



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

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

March 20, 2019

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 Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). I appreciate the efforts of the Oklahoma State Department of Education (OSDE) to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in February 2019. Specifically, OSDE submitted evidence regarding the ACT, which OSDE requested to permit interested local educational agencies (LEAs) to administer as a locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics in place of the statewide high school assessments.

Section 1111(b)(2)(H) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, permits a State to allow its LEAs to select and use, in lieu of the statewide assessment, a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics. As defined in 34 C.F.R. § 200.3(d), a nationally recognized high school academic assessment is "an assessment of high school students' knowledge and skills that is administered in multiple States and is recognized by institutions of higher education in those or other States for the purposes of entrance or placement into courses in postsecondary education or training programs." OSDE is offering its LEAs the option to administer the ACT in reading/language arts and mathematics in place of its statewide assessments in those subjects.

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

External peer reviewers and Department staff carefully evaluated OSDE's submission and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that this component of your assessment system met many, but not all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of section 1111(b)(1) and (2) of

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.

the ESEA. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and our own analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

- The ACT **substantially meets requirements** as locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics in Oklahoma.

Substantially meets requirements means that these components meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. Because the ACT substantially meets requirements, and consistent with the information provided to States on May 17, 2017 (available here: <https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa/locallyselected72117.pdf>), OSDE may continue to permit LEAs to administer the ACT in place of the statewide assessment beginning in the 2018-2019 school year.

The specific list of items required for OSDE to submit is enclosed with this letter. Within 30 days of receipt of this letter, OSDE must provide to the Department a plan and timeline by which it will submit the additional documentation. If adequate progress is not made in providing this information, the Department may take additional action.

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

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.

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank T. Brogan
Assistant Secretary for
Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Craig Walker, Executive Director of Assessment

Critical Elements Where Additional Evidence is Needed to Meet the Requirements for Oklahoma’s Use of the ACT as a Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Assessment

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with representatives of Indian tribes located in the State in developing the academic content standards adopted in 2016.
2.1 – Test Design and Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the test design of the ACT addresses the full depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards, such as test blueprints which indicate the number or percentage of items by depth of knowledge (DOK) classification within each reporting category of the academic content standards.
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of adequate alignment between the ACT and the full breadth and depth of the State’s academic content standards its assessments are designed to measure, specifically that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ACT assesses all of the academic content standards in reading/language arts. The ACT reporting categories align with the State’s academic content standards (e.g., there is a coherent relationship between the State’s mathematics standards and the mathematics standards represented by the ACT’s reporting categories). The State has confirmed that all planned changes /updates to ACT forms based upon findings of the alignment evaluation have been implemented.
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of validity that the ACT taps the intended cognitive processes as represented in the State’s content standards (e.g., think-aloud labs, item analysis protocols, and surveys following test items).
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of the ACT writing test are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s content standards (e.g., correlations among domain scores).
4.1 – Reliability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of subtest reliabilities Evidence for overall and conditional standard error of measurement (CSEM) by student group. Evidence of reliability, including overall standard error of measurement (SEM) and CSEM of subtests for the ACT writing test.
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that OSDE has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of the ACT.
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities are made by a student’s IEP Team under the Individual with Disabilities Education Act, the placement team under Section 504, or the individual or team designated by a district to make that decision under Title II of the ADA, as applicable, based on each student’s individual abilities and needs. Specifically, evidence that the State has determined what accommodations are allowable on the ACT, and communicates the allowable accommodations to IEP teams. If IEP teams select allowed accommodations for the State tests, including the ACT, then the student must be allowed to take the test with those accommodations and receive a valid score. Evidence that no student with a valid score on the State assessment (including

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>the ACT) is denied the equal benefit of other students (i.e., all students with a valid score receive a college-reportable score).</p>
<p>5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with a linguistic accommodation(s). Specifically, evidence that the State has determined what English learner accommodations are allowable on the ACT and communicates the allowable accommodations to LEAs. If English learner service teams in LEAs select allowed accommodations for the State tests, including the ACT, then the student must be allowed to take the test with those accommodations and receive a valid score. • Evidence that no student with a valid score on the State assessment (including the ACT) is denied the equal benefit of other students (i.e., all students with a valid score receive a college-reportable score).
<p>5.3 – Accommodations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations on the ACT beyond those routinely allowed. • Evidence that the accommodations provided do not alter the construct being assessed and allow meaningful interpretation of results. • Evidence that OSDE ensures that accommodations for the ACT do not deny students with disabilities or English learner students the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment (see the evidence requested in critical elements 5.1 and 5.2 regarding allowable accommodations for students with disabilities and English learners, respectively).
<p>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the ACT achievement standards for mathematics and reading/language arts align with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards such that a 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>6.4 – Reporting</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that student reports: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students. ○ To the extent practicable, are available in alternative formats (e.g., oral or written translations and accessible formats as needed). • Evidence of the reliability of each of the subscale scores on score reports, or the addition of confidence intervals reflecting the level of precision. • Evidence of how the state will report mathematics scores consistent with the model it validated through confirmatory factor analysis. Evidence submitted in critical element 3.3 will also address this critical element.
<p>7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State has established technical criteria to review any selection of a nationally recognized high school assessment. • Evidence that the State has completed this review of the ACT using its established technical criteria and has found the use of the locally selected assessment meets its criteria. • Evidence requested for critical elements 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 is needed to also address this critical element regarding allowable accommodations.
<p>7.2 – State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that OSDE has procedures to ensure that before an LEA requests approval to use a nationally recognized assessment like the ACT, it describes how the LEA notified all parents of high school students it serves:

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ That the LEA intends to request approval from the OSDE to use a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in place of the statewide academic assessment. ○ How parents and, as appropriate, students may provide meaningful input regarding the district’s request (includes students in public charter schools who would be included in such assessments). ○ Any effect of such a request on the instructional program in the LEA.
7.3 – Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State Assessments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evidence of comparability between the ACT tests and the statewide test (the SAT) (e.g., tables comparing reliability coefficients for the tests, in addition to correlations between the two tests already provided). ● Evidence for critical elements 2.1 and 3.1 are needed to address this critical element.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

January State Assessment Peer Review

Notes

for the Oklahoma administration of the ACT as a locally selected nationally recognized high school test



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.

