                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Evidence that the state has and uses clear and technically sound criteria for the analysis of all of the assessments in the assessment system.</li> <li>▪ Evidence that the state has and uses clear and technically sound decision-making processes to determine whether or not it will adopt recommendations from the TAC as a component of a deliberate cycle to review and update the State’s assessments; criteria for the analysis of the assessments in the assessment system; and monitor, maintain, and improve the quality of the State’s assessment system.</li> <li>▪ Evidence that the State is proactively monitoring potential score inflation and established plans, policies, and/or procedures that define actions the State will take to improve the quality of the assessment system to prevent the integrity of the system from being</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 Oklahoma**

<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>
compromised.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards;</li> <li>• States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs;</li> <li>• Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment;</li> <li>• Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities;</li> <li>• Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;</li> <li>• Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b>                      Consortium information/evidence Oklahoma’s alternate assessments were developed by the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) assessment consortium. Evidence for section 5.1 is a combination of the West Virginia DLM common submission and the information/evidence provided in this document. State specific information/evidence OSDE-SES provides guidance to school districts and parents regarding assessment participation policies and the different types of assessments through manuals, website information, and both in-person and online opportunities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Attachment 13 – Oklahoma Special Education Handbook</li> <li>· Attachment 20 - OAAP 2016-2017 Administration Manual (pgs 1-5)),</li> <li>· Attachment 15 - Screen shot of OSDE-SES alternate assessment webpage)</li> <li>· Attachment 6 - OAAP Inperson Training Schedule</li> <li>· Attachment 11 - Snapshot of OSDE-SES Website (DLM training and resources).</li> <li>· Attachment 5 - OAAP Weekly Update (Instructional Embedded Assessments) 1.31.17</li> </ul> <p>All alternate assessment trainings include information regarding federal/state laws concerning required state assessment of all students, choosing the appropriate assessment type, and providing student practice throughout the school year in the DLM system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Attachment 2 – Oklahoma Administrative Code (OAC) SECTION 210_10-13-11 (alternate assessment)</li> <li>· Attachment 3- Ok School Law 2014 for OSTP-Section 1252Test for Students)</li> <li>· Attachment 16 – OAAP Training Ppt 2016-17</li> </ul> <p>Oklahoma created the <i>CRITERIA CHECKLIST FOR</i></p>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAA</b>                      Communication that clearly specifies any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards (e.g., graduation or diploma requirements, retest opportunities).</p> <p>Evidence was not found 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).</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b>                      There is a concern that the communication related to the decision making process for selecting appropriate accommodation for students participating in the general assessment is unclear.</p> <p>The special education guidance needs to be updated to reflect current federal legislation (e.g., There is still reference to NCLB).</p> <p>There is a concern, based on the Oklahoma Accommodations Guide in the Access Needs section that May Require an Accommodation Section, that the checklist could prevent a student with some sight impairments (i.e., protanopia, deuteranopia, or tritanopia) from receiving appropriate accommodations.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments);</li> <li>The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.</li> </ul>	<p><i>ASSESSING STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON ALTERNATE ASSESSMENTS</i> to help IEP teams make the appropriate assessment decision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attachment 14 - OSDE Form 12 CRITERIA CHECKLIST FOR ASSESSING STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON ALTERNATE ASSESSMENTS).</li> </ul> <p><b>General Assessments:</b></p> <p>The procedures and guidance to ensure the inclusion of students with disabilities in the OSTP are provided in the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Office of Special Education Services webpage, providing a detailed explanation of the alternate assessment, and differences between grade-level achievements standards and achievement standards based on alternate academic achievement standards. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">Criteria Checklist for Assessing Students with Disabilities on Alternative Assessments</a> provides a detailed checklist to determine whether a student qualifies for Oklahoma’s alternate assessment based upon an IEP team decision.</li> </ul> </li> <li>16-17 IEP-504 Accommodations Manual details the accommodations offered for the OSTP, which students are eligible, and how to request accommodations. This document includes standard and nonstandard accommodations as well as accessibility features provided in the technology-based assessments for Grade 6-8 &amp; 10.</li> <li>Information on accessibility tools and features may be found in two documents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSTP Technology Guidelines</li> <li>OSTP Test Administrator’s Technology Guide</li> </ul>                     These documents are specifically used for guiding IEP teams in determining appropriate accommodation selection for students with disabilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accessible Educational Materials (AEM) Technical</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>There is a concern that the Assessment Accommodation Plan could limit access to accommodations for students with a 504 plan who don’t have a special education teacher.</p> <p>The language in the Special Education Process Guide references only a portfolio assessment for the alternative assessment. There is a portfolio system for Alt History, but it is not clear whether the portfolio is applicable to other content areas. The document may need to be updated. In addition, there is no reference in the accommodation section of the document to the unique accommodations form request process.</p> <p>No evidence that the State provides procedures to ensure that the implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum was found (e.g., resource guides, professional development modules, curriculum frameworks).</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 Oklahoma