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS4

Critical Element 1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students..... 4

Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content Standards 5

Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments..... 6

Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments.. 8

Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments..... 10

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS..... 11

Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development 11

Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development 13

Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration..... 13

Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration 15

Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security..... 16

Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy .. 17

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY 18

Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content18

Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes 20

Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure..... 21

Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables..... 22

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER.....23

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability 23

Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility 25

Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum 25

Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring..... 26

Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms..... 26

Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment 27

Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance 28

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS.....29

Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 29

Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments..... 32

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations 33

Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations

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

..... 35

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING.....37

Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students..... 37
Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting 39
Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 40
Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting 42

SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS..45

Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments 45
Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments 48
Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State Assessments 50

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

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

Critical Element 1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic content standards:</u> 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 schools and public school students in the State.</p>	<p>See CE 1.1 Oklahoma Peer Review February 2018</p>	<p>No additional evidence is required</p>
<p>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma ACT Locally Selected

Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content Standards

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic content standards:</u> The State’s challenging academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science are aligned with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards.</p>	<p>See CE 1.2 Oklahoma Peer Review February 2018</p>	<p>No additional evidence is required.</p>
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma ACT Locally Selected

Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments aligned with <u>grade-level academic achievement standards</u> or alternate academic achievement standards in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 9-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). <p>AND</p> <p>The State’s <u>academic content assessments</u> must be the same assessments administered to all students in the tested grades, with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may take an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards. • A State may permit an LEA to administer a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in lieu of the State high school assessment if certain conditions are met. • A State that administers an end-of-course high school mathematics assessment may exempt an 8th grade student from the mathematics assessment typically administered in 	<p>See CE 1.3 Evidence: Required Assessment Postcard</p>	<p>ED determined that this critical element was met in 2018. No additional evidence 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 Oklahoma ACT Locally Selected

<p> eighth grade and allow the student to take the State end-of-course mathematics test instead. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Department may have approved the State, under the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority, to permit students in some LEAs to participate in a demonstration assessment system in lieu of participating in the State assessment. </p>		
<p>Section 1.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or <input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] </p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma ACT Locally Selected

Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For students with disabilities, policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including those children with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system; • For ELs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policies state that all ELs must be included in all aspects of the content assessment system, unless the State has chosen the statutory option for recently arrived ELs under which such ELs are exempt from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment. ○ If a State has developed native language assessments for ELs in R/LA, ELs must be assessed in R/LA 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 	<p>See CE 1.4 Oklahoma Peer Review February 2018</p>	<p>ED determined that this critical element was met in 2018. No additional evidence 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 Oklahoma ACT Locally Selected

<p>language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If the State uses the flexibility for Native American language schools and programs: (1) the State provides the content assessment in the Native American language to all students in the school or program; (2) the State submits such content assessment for peer review as part of its State assessment system; and (3) the State continues to provide ELP assessments and services for ELs as required by law. The State must assess in English the students' achievement in R/LA in high school. 		
<p>Section 1.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma ACT Locally Selected

Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments

(Note: this is a new requirement under ESSA, so it does not apply to standards and assessments adopted prior to the passage of ESSA (December 2015)).

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State has developed or amended challenging academic standards and assessments, the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education). • Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas). • Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State. • Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents. 	<p>See CE 1.2 Oklahoma Peer Review February 2018: ELA/Math Stakeholder Involvement</p>	<p>ED staff note that OSDE adopted reading/language arts and mathematics standards in 2016. In reviewing the evidence related to these standards development and adoptions, staff found that the State involved a wide variety of stakeholders consisting of parents, teachers, principals, district administrators, and local school board members in reviewing and drafting academic content standards.</p> <p>Staff is unsure, however, if OSDE has met the requirement that representatives of Indian tribes located in the State were meaningfully consulted in the development of the State’s academic content standards in 2016.</p>
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the State has developed or amended challenging academic standards and assessments, evidence that the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with representatives of Indian tribes located in the State. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma ACT Locally Selected

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to <u>the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards</u> for the grade that is being assessed and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of <u>the State’s grade-level academic content standards</u> and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results. • Processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <u>the State’s academic content standards</u>, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills). • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design and intended uses and interpretations 	<p>See ACT Evidence</p> <p>Alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence # [1]: How ACT Assessments Align with State College and Career Readiness Standards. • Evidence #[2a]: Oklahoma Independent Alignment Report. • Evidence #[2b]: Oklahoma Alignment Study ELA Appendix. • Evidence #[2c]: Oklahoma Alignment Study Math Appendix • Evidence # [3]: ACT Alignment Updates. <p>Statement of purpose and intended interpretations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See West Virginia Submission/Peer Notes <p>Test blueprints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See West Virginia Submission/Peer Notes • Evidence #[5]: ACT Technical Manual includes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Writing Test Blueprint (pp. 3.15-3.20) ○ Scoring procedures (p. 2.9-2.11). <p>Processes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See West Virginia Submission/Peer Notes 	<p>A statement of purpose is included. [ACT05]</p> <p>Blueprints depict percentages by reporting categories and DOK levels (as well as by formats). Blueprints do not show item frequencies or percentages by DOK within category. [ACT05]</p> <p>Evidence is needed indicating the number or percentage of items in each DOK within each category.</p> <p>The description of the writing subtest design is sufficient [ACT05].</p> <p>Test development processes are appropriate [ACT05].</p> <p>While it is likely the ACT is not currently using a computer-adaptive format, nor is it incorporating portfolios, neither of these points are made explicitly in the evidence.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma ACT Locally Selected

<p>of results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the student is enrolled and uses that determination for all reporting. • If the State administers a content assessment that includes portfolios, such assessment may be partially administered through a portfolio but may not be <i>entirely</i> administered through a portfolio. 		
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence indicating the number or percentage of items by DOK within each category. 		

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

Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills. 	<p>NOTE TO PEERS—this critical element has been found to have sufficient evidence supporting the use of the ACT as a State assessment in prior peer reviews of the ACT</p>	<p>NOTE TO PEERS—this critical element has been found to have sufficient evidence supporting the use of the ACT as a State assessment in prior peer reviews of the ACT</p>
Section 2.2 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or NOTE TO PEERS—this critical element has been found to have sufficient evidence supporting the use of the ACT as a State assessment in prior peer reviews of the ACT</p>		

Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; Has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, 	<p>See ACT Evidence</p> <p>See West Virginia Submission/Peer Notes</p> <p>State Evidence See CE 2.3a- Required District Test Coordinator (DTC) training slides 13,23-24,45-49-52,61-67,90-92</p> <p>See CE 2.3b- State communication to DTC’s regarding ACT test administration training.</p> <p>See CE 2.3c- State communication to DTC’s regarding ACT accommodation training for special education and ELs.</p> <p>See CE 2.3d- ACT Test Administrator Webinar 1 Summary</p>	<p>Documents collectively indicate OK has and communicates clear, standardized administration procedures, including those connected to accommodations. Procedures are in place to train on the use of these procedures. (CE2.3a – 2.3h)</p> <p>Technology requirements are addressed in CE2.3a.</p> <p>No additional evidence is needed.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma ACT Locally Selected

<p>alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>See CE 2.3e- OK TA Webinar 1 Attendees</p> <p>See CE 2.3f- ACT Test Administrator Webinar 2 Summary</p> <p>See CE 2.3g- OK TA Webinar 2 Attendees</p> <p>See CE 2.3h ACT Accoms Q and A Attendance 17-18</p>	
<p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma ACT Locally Selected

Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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. Monitoring of test administration should be demonstrated for all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS.</p>	<p>Standardization of administration:</p> <p>See ACT Evidence</p> <p>State Evidence</p> <p>See the following evidence of an on-site monitoring that included findings and corrective actions for an ACT test administration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CE 2.4a: On-Site Monitoring Checklist w/ OSDE staff observations • CE 2.4b: Communication regarding the misadministration of the ACT and score cancellation (pp. 3-4) • CE 2.4c: Academic Assessment Monitoring Status Determination Letter • CE 2.4d: Indianhoma Corrective Action Plan 	<p>OSDE provided detailed evidence of a process for monitoring the administration of its State assessments, including the ACT, to ensure that standardized test procedures are implemented with fidelity. Evidence included a sample monitoring checklist, a detailed response letter, and a corrective action plan from a district.</p>
<p>Section 2.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma ACT Locally Selected

Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. • Application of test security procedures to all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS. 	<p>See ACT evidence</p> <p>See West Virginia Submission/Peer Notes</p> <p>State Evidence See CE 2.5 Oklahoma Peer Review February 2018</p> <p>See CE 2.4a-d</p>	<p>The evidence presented for this critical element is thorough and adequate.</p> <p>In CE 2.3a (used for training), Slides 39-43 adequately cover test irregularities and invalidation and Slides 44-53 adequately cover test security.</p> <p>No additional evidence is required.</p>
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma ACT Locally Selected

Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 	<p>See ACT Evidence</p> <p>See West Virginia Submission/Peer Notes</p> <p>State Evidence See CE 2.6 Oklahoma Peer Review February 2018</p>	<p>No additional evidence is required.</p>
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma ACT Locally Selected

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. The State’s validity evidence includes evidence that:</p> <p><u>The State’s academic assessments</u> measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards; • If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards and administers alternate assessments aligned with those standards, the assessments show adequate alignment to the State’s academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content 	<p>See ACT Evidence</p> <p>Alignment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[2a]: Oklahoma Independent Alignment Report. • Evidence #[2b]: Oklahoma Alignment Study ELA Appendix. • Evidence #[2c]: Oklahoma Alignment Study Math Appendix • Evidence #[3]: ACT Alignment Updates <p>Content Validity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See West Virginia Submission/Peer Notes • Evidence #[15]: ACT Writing Test Technical Report. Includes results of various studies that demonstrate overall validity of the optional Direct Writing (ACT-W) Test. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Relationship between ACT-W scores and writing-intensive college courses (pp. 13-17). 	<p>The ACT did NOT meet minimal alignment to OK content standards. The following needed to be done to approach fit: (a) Standard 6 (research) of ELA needed to be removed from consideration, because it does NOT align with the ACT, (b) nine mathematics standards needed to be collapsed into five, by collapsing five into one (Geometry), and (c) results were consistently averaged across two forms. Including the aforementioned adjustments, the report indicates approximately 7 ELA items and approximately 3 mathematics items (per form) needed to be revised or augmented to reach minimal levels of alignment. [ACT2a]</p> <p>ACT Alignment Updates [ACT 3] address how items will be removed, revised, and/or added to address findings of the report. The document also indicates internal reviews will be conducted following revisions.</p> <p>Evidence is needed indicating how OK will assess ELA Standard 6 (research), whether OK will collapse reporting categories to align in mathematics, and how OK will address the alignment of forms after ACT revisions (e.g., through independent review).</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma ACT Locally Selected

<p>and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>		
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence indicating how OK will assess ELA Standard 6 (research), whether OK will collapse reporting categories to align in mathematics, and how OK will address the alignment of forms after ACT revisions (e.g., through independent review). 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma ACT Locally Selected

Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap: <u>the intended cognitive processes</u> appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>See ACT Evidence See West Virginia Submission/Peer Notes</p>	<p>While the ACT Technical Manual (section 1.2) mentions the use of cognitive labs, the results of these studies are not provided. It is unclear whether these cognitive labs provided evidence of the cognitive processes represented in the OK academic content standards.</p> <p>Evidence is needed that provides adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validity evidence based on students’ intended cognitive processes to complete assessments. Strong examples of such evidence include think aloud labs, item analysis protocols (i.e., prompts to students to describe their thought processes following item completion), and surveys following tests that directly address cognitive strategies used. 		

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

Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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 <u>academic content standards</u>.</p>	<p>See ACT Evidence</p> <p>Subscore structures and DIF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[17]: Peer Review Report on the ACT for Oklahoma <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Correlation matrices (pp. 1-3) ○ Factor analysis (pp. 3-5) ○ Differential item functioning (pp. 8-10). <p>English and Writing Subscores:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[15]: ACT Writing Test Technical Report (2009). Includes results of analyses that demonstrate overall validity of the optional Direct Writing (ACT-W) Test. Relationship between ACT-W scores and writing-intensive college courses (Tables 9-12, pp. 13-17). 	<p>No additional evidence is required.</p> <p>The correlation between mathematics and ELA scores was acceptable at $r = .71$. This represents related but distinct constructs. Correlations among reporting areas within content areas (i.e., subscale scores) were also mostly acceptable, with the exceptions being that correlations were too high between Modeling and Preparing for Higher Math (PHM) ($r = .81$) and between Modeling and Integrating Essential Skills (IES) ($r = .89$). Correlations exceeding .80 indicate constructs that may be so related they should not be reported as separate scores. Confirmatory factor analytic results were appropriate ($RMSEA \leq .04$) in each content area. The factor analysis for mathematics did NOT include PHM and Modeling [ACT17].</p> <p>These correlational and factor analytic results do NOT support PHM and Modeling as reporting categories (see related comments in 6.4).</p> <p>Writing scores are sufficiently distinct from English scores ($r = .48$). [ACT15]</p> <p>Correlations among writing domain scores were not provided. Evidence of internal structure validity of the ACT writing test is needed.</p>
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of internal structure validity of the ACT writing test (e.g., correlations among domain scores). 		