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Assistance · Special Education Accommodations Guidance · Special Education Accommodations Synopsis · Special Education Oklahoma Process Guide	

<b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b>
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examples of communications received by multiple stakeholder groups (e.g, administrators, teachers, parents) that clearly specify any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards (e.g., graduation or diploma requirements, retest opportunities).                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Evidence of communication received by parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and 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> </ul> </li> <li>• Evidence that the State has procedures in place to ensure that the implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum was found (e.g., resource guides, professional development modules, curriculum frameworks).</li> <li>• Evidence that communication and/or training related to the decision-making process for selecting appropriate accommodation for students participating in the general assessment (i.e., students with IEPs as well as 504 plans) is provided.</li> <li>• Evidence that students with a 504 plan received accommodations if they did not have a special education teacher to complete the state’s required form and corresponding evidence that the lack of a special education teacher completing the form did not cause a test compliance issue for the school/district.</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 Oklahoma**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> <li>• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;</li> <li>• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b> See submission evidence for Oklahoma’s general assessments.</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b> 16-17 ELL State Testing Accommodations Manual details testing for EL students, including who is eligible for testing, students who are dually identified as EL with a disability, requirements for accommodations, and testing formatting options.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· 16-17 ELL State Testing Accommodations Manual</li> <li>· Language Instruction Education Plan (LIEP)</li> <li>· ELL Exemption Flowchart</li> </ul> <p>Information on accessibility tools and features may be found in two documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o OSTP Technology Guidelines</li> <li>o OSTP Test Administrator’s Technology Guide</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b></p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b> There is concern that the process for determining student eligibility for accommodations and guidance on selection of appropriate accommodations for ELs prevents access to all applicable accommodations for this population. For example, the OK EL State Testing Accommodations Manual includes a list of 15 distinct accommodations available to EL students and the LIEP lists only 8 accommodations and does not appear to note any other place where they could list the other available accommodations.</p> <p>There is a concern about the inconsistencies in the procedural guidance (e.g., in Section 5 in the read-aloud procedures emphasis is placed on bold, italics and caps (#4) versus italics and caps (#15)).</p> <p>Evidence of the number of EL accommodations that are provided in the State.</p> <p>Evidence of the number of EL accommodations, by type, by assessment for the most recent assessment administration, that are provided in the State, to demonstrate that the inconsistencies in the guidance have not negatively impacted their appropriate application needs to be provided.</p> <p>A resource regarding the selection of appropriate (or approved/vetted) word-to-word dictionaries for the languages recognized by the state should be provided</p> <p>Technical assistance/best practice notes/comments from one or more peer reviewers:</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 Oklahoma**

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>The LIEP form lists only 8 of the 15 approved accommodations for students identified as English Learners. The documentation identifies that this form must be completed and used to request accommodations for students, but does not provide another means by which the other 7 accommodations could be requested.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of consistency and clarity in the guidance used to make accommodations decisions for ELs.</li> <li>Evidence of the number of EL accommodations, by type, by assessment for the most recent assessment administration, that are provided in the State, to demonstrate that the inconsistencies in the guidance have not negatively impacted their appropriate application.</li> <li>Evidence that all documented accommodations for English Learners have the possibility of being used as appropriate.</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 Oklahoma**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>5.3 – Accommodations</b></p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities (SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504;</li> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);</li> <li>Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> <li>Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b></p> <p>Accommodations for the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) assessment are built into the test. IEP teams determine the accommodations needed for student access and the teachers activate accommodations within the DLM Educator Portal system based on the access needs of the student as documented in the IEP(see consortium submission for further information on the DLM system). The OSDE has provided guidance regarding any additional accommodation needs not available within the DLM system such as state approved accommodations, Unique accommodations, and Non-standard accommodations. This guidance has been provided via test manuals, website information, and online trainings. IEP teams are required to document all needed accommodations and accessibility related needs within the student’s IEP on an annual basis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attachment 9-Form UNIQUE ACCOMM-ext</li> <li>Attachment 18 OSTP IEP_504 Accommodation Manual</li> <li>Attachment 22 – Sample accommodations page from Oklahoma IEP Attachment 16 – OAAP Training Ppt 2016-17</li> </ul> <p><b>General Assessments:</b></p> <p>Please see supporting evidence and documentation of accommodations and accessibility features for students with disabilities &amp; English Language Learners to ensure fully accessible state assessments are provided, as appropriate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o OSTP IEP/504 Accommodation Manual</li> <li>o OSTP ELL Accommodation Manual</li> <li>o Accommodation Frequencies</li> <li>o Ch. 4 Technical Manual</li> <li>o Communication to Districts regarding OSTP Accommodations</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b></p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b></p> <p>The state must provide evidence that clearly demonstrates that appropriate testing accommodations were provided to students identified as English Learners.</p> <p>There is a concern that the Assessment Accommodation Plan could limit access to accommodations for students with a 504 plan who don’t have a special education teacher. (from 5.1)</p> <p>The State should provide reports of studies, data analyses, or other evidence that indicate that scores based on accommodated and non-accommodated administrations can be meaningfully compared (e.g., the Neutral Latin American/Spanish accommodation, word-for-word oral translations).</p> <p>Technical assistance/best practice notes/comments from one or more peer reviewers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Word-for-word translations are known to be problematic due to differences in semantic and syntax structures between languages. However, the guidance requires that only word-for-word translations be used. There is no evidence provided by the State to indicate that this translation practice does not introduce construct irrelevant difficulties into the testing process.</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

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>o Communication to Districts regarding Nonstandard Accommodations.</li> <li>o OSTP Test Administrator’s Technology Guide                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Expert stakeholder meetings were conducted to ensure reasonable and appropriate basis for the set of accommodations offered:</li> </ul> </li> <li>o Assessment Accommodation &amp; AT Committee and Outcomes</li> <li>o Technical Advisory Committee Agenda &amp; Notes See the process the state employs to consider exceptional accommodation requests:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· <a href="#">Non-Standard Accommodations</a> page of the SDE website provides brief descriptions of non-standard accommodations and the application process.</li> <li>· <a href="#">Unique Accommodation Request Form</a> is used by districts to request a unique accommodation as defined in the accommodation manual.</li> <li>· OSTP ELA Test Read Aloud Protocol helps IEP/504 teams identify students who may be appropriate candidates to receive the accommodation for Text-to-Speech (computer-based), Human Reader or, for a student who is deaf or hard of hearing, Sign Language Interpretation for the OSTP English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.</li> </ul> </li> <li>o <a href="#">Introduction to the Protocol for Accommodations in Reading (PAR)</a> is a training document used to help districts make informed decisions about reading accommodations.</li> <li>o Nonstandard Accommodation Frequency:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approximately 200 students received the OSTP ELA Test Read Aloud. This represented 0.06% of the tested student population.</li> <li>• Approximately 75 students received a Unique Accommodation.</li> </ul> </li> <li>o The typical students who received the OSTP ELA Test Read Aloud accommodation were students who</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 Oklahoma**