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

Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.	NOTE TO PEERS—this critical element has been found to have sufficient evidence supporting the use of the ACT as a State assessment in prior peer reviews of the ACT	NOTE TO PEERS—this critical element has been found to have sufficient evidence supporting the use of the ACT as a State assessment in prior peer reviews of the ACT
Section 3.4 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or NOTE TO PEERS—this critical element has been found to have sufficient evidence supporting the use of the ACT as a State assessment in prior peer reviews of the ACT		

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

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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 consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. If the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, measures of reliability for the assessment overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of <u>a student’s academic achievement</u>. 	<p>See ACT Evidence</p> <p>Overall reliability, including standard error of measurement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[5]: ACT Technical Manual. The technical manual for the ACT assessment includes a chapter on reliability evidence, (Chapter 10, pp. 10.1-10.17). Reliability evidence includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reliability and SEM for the ACT Test Scores (pp. 10.1-10.2) ○ Reliability and SEM for ACT Reporting Scores (pp. 10.2-10.4) ○ Conditional Standard Errors of Measurement for the ACT (pp. 10.5-10.6) ○ Reliability, CSEM, and Agreement Indices for the ACT Writing Test (pp. 10.6-10.8) ○ CSEM for Composite Scores (pp. 10.8-10.10) ○ CSEM for STEM and ELA Scores (pp. 10.11-10.14) • Evidence #[17]: Peer Review Report on the ACT Assessment for Oklahoma (pp. 5-6). <p>Classification consistency:</p>	<p>ACT prepared a report of psychometric evidence based solely on OK students [ACT017].</p> <p>Reliability coefficients for both content areas were acceptable ($r's \geq .80$). Reliability coefficients were NOT reported for component sub-tests within ELA and mathematics [ACT017].</p> <p>Evidence of subtest reliabilities is needed.</p> <p>Reliability coefficients for all content areas by gender and by ethnicity were mostly acceptable ($r's \geq .80$) [ACT017].</p> <p>Classification consistencies were acceptable ($> .80$) across content areas and student groups, as well as overall [ACT017].</p> <p>The overall and conditional SEM were acceptable across content areas [ACT05].</p> <p>Evidence is needed for overall and conditional SEM by student group.</p> <p>Evidence of reliability, overall SEM, and conditional SEM of subtests was NOT provided for the ACT writing 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 ACT Locally Selected

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[17]: Peer Review Report on the ACT Assessment for Oklahoma (pp. 6-8). • Evidence #[5]: ACT Technical Manual <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Classification consistency analysis (pp. 10.4-10.5) <p>Inter-rater reliability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[5]: ACT Technical Manual <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Agreement Indices for the ACT Writing Test (pp. 10.6-10.8) • Evidence #[15]: ACT Writing Test Technical Report <p>Inter-rater reliability and measurement precision information (pp. 1-2).</p>	
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of subtest reliabilities is needed. • Evidence is needed for overall and conditional SEM by student group. • Evidence of reliability, overall SEM, and conditional SEM of subtests for the ACT writing test. 		

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

Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><i>For all State academic assessments,</i> assessments should be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (see definition¹).</p> <p>For academic content assessments, the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in their design, development and analysis.</p>	<p>NOTE TO PEERS—this critical element has been found to have sufficient evidence supporting the use of the ACT as a State assessment in prior peer reviews of the ACT</p>	<p>NOTE TO PEERS—this critical element has been found to have sufficient evidence supporting the use of the ACT as a State assessment in prior peer reviews of the ACT</p>
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or NOTE TO PEERS—this critical element has been found to have sufficient evidence supporting the use of the ACT as a State assessment in prior peer reviews of the ACT</p>		

Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for academic assessments, including performance for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>NOTE TO PEERS—this critical element has been found to have sufficient evidence supporting the use of the ACT as a State assessment in prior peer reviews of the ACT</p>	<p>NOTE TO PEERS—this critical element has been found to have sufficient evidence supporting the use of the ACT as a State assessment in prior peer reviews of the ACT</p>

¹ see page 28 of “A State’s Guide to the U.S. Department of Education’s Assessment Peer Review Process”, September 24, 2018 available at: www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html

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

Section 4.3 Summary Statement
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or NOTE TO PEERS—this critical element has been found to have sufficient evidence supporting the use of the ACT as a State assessment in prior peer reviews of the ACT

Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s <u>academic achievement standards</u> .	NOTE TO PEERS—this critical element has been found to have sufficient evidence supporting the use of the ACT as a State assessment in prior peer reviews of the ACT	NOTE TO PEERS—this critical element has been found to have sufficient evidence supporting the use of the ACT as a State assessment in prior peer reviews of the ACT

Section 4.4 Summary Statement
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or NOTE TO PEERS—this critical element has been found to have sufficient evidence supporting the use of the ACT as a State assessment in prior peer reviews of the ACT

Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
If the State administers multiple forms of <u>academic assessments</u> within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s <u>academic content standards</u> and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.	NOTE TO PEERS—this critical element has been found to have sufficient evidence supporting the use of the ACT as a State assessment in prior peer reviews of the ACT	NOTE TO PEERS—this critical element has been found to have sufficient evidence supporting the use of the ACT as a State assessment in prior peer reviews of the ACT.

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

Section 4.5 Summary Statement
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or NOTE TO PEERS—this critical element has been found to have sufficient evidence supporting the use of the ACT as a State assessment in prior peer reviews of the ACT

Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment		
Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State administers any of its assessments in multiple versions within a subject area (e.g., online versus paper-based delivery; <u>or a native language version of the academic content assessment</u>), grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<p>NOTE TO PEERS—this critical element has been found to have sufficient evidence supporting the use of the ACT as a State assessment in prior peer reviews of the ACT</p>	<p>NOTE TO PEERS—this critical element has been found to have sufficient evidence supporting the use of the ACT as a State assessment in prior peer reviews of the ACT.</p>
Section 4.6 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or NOTE TO PEERS—this critical element has been found to have sufficient evidence supporting the use of the ACT as a State assessment in prior peer reviews of the ACT		

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

Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a system for monitoring, 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), and Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website. 	<p>See ACT Evidence</p> <p>See West Virginia Submission/Peer Notes</p> <p>State Evidence See CE 4.7a (pp. 2 & 5) TAC Meeting Agenda & Minutes March 2018</p> <p>See CE4.7b (Pages 1 and 5-7) TAC Meeting Agenda & Minutes September 2018</p> <p>See CE 4.7c Technical Manual Archive of ACT Technical Report Screenshot</p>	<p>OK posts its technical manuals on its website. [CE4.7c]</p> <p>CE 4.7a and 4.7b show that Oklahoma has discussed the 2018 peer review documents and ACT with their TAC. However, evidence of a process for monitoring, maintaining, and improving the ACT tests for OK was not found.</p> <p>Evidence that indicates the State’s plan to use a process (i.e., including the State’s TAC) for monitoring, maintaining, and improving the assessment is needed.</p>
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that indicates the State’s plan to use a process (i.e., including the State’s TAC) for monitoring, maintaining, and improving the assessment. 		