<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>had recently gone blind or were going blind due to a medical condition and had not learned Braille.</p> <p>o The typical student who received a Unique Accommodation were students who were deaf and needed the test signed. The test administrator was permitted to project the OSTP on a whiteboard to provide the best way for the student to simultaneously view the test and Sign Language Interpreter.</p> <p>Students, teachers, and arentsare given access to online practive tests for Science, Math, and ELA so students are familiar with the format and accessibility tools.</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 Oklahoma**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>5.3 – Accommodations</b></p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504;</li> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);</li> <li>• Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> <li>• Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b>  Accommodations for the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) assessment are built into the test. IEP teams determine the accommodations needed for student access and the teachers activate accommodations within the DLM Educator Portal system based on the access needs of the student as documented in the IEP (see consortium submission for further information on the DLM system). The OSDE has provided guidance regarding any additional accommodation needs not available within the DLM system such as state approved accommodations, Unique accommodations, and Non-standard accommodations. This guidance has been provided via test manuals, website information, and online trainings. IEP teams are required to document all needed accommodations and accessibility related needs within the student’s IEP on an annual basis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Attachment 9-Form UNIQUE ACCOMM-ext</li> <li>· Attachment 18 OSTP IEP_504 Accommodation Manual</li> <li>· Attachment 22 – Sample accommodations page from Oklahoma IEP Attachment 16 – OAAP Training Ppt 2016-17</li> </ul> <p><b>General Assessments:</b>  Please see supporting evidence and documentation of accommodations and accessibility features for students with disabilities &amp; English Language Learners to ensure fully accessible state assessments are provided, as appropriate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o OSTP IEP/504 Accommodation Manual</li> <li>o OSTP ELL Accommodation Manual</li> <li>o Accommodation Frequencies</li> <li>o Ch. 4 Technical Manual</li> <li>o Communication to Districts regarding OSTP Accommodations</li> </ul>	<p><b>General Assessments:</b>  The State must provide evidence that clearly demonstrates that appropriate testing accommodations were provided to students identified as English Learners.</p> <p>There is a concern that the Assessment Accommodation Plan could limit access to accommodations for students with a 504 plan who don’t have a special education teacher. (from 5.1)</p> <p>The State should provide reports of studies, data</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 Oklahoma**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>o Communication to Districts regarding Nonstandard Accommodations.</p> <p>o OSTP Test Administrator’s Technology Guide</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Expert stakeholder meetings were conducted to ensure reasonable and appropriate basis for the set of accommodations offered:</li> </ul> <p>o Assessment Accommodation &amp; AT Committee and Outcomes</p> <p>o Technical Advisory Committee Agenda &amp; Notes</p> <p>See the process the state employs to consider exceptional accommodation requests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· <a href="#">Non-Standard Accommodations</a> page of the SDE website provides brief descriptions of non-standard accommodations and the application process.</li> <li>· <a href="#">Unique Accommodation Request Form</a> is used by districts to request a unique accommodation as defined in the accommodation manual.</li> <li>· OSTP ELA Test Read Aloud Protocol helps IEP/504 teams identify students who may be appropriate candidates to receive the accommodation for Text-to-Speech (computer-based), Human Reader or, for a student who is deaf or hard of hearing, Sign Language Interpretation for the OSTP English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.</li> </ul> <p>o <a href="#">Introduction to the Protocol for Accommodations in Reading (PAR)</a> is a training document used to help districts make informed decisions about reading accommodations.</p> <p>o Nonstandard Accommodation Frequency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approximately 200 students received the OSTP ELA Test Read Aloud. This represented 0.06% of the tested student population.</li> <li>• Approximately 75 students received a Unique Accommodation.</li> </ul> <p>o The typical students who received the OSTP ELA Test Read Aloud accommodation were students who</p>	<p>analyses, or other evidence that indicate that scores based on accommodated and non-accommodated administrations can be meaningfully compared (e.g., the Neutral Latin American/Spanish accommodation, word-for-word oral translations).</p> <p>Technical assistance/best practice notes/comments from one or more peer reviewers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Word-for-word translations are known to be problematic due to differences in semantic and syntax structures between languages. However, the guidance requires that only word-for-word translations be used. There is no evidence provided by the state to indicate that this translation practice does not introduce construct irrelevant difficulties into the testing process.</li> <li>• The language used to describe the dialect – or lack thereof – of Spanish to be used in translations could also introduce construct irrelevant measurement error if the translation does not yield a comparable item stem.</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 Oklahoma**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>had recently gone blind or were going blind due to a medical condition and had not learned Braille.</p> <p>o The typical student who received a Unique Accommodation were students who were deaf and needed the test signed. The test administrator was permitted to project the OSTP on a whiteboard to provide the best way for the student to simultaneously view the test and Sign Language Interpreter. Students, teachers, and parents are given access to online practice tests for Science, Math, and ELA so students are familiar with the format and accessibility tools.</p>	

**Section 5.3 Summary Statement**

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

- Reports of studies, data analyses, or other evidence that indicate that scores based on accommodated and non-accommodated administrations can be meaningfully compared, do not alter the construct being measured, and are appropriate and effective for meeting the needs of the students (e.g., the Neutral Latin American/Spanish accommodation).
- Evidence of the number of EL accommodations, by type, by assessment for the most recent assessment administration, that are provided in the State, to demonstrate that the inconsistencies in the guidance have not negatively impacted their access to appropriate accommodations.

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>5.4 – 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>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b> See submission evidence for Oklahoma’s general assessments.</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b> Procedures used to monitor the accommodations selected for students with disabilities and English learner as well as guidance for districts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· IEP teams utilize the Criteria Checklist to determine the appropriate assessment for students with disabilities, and the state monitors compliance by checking student IEPs for evidence of this determination.</li> <li>· The <a href="#">Academic Assessment Monitoring Program (AAMP) FAQs</a> detail the most frequently asked questions about the Academic Assessment Monitoring Program including what regulations guide the program, which school sites will be monitored, and how the monitoring occurs. This monitoring ensures that all eligible students are tested, school district staff are properly trained, test security is maintained, and assessments are administered consistently.</li> <li>· Desk Monitoring Checklist</li> <li>· On-site Monitoring Checklist <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Onsite Monitoring Guidelines</li> <li>o AAMP Presentation</li> </ul> </li> <li>Onsite Monitoring Schedule for 16-17</li> <li>Detail of AAMP Results for 16-17</li> <li>· AAMP Summary Results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Detail of AAMP Results</li> </ul> </li> <li>· Tulsa Central High School Onsite (IEP/504 violations)</li> <li>· Tyrone Onsite evidence (IEP/504 violations)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b></p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b> The onsite monitoring checklist does not describe the procedures that the State uses to monitor the accommodations during administration (e.g., the word-for-word administrations are word-for-word)</p>
<p><b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</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 Oklahoma

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all assessment accommodations are monitored so that they are administered 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 Oklahoma

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

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

<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>6.1 – 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>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b></p> <p>The Oklahoma State Board of Education formally adopted the DLM Essential Elements in February 2016 and Oklahoma’s Commission for Quality and Accountability (CEQA) board formally approved the DLM cut scores in August of 2015.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attachment 1 - State Board Minutes 2.28.16 (adoption of essential elements)(pg. 4)</li> <li>• Attachment 12. CEQA meeting notes 8.19.15 (approval of DLM cut scores) pg.2</li> </ul> <p><b>General Assessments:</b></p> <p>On August 16, 2017, the Commission for Educational Quality Accountability (CEQA) formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in English Language Arts, Mathematics and Science applicable to all public school students who participated in the general assessments in grades 3-8 &amp; 10.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSDE Communication to districts regarding the reset of the assessment cut scores for Grades 3-8 &amp; 10.</li> <li>• See the CEQA agenda, Meeting Minutes, and Presentation</li> <li>• See State Statute vesting the power of the CEQA to set cut scores and define the four performance levels: Advanced Proficient, Limited Knowledge, and Unsatisfactory. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Performance Level Descriptors provide associated competencies with each performance level</li> <li>o Performance Level look up tables provide achievement scores that differentiate.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b></p> <p>Based on the evidence submitted, there is no description of competencies associated with each achievement level or achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels for the Science Alternative Assessment.</p> <p>Evidence that academic achievement standards have been adopted for the alternate assessment in science needs to be submitted.</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b></p> <p>Evidence related to achievement that differentiates among the achievement levels is not consistent. (Refer to Critical Element 4.1.)</p> <p>Although the State submitted their achievement level descriptors and cut scores, there is not evidence that the State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State’s Academic Achievement Standards include a description of competencies associated with each achievement level and achievement</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 Oklahoma