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

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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. Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, the placement team under Section 504, or the individual or team designated by a district to make that decision under Title II of the ADA, as applicable, based on each student’s individual abilities and needs.</p> <p>If a State adopts alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and administers an alternate assessment aligned with those standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(1)(E) and (b)(2)(D), respectively, the State must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish guidelines for determining whether to assess a student with an AA-AAAS, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A State definition of “students with the most significant cognitive disabilities” that addresses factors related to cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior; • Provide information for IEP Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that: 	<p>See ACT Evidence</p> <p>See West Virginia Submission/Peer Notes.</p> <p>State Evidence</p> <p>See CE 5.1a (Pages 3-5) OSTP IEP-504 Accommodation Manual</p> <p>See CE 5.1b IEP-504 Accommodation Manual Communication</p> <p>See CE 5.1c ACT Accommodations Training for State Testing Communication</p>	<p>No additional evidence is required for this critical element.</p> <p>Page 2 of CE 5.1a states that: “Both SAT and ACT require schools to request appropriate accommodations for students with a documented need. Accommodation needs should be addressed during the development of the grade 11 student’s IEP/504 plan or through an amendment process as necessary.”</p> <p>CCRA accommodation requests must be submitted to SAT or ACT during the designated window and approved before a student can be provided their SAT or ACT specific accommodations. Assessment accommodations requested on behalf of the student must be regularly used in classroom instruction and documented in the student’s IEP/504 plan. If an accommodation request is denied, then the student may either take the SAT or the ACT with <i>State-Approved OSTP Accommodations</i> (NOT a college reportable score) or take the SAT/ACT (college reportable score) without accommodations, per SAT/ACT policy.</p> <p>This creates an issue that will be addressed in 5.3.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma ACT Locally Selected

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"> ○ Provides a clear explanation of the differences between assessments aligned with grade-level academic achievement standards and those aligned with alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student's education resulting from taking an AA-AAAS, such as how participation in such assessments may delay or otherwise affect the student from completing the requirements for a regular high school diploma; • Ensure that parents of students assessed with an AA-AAAS are informed that their child's achievement will be measured based on alternate academic achievement standards; • Not preclude a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who takes an AA-AAAS from attempting to complete the requirements for a regular high school diploma; and • Promote, consistent with requirements under the IDEA, the involvement and progress of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in the general education curriculum that is based on the State's academic content standards for the grade in which the student is 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>enrolled; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop, disseminate information on, and promote the use of appropriate accommodations to ensure that a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who does not take an AA-AAAS participates in academic instruction and assessments for the grade in which the student is enrolled. • The State has in place and monitors implementation of guidelines for IEP teams to apply in determining, on a case-by-case basis, which students with the most significant cognitive disabilities will be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, if applicable. Such guidelines must be developed in accordance with 34 CFR § 200.6(d).² 		
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

² See the full regulation at 34 CFR § 200.6(d) (online at https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=07e168e9e7a6c5931b4549cc15547ee9&mc=true&node=se34.1.200_16&rgn=div8)

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

Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all ELs in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s academic content assessments and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed with a linguistic accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for ELs; • Assistance regarding selection of appropriate linguistic accommodations for ELs, including to the extent practicable, assessments in the language most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what those students know and can do to determine the students’ mastery of skills in academic content areas until the students have achieved English language proficiency. 	<p>See ACT Evidence</p> <p>See West Virginia Submission/Peer Notes</p> <p>State Evidence See CE 5.2a (Pages 2-4) 17-18 OSTP EL Accommodations Manual</p> <p>See CE 5.2b CCRA Accommodations Flowchart</p>	<p>OK includes instructions for determining whether an EL should be assessed with linguistic accommodations. [OK CE5.2a]</p> <p>In CE 5.2a, OK includes an overview of accommodations for EL students.</p> <p>In CE 5.2b, OK presents a flow chart to help in the decisions around accommodations for EL students.</p> <p>No additional evidence is required.</p>
Section 5.2 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma ACT Locally Selected

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and ELs, including ELs with disabilities. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures that appropriate accommodations, such as, interoperability with, and ability to use, assistive technology, are available to measure the <u>academic achievement</u> of students with disabilities. • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs; • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual 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; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. • Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny 	<p>See ACT Evidence</p> <p>See West Virginia Submission/Peer Notes</p> <p>State Evidence Please see CE 5.3 February 2018 Peer Review Submission regarding the process the state employs to consider exceptional accommodation requests</p> <p>See CE 5.1a & 5.2a-IEP/504 and EL Accommodation Manuals</p>	<p>OK addresses multiple types of technology-based accommodations and implications for using the accommodations in various contexts. [CE5.1a] Both linguistic and nonlinguistic accommodations for ELs are described. [CE5.2a]</p> <p>The State ensures accommodations it provides are individualized, are intended to not alter the construct, and are intended to allow meaningful interpretations. Guidance is provided on matching functional impairments with the accommodations intended to address the functional impairments. [CE5.1a, CE5.2a]</p> <p>OK seems to use the term “unique” accommodation for exceptional requests, and provides a link to Form U to make these requests. [CE5.1a] Unique accommodations seem to be a narrow form of exceptional requests, because OK includes in the definition that unique accommodations require changes or alterations to the test materials/booklet or media presentation. It is conceivable students may need exceptional accommodations that do NOT meet these criteria that OK provides for being a unique accommodation. Some exceptional accommodations may NOT require changes or alterations to the test materials, booklet, or media presentation.</p> <p>Evidence is needed that describes a process for how OK individually reviews and allows exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</p> <p>Reliability and validity evidence disaggregated by whether or not students received accommodations would provide clearer evidence that the construct is preserved and interpretations are meaningful. Evidence is needed of</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma ACT Locally Selected

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.</p>		<p>reliability (e.g., coefficient alpha, SEM) and/or validity (e.g., predictive validity correlations, factor analytic results) by group. The evidence should be disaggregated by whether or not students received accommodations, in order to provide clear evidence that the construct is preserved and interpretations are meaningful.</p> <p>Students with disabilities and English learners may be denied the benefit of a college-reportable score if ACT does NOT approve an accommodation that the IEP/504 team or the ELAP does approve. [p. 3 of CE5.1a/page 5 of CE 5.2a].</p> <p>Evidence is needed regarding how OK ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny students with disabilities or EL students the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment (non-college reportable scores result is an unequal benefit). In other words, evidence is needed that the accommodations necessary to access the test do NOT result in equal benefits being denied.</p> <p>ACT ensures appropriate accommodations are available for ELs. [ACT05, ACT21, ACT22]</p>
<p>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that describes a process for how OK individually reviews and allows exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed • Evidence of reliability (e.g., coefficient alpha, SEMs) and/or validity (e.g., predictive validity correlations, factor analytic results) that is disaggregated by whether students received accommodations. This evidence is needed to demonstrate the construct is preserved and interpretations are meaningful. • Evidence regarding how OK ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny students with disabilities or EL students the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment (non-college reportable scores result in an unequal benefit). 		