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>scores that differentiate among the achievement levels for the Science Alternative and General Assessments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that academic achievement standards have been adopted for the alternate assessment in science.</li> <li>• Evidence that reflects that the achievement scores differentiate among the achievement levels for the general assessments in all content areas adopted by the State.</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 Oklahoma

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b></p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b>                      Oklahoma’s alternate assessments were developed by the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) assessment consortium. Evidence for the assessments was submitted on Oklahoma’s behalf by the State of West Virginia</p> <p><b>General Assessments:                      State Submitted Evidence</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The need for standard setting arises from the fact that this is a new general assessment that was administered for the first time in 2017.</li> <li>· The primary goal of the standard setting was to determine the knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) that students must demonstrate in order to be classified into each of the student status levels (performance levels).</li> <li>· The standard setting meeting was conducted between August 7 and August 11, 2017. In all, 111 panelists participated in the process and were organized into eight panels of 8–11 panelists each plus a acilitator provided by Measured Progress.</li> <li>· Please see the Standard Setting Report sections that address the following:                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Standard setting method and process</li> <li>2. Rationale for the method selected</li> <li>3. Documentation for setting cut scores that allowed panelists to apply their knowledge and experience to create defensible cut scores</li> <li>4. Process for setting cut scores and developing performance-level descriptors</li> <li>5. Panelists with appropriate experience and expertise                                     <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Content experts’ experience</li> <li>b. Panelists with experience and expertise teaching students with disabilities, English Learners, and other representative student populations</li> <li>c. Panelists from institutions of higher education and</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b>                      Evidence for this critical element is required.</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b>                      Evidence that technically sound rationale was used to select the method used for the standard-setting process.</p> <p>Evidence that the participants involved in the standard-setting have expertise with the range of student subgroups taking the assessment (e.g., students with disabilities)</p> <p>It is recommended that the State acquire evidence from an independent expert who observes the standard setting process, or empirically verifies, in terms of its appropriateness and provides evidence of the reliability of the cut scores and the validity of the recommended interpretations.</p> <p>Technical assistance/best practice notes/comments from one or more peer reviewers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State may want to consider using techniques such as Receiver Operating Characteristic Curve modeling to determine locations along the scaled score continuum that lead to the most consistent classification of records.</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 Oklahoma**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>ones knowledgeable about career-readiness.                      d. Panelist demographics                      6. Summary of statistical descriptions and analyses that provides evidence of the reliability of cut scores and validity claims. The speaking &amp; listening standards will not be assessed on the ELA OSTP assessment-only reading/ELA specific standards contained in the Test &amp; Item Specifications. Please see approved WAIVER.</p>	<p>This could also provide additional supporting evidence that the standard setting yields performance levels that differentiate consistently.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although the evidence included a statement that the previously used method should be considered, it would be useful for the State to document the rationale for continuing/discontinuing the use of the same standard setting method.</li> </ul>

<b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b>
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence for this critical element is required.</li> <li>Evidence that technically sound rationale was used to select the method for the standard-setting process for the general assessments and the science alternate assessment.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documentation of the standard-setting process for the science alternate assessment.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Evidence that the participants involved in the standard-setting process for the general assessments have expertise (e.g., experience commensurate with expert level knowledge) with the range of student subgroups taking the assessment (e.g., students with disabilities)</li> </ul>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

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>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b>            CONSORTIUM INFORMATION/EVIDENCE            OKLAHOMA’S SCIENCE ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT ASSESSMENT ALIGNMENT EVIDENCE FOR SECTION 6.3 WAS PROVIDED THROUGH THE WEST VIRGINIA DLM COMMON SUBMISSION.            STATE SPECIFIC INFORMATION/EVIDENCE            OKLAHOMA PERFORMED AN ALIGNMENT STUDY OF THE OAS TO THE DLM ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS IN            •ATTACHMENT 30 – ALIGNMENT REPORT</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b>            ☑ Evidence of alignment between the Oklahoma Academic Standards and the Oklahoma Performance Level Descriptors contained in the OSTP Standard Setting Report:            o Oklahoma Academic Standards used as main reference for writing PLDs.            o Process of setting cut scores centered around performance level descriptors            o Cut scores were set and performance level descriptors were written to reflect the full range of the state’s academic content standards            o Vertical articulation process and results            o Panelists and external experts evaluated alignment to the gradelevel academic standards and differentiation across performance levels within grades, and vertically articulated these across grades.            · Challenging Achievement Standards            o During standard setting, national scores for NAEP (grades 4 &amp; 8) and ACT (grade 10) were used as benchmarks. Oklahoma used the bookmark method during standard setting. Within the ordered item booklet, the band that corresponded to +/-2 standard deviations of the NAEP or ACT benchmark was highlighted for panelists. Panelists were able to set their cuts outside of this band if they provided</p>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b>            Documentation that the State’s Science Alternate Academic Achievement Standards are linked to the State’s Academic Content Standards.</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b>            Further evidence that there is sufficient challenge and rigor in the academic achievement standards to predict appropriate outcomes for students (e.g., Student who score at the proficient or above level are proficient in the knowledge and skills they need to be on track to graduate from high schools and succeed in college and/or career, reduction in post-secondary remedial course taking) is recommended.</p> <p>Technical assistance/best practice notes/comments from one or more peer reviewers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It isn’t completely clear how a state could truly satisfy the requirement listed in the left most column. If the administration of the 10<sup>th</sup> grade assessment should measure what students should know and be able to do by the they graduate from high school the assessment would need to measure content that has yet to be taught to the student. If the students in the school do not score proficient the school would be penalized for not teaching four years of content in the span of two years.</li> <li>• Given the varied nature of the knowledge and skills required to be successful in the workforce, it might be useful for the state to discuss specific</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 Oklahoma**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	reasoning; however, all cuts were within this range. In addition, the full Standard Setting Report & Appendices provides additional information.	<p>types of careers that it would aim to prepare students for – at minimum.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Since some students in the state are able to opt-in to an alternative track of curricula, how well does that group of students perform and does that alternate track adequately prepare the students for the workforce.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation that the State’s Science Alternate Academic Achievement Standards are linked to the State’s Academic Content Standards.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma**

<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 style="text-align: center;"><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;</li> <li>• The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;</li> <li>• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;</li> <li>○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;</li> <li>○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b>  Consortium information/evidence Oklahoma’s alternate assessments were developed by the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) assessment consortium. Evidence for section 6.4 is a combination of the West Virginia DLM common submission and the information/evidence provided in this document. State specific information/evidence Oklahoma uses the DLM alternate assessment system to assess the science, math, and English Language Arts content knowledge of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. Letters and scoring guides are posted on the OSDE website and sent to parents and educators along with score reports.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Attachment 25 - Parent letter from Supt. Hofmeister regarding DLM score reports</li> <li>· Attachment 26 – Scoring Reporting Guide for Administrators.pdf. Page 12 of the OSTP FAQ identifies that the scores of students who take an alternate assessment are used in the state/federal accountability system.</li> <li>· Attachment 24 - OSTP FAQ</li> </ul> <p><b>General Assessments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· See Chapter 9 Technical Manual – Score Reporting for a detailed explanation of the score reporting for the OSTP.</li> <li>· See Sample Student/Parent Reports (Please note: Accessible score reports are available upon request.)</li> <li>· Assessment Toolkit information for educator, parent, and public score interpretations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Assessment Results &amp; Reporting Webpage</li> <li>○ OK Lexile Parent Guide</li> <li>○ Assessment Guidance for Educators</li> <li>○ What Families Need to Know Flyer</li> <li>○ Spanish Version of “What Families Need to Know Flyer”</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Alternate Assessments – AA-AAAS</b>  Although a parent letter is sent, it is not clear that interpretive guidance that accompanies individual student reports is provided.</p> <p><b>General Assessments:</b>  The non-regulatory guidance for reporting to the public was not followed for submission of evidence, pg. 15 of the Non-Regulatory guidance, (i.e., links to website links should not be submitted as guidance). Evidence that 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 is needed.</p> <p>Evidence that alternate formats are available (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can</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 Oklahoma