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

Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures; • Monitored for administrations of all required academic content assessments and AA-AAAS. 	<p>See ACT Evidence</p> <p>See West Virginia Submission/Peer Notes</p> <p>State Evidence See CE 5.4 Oklahoma Peer Review February 2018</p> <p>See CE 5.4a 17-18 On-Site Monitoring Checklist</p> <p>See CE 5.4b Tyrone OS letter</p> <p>See CE 5.4c 17-18 Tyrone On-Site Monitoring Checklist</p> <p>See CE 5.4d ACT Tyrone 2017-18 Test Day Observations Checklist</p>	<p>OK defers to the peer review from February 2018. It is unclear whether accommodations are consistent with those provided during instruction, as well as consistent with those identified in IEP plans and other plans. One item on the monitoring checklist (p. 4 of CE5.4a) addresses this issue at the whole site level, rather than at the individual student level. This is NOT sufficient, because the critical element refers to “all students with disabilities and ELs.” One item at the whole site level seems unlikely to cover all students.</p> <p>OK ensures assessments and accommodations are administered with fidelity. [CE5.4a-5.4d]</p> <p>Assessments and accommodations are monitored for all administrations. [ACT20].</p> <p>Previously provided documents largely guide matching of accommodations to students’ disability [CE5.1a] and language [CE5.2a] needs. Both documents also indicate accommodations are being provided consistent with state policies.</p> <p>Evidence is needed of a plan and forms for collecting information (e.g., monitoring of classrooms, self-report by teachers) linking the accommodations actually used during classroom instruction with the accommodations in the IEP and used during testing. This is necessary to show assessment accommodations are “consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice.”</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 ACT Locally Selected

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 5.4 Summary Statement		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a plan and forms for collecting information (e.g., monitoring of classrooms, self-report by teachers) linking the accommodations actually used during classroom instruction with the accommodations in the IEP and used during testing. This is necessary to show assessment accommodations are “consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice.” 		

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

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>For academic content standards:</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its 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; <p>The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include:</p> <p>(1) at least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third for lower achievement; (2) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (3) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</p>	<p>State Evidence</p> <p>On August 15, 2018, the Commission for Educational Quality Accountability (CEQA) formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in English Language Arts and Mathematics for high school students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See CE 6.1a CEQA agenda, CE 6.1b CEQA Meeting Minutes, and CE 6.1c Presentation • See CE 6.1 d State Statute vesting the power of the CEQA to set cut scores and define the four performance levels: Advanced Proficient, Limited Knowledge, and Unsatisfactory <p>See CE 6.4c (pp. 4-6) Performance Level look up tables and conversion tables that provide achievement scores that differentiate</p>	<p>OK does NOT explicitly state these achievement standards apply to all public school students in the grades to which they apply.</p> <p>Evidence is needed that affirms the state applies its academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply.</p> <p>Academic achievement standards and cut scores for the ACT in OK were formally adopted [CE6.1a, 6.1b, 6.1d].</p> <p>There are four levels of achievement (two of which are for high achievement), descriptions of competencies associated with the levels, and scores that differentiate among the levels (i.e., cut scores) [CE6.4c].</p>
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</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 ACT Locally Selected

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"> Evidence that affirms the state applies its academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply. 		

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

Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards.</u> 	<p>State Evidence See 6.2a SAT-ACT Standard Setting Tech Report See 6.2b CCRA (ACT/SAT) Standard Setting Participant List See 6.2c Standard Setting Agenda See 6.2d Standard Setting Invitation</p>	<p>No additional evidence is required.</p> <p>Achievement standards were set using the Briefing Book approach. [CE 6.2a]</p> <p>Participants in the standard setting had the appropriate expertise including regular education, special education, and English Learner teachers, faculty members, and administrators. [CE 6.2b]</p>
Section 6.2 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma ACT Locally Selected

Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic achievement standards:</u></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards and with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards such that a 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 adopted alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards (1) are aligned with the State’s challenging academic content standards for the grade in which a student is enrolled; (2) promote access to the general curriculum consistent with the IDEA; (3) reflect professional judgment as to the highest possible standards achievable for such students; (4) are designated in the IEP for each student for whom alternate academic achievement standards apply; and (5) are aligned to ensure that a student who meets the alternate academic achievement standards is on track to pursue postsecondary education or competitive</p>	<p>See ACT Evidence for CE 2.1</p> <p>State Evidence</p> <p>See 6.2a SAT-ACT Standard Setting Tech Report</p> <p>See 6.3a ACT PLD Training for ELA-Math</p> <p>See 6.3b ACT PLD Participant List</p> <p>See 6.3c Draft CCRA Math PLDs</p> <p>See 6.3d CCRA ELA PLDs</p>	<p>Evidence is needed indicating the ACT achievement standards for mathematics and English Language Arts in OK align with college readiness. Examples of such evidence might include scores used for proficiency aligning with those used for entry into the OK system of higher education, research indicating students attaining the cut scores or higher succeed in college at a high rate, or independent review by persons at institutions of higher education who were NOT included on the standard setting panel.</p> <p>Cross-referencing the ACT technical manual (ACT05, p. 8.10) with the standards setting presentation (CE6.1c slides 7), one can determine the ACT College Readiness benchmark for Algebra (22) is higher than the OK cut score for proficiency in mathematics (21). It is hard to know what the comparable scores are for ELA; ACT05 8.1 indicates an English score of 18 and a reading score of 22 indicate college readiness. An ELA score of 20 indicates college readiness. Slide 12 of CE6.1c indicates a proficiency cut score of 38 for ERW. This score is lower than English plus reading (40) or ELA plus reading (42). OK should address whether proficiency levels that are lower than college readiness benchmarks were adopted.</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 ACT Locally Selected

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
integrated employment.		
Section 6.3 Summary Statement		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence to support how the ACT achievement standards for mathematics and English Language Arts that were selected in OK align with college readiness. 		

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

Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State reports its assessment results for all students assessed, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public.</p> <p>The State reports to the public its assessment results on <u>student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level</u>³</p> <p>For <u>academic content assessments</u>, 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 <u>specific academic needs of students</u>, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its academic content assessments that: 	<p>See ACT evidence</p> <p>See West Virginia Submission/Peer Notes</p> <p>An Oklahoma Profile Report is available as Evidence #[23]</p> <p>State Evidence See 6.4a CCRA Performance Level Descriptors Math-ELA Communication</p> <p>See 6.4b CCRA webpage snapshot</p> <p>See 6.4c SAT-ACT Standard Setting and Conversion Tables</p> <p>See 6.4d SAT-ACT Standard Setting Conversion Tables Public Communication</p> <p>See 6.4e CCRA Performance Level Ranges and Percentages webpage</p> <p>See 6.4f College- and Career-Readiness Assessment(CCRA) Performance Level Tables</p> <p>See CE 6.4g CCRA Performance Level Look-up Tables communication</p> <p>Upon request, LEAs are required to provide individuals with a disability an alternative means of accessing and</p>	<p>Evidence is needed in regard to how the State helps parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and addresses the specific academic needs of students.</p> <p>Evidence is also needed regarding how the State provides alternative means for accessing reports and how parents are made aware of this possibility.</p> <p>The ACT reports to the State performance for all students and for groups based on ethnicity and gender. [ACT23]</p> <p>OK publishes a spreadsheet indicating percentages proficient across districts by content area, grade, and reporting subgroup. It may be possible to determine academic achievement based on grade level standards (i.e., percent proficient) for all students and for each student group from this spreadsheet. It would take substantial proficiency with Excel to obtain this information. [CE6.4h]</p> <p>OK indicates alternative means of accessing the report are available for persons with disabilities. The methods for communicating this opportunity to parents, and the method for making such requests, are both unclear.</p> <p>OK reports a timeline of 3-8 weeks for individual reports, with aggregated reports available each August.</p> <p>The ACT offers translation of reports as needed into multiple languages. [ACT05] It is unclear how parents are informed of the translation options.</p>

³ Although all students with disabilities must be included in a State’s assessment system, requirements for public reporting in ESEA section 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) apply only to children with disabilities as defined in section 602(3) of the IDEA.