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Assessment in the System Graphic</li> <li>o Frequently Asked Questions – Test Results</li> <li>o Assessment Guidance Sample Press Release</li> <li>o OSTP Portal information utilized by district personnel for instructional program and individual student analyses:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ <a href="#">Reporting Modules Training Webpage with video modules</a></li> <li>§ <a href="#">Reporting Training Webpage with video recordings</a></li> </ul> </li> <li>· Please see the published assessment results for the 2016-17 SY located on the OSDE’s webpage:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o State Testing Resources Webpage</li> <li>o <a href="#">Grade 3 State, District &amp; School (ELA/Math)</a></li> <li>o <a href="#">Grade 4 State, District &amp; School (ELA/Math)</a></li> <li>o <a href="#">Grade 5 State, District &amp; School (ELA/Math/Science)</a></li> <li>o <a href="#">Grade 6 State, District &amp; School (ELA/Math)</a></li> <li>o <a href="#">Grade 7 State, District &amp; School (ELA/Math)</a></li> <li>o <a href="#">Grade 8 State, District &amp; School (ELA/Math/Science)</a></li> <li>o <a href="#">Grade 10 State, District &amp; School (ELA/Math/Science)</a></li> </ul> </li> <li>· The Office of Accountability, Oklahoma State Department of Education (OSDE) publishes participation data per school, district, and state annually. The final participation data for 2016-17 will be published in Spring 2018. Please see the published information on the OSDE’s website:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <a href="#">2016 OSTP Assessment Participation and Performance Data - Schools</a></li> <li>o <a href="#">2016 OSTP Assessment Participation and Performance Data - Districts and State</a></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>understand is needed. The State should request confirmation that the reports meet accessibility standards and guidelines (e.g., 508 compliance or WCAG).</p> <p>Additional evidence that the State provides itemized score analyses to districts and schools is needed.</p> <p>The sub-scores that are reported should include information related to margins of error.</p> <p>The State needs to adopt a 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.</p> <p>Technical assistance/best practice notes/comments from one or more peer reviewers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Providing districts with detailed student by item level scores allows more opportunity for districts to mine the data to support educational practices. For example, using item responses within a content area districts could fit clustering models, latent class analysis models, or other classification algorithms to the data in order to identify groups of students who may require additional support. Even without the item stems/response set, knowing that a set of students provided the same incorrect responses to a set of items can help to reduce the domain that classroom educators need to search to identify where specific deficiencies may exist.</li> <li>The reports provided to parents, teachers,</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 Oklahoma**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>students, and the public should also provide some indication of the amount of error in the measurement/aggregation. Important decisions are made using these data with limited consideration of measurement error. It is important to provide the information about the amount of error along with the point estimates to ensure that it can be considered when making decisions based on those data.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several documents are promised several months from now (i.e., participation rates for the 2016-2017 school year). Given the nature of the assessments used by the state, there is little reason why the results cannot be provided back to the state from its assessment vendor much sooner. If schools are unaware of their participation rates until the spring of the following school year, how could it be used when they are completing their comprehensive school/district improvement plans?</li> </ul>
<b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that reports are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand.</li> <li>• Evidence that the State provides for the production and delivery of individual parent interpretive reports for the alternate assessment.</li> <li>• Evidence that the State has implemented a 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.</li> <li>• Evidence that the State reports itemized score analyses to districts and schools</li> </ul>		

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