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

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"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a <u>student’s academic achievement</u>; ○ Report the <u>student’s academic achievement</u> in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards; ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific <u>academic needs of students</u>; ○ Are provided in an understandable and uniform format; ○ Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian; ○ Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent. ● The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. 	<p>interpreting information from score reports.</p> <p>Student-level reports are provided to students approximately 3-8 weeks after they take the ACT or SAT test. State, district, and site-level student results and aggregates are typically provided in August of each year.</p> <p>Student subgroup reporting for the 17-18 SY will be delayed until February 2019.</p> <p>See public reporting evidence for 16-17SY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CE 6.4h 2017PublicAchievementData for all student and subgroups ● CE 6.4i Accountability Resources Webpage. 	<p>The reports for the ACT tests and the State include itemized score analyses specific to academic needs of students. The State provides valid and reliable information on each student <u>to the extent</u> the scores from the tests are reliable and lead to valid inferences. Limitations in reliability involve subscale scores and are addressed in critical element 4.1. These scores are reported without error bands; reporting such scores without error bands may not be helpful to students, given some relatively low reliability coefficients. [ACT05]</p> <p>Evidence is needed supporting the reliability of each of the subscale scores on score reports, or the addition of confidence intervals reflecting the level of precision. The comment applies to English, reading, mathematics, and writing, because subscale scores for each are included on the score report. If writing subscale scores are included, evidence of both reliability (see critical element 4.1) and internal structure validity (see critical element 3.3) is needed.</p> <p>In mathematics, PHM, IES, and Modeling should not all be reported as separate scores, given their high correlation with each other and the exclusion of PHM and Modeling from the confirmatory factor analysis. A closer match to the internal structure validity evidence would be to report IES along with the other five subscales. [ACT05, ACT17]</p> <p>Evidence is needed supporting how the state will report mathematics scores consistent with the model it validated through confirmatory factor analysis.</p> <p>The ACT reports to the State performance for all students and for groups based on ethnicity and gender. [ACT23]</p> <p>The ACT offers translation of reports, as needed, into multiple languages. [ACT05].</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 ACT Locally Selected

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>OK individual reports are made available over a 3-8-week timeline.</p> <p>OK aggregated reports are made available in August.</p>
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence in regard to how the State helps parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students. • Evidence regarding how the State provides alternative means for accessing reports and how parents are made aware of this possibility. • Evidence supporting the reliability of each of the subscale scores on score reports, or the addition of confidence intervals reflecting the level of precision. The comment applies to English, reading, mathematics, and writing, because subscale scores for each are included on the score report. If writing subscale scores are included, evidence of both reliability (see critical element 4.1) and internal structure validity (see critical element 3.3) is needed. • Evidence supporting how the state will report mathematics scores consistent with the model it validated through confirmatory factor analysis. 		

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

SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS

(if applicable; evidence for this section would be submitted in ADDITION to evidence for sections 1 through 6)

Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has established technical criteria to use in its review of any submission of a locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment. The State has completed this review using its established technical criteria and has found the assessment meets its criteria prior to submitting for the Department’s assessment peer review.</p> <p>The State’s technical criteria include a determination that the assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is aligned with the challenging State academic standards; and • Addresses the depth and breadth of those standards. <p>AND</p> <p>The State has procedures in place to ensure that a district that chooses to use a nationally recognized high school academic assessment administers the same assessment to all high school students in the district except for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who may be assessed with an</p>	<p>See ACT Evidence CE 2.1: Alignment Study and CE 5.1 & 5.2</p> <p>State Evidence The OSDE utilized the State Academic Assessment Peer Review Guide as our technical criteria and determined the ACT meets all of the federally-required Critical Elements (1-7) for <i>State Academic Assessment Peer Review</i> based on September 24, 2018 Peer Review Guide.</p> <p>See CE 7.1a Assessment Update (pp. 24-27) ACT selection applies to all high school students within a district.</p> <p>See CE 7.1b District CCRA Selection Communication</p> <p>See CE 7.2a OSDE College- and Career-Readiness Assessment Survey</p> <p>See CE 5.1 & CE 5.2 Evidence</p>	<p>OK provides two announcements indicating districts may select the ACT or SAT for HS assessment [CE7.1a-7.1b].</p> <p>OK does NOT provide established technical criteria nor the details of an established review process.</p> <p>Instead of providing technical criteria and a review process, OK pastes information (slides 26 and 27) from the peer review guidance. This does NOT seem detailed enough to meet the critical element.</p> <p>Evidence is needed that describes (a) OK has established technical criteria to use in its review of the locally selected ACT, and (b) subsequently how OK’s established technical criteria was used to review the locally selected ACT.</p> <p>OK includes language in CE7.1a (slide 25) indicating all students in OK must take the same academic assessments, then indicating districts can choose SAT or ACT for HS. This language is potentially confusing.</p> <p>Concerns from critical elements 5.2 and 5.3 apply here. Specifically, OK should indicate how ELs who do not speak English proficiently can meaningfully complete the ACT in mathematics with only the instructions translated.</p> <p>Also, reliability and validity information should be provided for subgroups based on use and non-use of accommodations, in order to determine whether the</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oklahoma ACT Locally Selected

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>AA-AAAS.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The technical criteria established by the State in reviewing a locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment must ensure that the use of appropriate accommodations does not deny a student with a disability or an EL—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The opportunity to participate in the assessment; and • Any of the benefits from participation in the assessment that are afforded to students without disabilities or students who are not ELs. 		<p>construct is preserved and inferences are justifiable.</p> <p>With regard to equal benefits, OK indicates IEP/504 teams determine accommodations. Accommodations approved by the IEP/504 team but NOT by SAT/ACT would result in a NOT college reportable score, per p. 3 of CE5.1a. In such a case, the use of appropriate accommodations (as determined by the IEP or other team) would result in the loss of the benefit of a college reportable score.</p> <p>Evidence of reliability (e.g., coefficient alpha, SEMs) and/or validity (e.g., predictive validity correlations, factor analytic results) that is disaggregated by whether students received accommodations is needed to provide clear evidence that the construct is preserved and interpretations are meaningful. (See Peer Reviewers comments under 5.3).</p> <p>Evidence is needed regarding how OK ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny students with disabilities or EL students the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment (non-college reportable scores result in an unequal benefit). (See Peer Reviewers comments under 5.3).</p>
Section 7.1 Summary Statement		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that describes how OK has established technical criteria to use in its review of the locally selected ACT. • Evidence that describes how OK’s established technical criteria was used to review the locally selected ACT. • Evidence of reliability (e.g., coefficient alpha, SEMs) and/or validity (e.g., predictive validity correlations, factor analytic results) that is disaggregated by whether students received accommodations to provide clear evidence that the construct is preserved and interpretations are meaningful. (See Peer Reviewers comments under 5.3). • Evidence regarding how OK ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny students with disabilities or EL students the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment (non-college reportable scores result in an unequal benefit). (See Peer Reviewers comments under 5.3). 		

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

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

Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State must have procedures in place to ensure that:</p> <p>Before a district requests approval from the State to use a nationally recognized high school academic assessment, the district notifies all parents of high school students it serves—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the district intends to request approval from the State to use a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in place of the statewide academic assessment; • Of how parents and, as appropriate, students may provide meaningful input regarding the district’s request (includes students in public charter schools who would be included in such assessments); and • Of any effect of such request on the instructional program in the district. 	<p>State Evidence See 7.2a OSDE College- and Career-Readiness Assessment Survey</p> <p>See 7.2b 2018-19 CCRA District Selection</p> <p>See 7.2c Stakeholder Meetings – Collinsville</p> <p>See 7.2d Stakeholder Meetings – Sand Springs: p. 1 (community agenda), item 2, and p. 2 (district leadership agenda), item XV.</p> <p>See 7.2e Impact of ACT Choice on Educational Program – Bixby</p>	<p>OK provided the online form [CE7.2a] for a district to select the SAT or ACT, as well as a file of output generated from the form [7.2b]. This form included assurances from the persons completing it that community stakeholders were provided the opportunity for input, notified of the district’s decision, and informed of any effect on the district’s instructional program.</p> <p>OK also provided evidence of meetings in some districts [CE7.2c-7.2d] with school leaders and a statement from one district regarding the benefits of ACT [CE7.2e].</p> <p>It is unclear how OK ensures the parents of all high school students are informed of the request to use ACT, are allowed to provide meaningful input, and are alerted to any effect of the request. Self-report at the district level does NOT seem sufficient for this critical element.</p> <p>Evidence is needed that describes how the district notifies all parents of high school students it serves that the district intends to request approval from OK to use a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in place of the statewide academic assessment.</p> <p>Evidence is needed that describes how parents and, as appropriate, students may provide meaningful input regarding the district’s request (includes students in public charter schools who would be included in such assessments). Evidence is also needed that describes any effect of such a request on the instructional program in the district.</p> <p>CE 7.2a presents a form for districts to use in selecting the SAT or the ACT.</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 ACT Locally Selected

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>CE 7.2 b provides evidence that the community is provided the opportunity for input and is notified of the district's decision. This includes the effect the decision may have on the district's instructional program.</p> <p>CE 7.2c-e provide evidence of district meetings.</p>
Section 7.2 Summary Statement		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that describes how the district notifies all parents of high school students it serves that the district intends to request approval from the OK to use a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in place of the statewide academic assessment. • Evidence that describes how parents and, as appropriate, students may provide meaningful input regarding the district's request (includes students in public charter schools who would be included in such assessments). • Evidence that describes any effect of such a request on the instructional program in the district. 		

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

Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is equivalent to or more rigorous than the statewide assessment, with respect to— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The coverage of academic content; ○ The difficulty of the assessment; ○ The overall quality of the assessment; and ○ Any other aspects of the assessment that the State may establish in its technical criteria; • Produces valid and reliable data on student academic achievement with respect to all high school students and each subgroup of high school students in the district that— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Are comparable to student academic achievement data for all high school students and each subgroup of high school students produced by the statewide assessment at each academic achievement level; ○ Are expressed in terms consistent with the State’s academic achievement standards; and ○ Provide unbiased, rational, and consistent differentiation among schools within the State for the purpose of the State determined accountability system including calculating the Academic Achievement indicator and annually meaningfully differentiating between schools. 	<p>See ACT Evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence # [26]: Guide to the 2018 ACT/SAT Concordance <p><u>State Evidence</u> See 6.3c Draft CCRA Math PLDs</p> <p>See 6.3d CCRA ELA PLDs</p> <p>See 6.4c SAT-ACT Standard Setting and Conversion Tables</p> <p>See 6.4e CCRA Performance Level Ranges and Percentages webpage</p> <p>See CE 6.4g CCRA Performance Level Look-up Tables communication</p> <p>17 provides relevant evidence regarding the results of an evaluation of the interrelationship among subjects and reporting categories, internal structure, test reliability, classification consistency, and differential item functioning (DIF) of the ACT tests for English, Mathematics, Reading, and Science.</p>	<p>See Peer Comments for critical elements 2.1. and 3.1.</p> <p>ACT Evidence 02a provides a description of an alignment study that includes both the ACT and the SAT that shows similar patterns of alignment with the OK state standards.</p> <p>The overall quality of the ACT is addressed in critical elements 3.1 through 4.1. Content validity evidence (3.1) and evidence based on cognitive processes (3.2) are NOT well established for the ACT. Evidence based on internal structure (3.3) is strong for ELA and mathematics, assuming modeling and PHM are NOT reported as subscales. Evidence based on relations with other variables (3.4) was NOT reviewed for ACT in this review. Reliability (4.1) was acceptable at the overall content area level. It was low for some subscales on the ACT.</p> <p>Overall quality and production of valid and reliable academic achievement data on individuals and groups of students are NOT compared between the ACT tests and the SAT tests. Making these comparisons requires validity and reliability evidence for the SAT to compare with the evidence currently provided for the ACT.</p> <p>Evidence is needed of comparability between the ACT tests and the SAT tests (e.g., tables comparing reliability and validity coefficients for the tests, in addition to correlations between the two tests already provided). This evidence addresses whether the ACT tests are equivalent to – or more rigorous than - the SAT tests, with respect to the overall quality of assessment.</p> <p>Scores from the reading and mathematics tests of the ACT and SAT correlate around .88. This indicates equivalence</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 ACT Locally Selected

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>of content, to a certain degree. [ACT26]</p> <p>ACT results are expressed in terms consistent with the OK academic achievement standards. [CE6.2a]</p> <p>ACT Alignment Updates [ACT 3] address how items will be removed, revised, and/or added; the alignment of forms after the ACT revisions is not addressed.</p>
Section 7.3 Summary Statement		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of comparability between the ACT tests and the SAT tests (e.g., tables comparing reliability and validity coefficients for the tests, in addition to correlations between the two tests already provided). This evidence addresses whether the ACT tests are equivalent to – or more rigorous than - the SAT tests, with respect to the overall quality of assessment. 		

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