



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Salam Noor
Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction
Oregon Department of Education
255 Capitol Street NE
Salem, OR 97301

March 13, 2017

Dear Deputy Superintendent Noor:

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

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

- Reading/Language (R/LA) and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (Smarter Balanced). **Substantially meets requirements.**
- R/LA and mathematics general assessments in high school (Smarter Balanced). **Substantially meets requirements.**
- R/LA and mathematics alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) in grades 3-8 and high school (Oregon Extended Assessment (ORExt)). **Partially meets requirements.**
- Science AA-AAAS in grade bands 3-5, 6-8, and high school (ORExt). **Partially meets requirements.**

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

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

The components that **substantially meet requirements** meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. The Department expects that Oregon should be able to provide this additional information within one year.

The components that **partially meet requirements** do not meet a number of the requirements of the statute and regulations and ODE will need to provide substantial additional information to demonstrate it meets the requirements. The Department expects that ODE may not be able to submit all of the required information within one year.

The specific list of items required for ODE to submit is enclosed with this letter. Because some of the State's components have partially met the requirements, the Department is placing a condition on the State's Title I grant award related to those components of the assessment system. To satisfy this condition, ODE must submit satisfactory evidence to address the items identified in the enclosed list. ODE must submit a plan and timeline within 30 days outlining when it will submit all required additional documentation for peer review. The Department will also host regular (e.g., quarterly) progress calls with the State to discuss the State's progress on its timeline. If, following the peer review of the additional evidence, adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action. Additionally, the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) will monitor progress on matters pertaining to requirements in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) related to the participation of students with disabilities in Title I assessments. Insufficient progress to address such matters may lead OSERS to place a condition on ODE's IDEA Part B grant award.

The Department notes that ODE submitted a waiver request for assessing speaking that was approved on August 5, 2016, for the 2016–2017, 2017–2018, and 2018–2019 school years.

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

Thank you for your ongoing commitment to improving educational outcomes for all students. I look forward to our continued partnership as we move ahead with this critical work. I appreciate the work you are doing to improve your schools and provide a high-quality education for your students. If you have any questions, please contact Shauna Myers or Carol Manitaras of my staff at: OSS.Oregon@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

Monique M. Chism Ph.D
Acting Assistant Secretary
Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Dawne R. Huckaby, Assistant Superintendent for the Office of Teaching, Learning and Assessment

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

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
1.5 – Participation Data	<p>For the alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) in reading/language arts (R/LA), mathematics, and science, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation that provides the overall statewide participation in the State’s AA-AAAS for each subject.
2.1 – Test Design and Development	<p>For the ORExt R/LA, mathematics, and science AA-AAAS for all grades, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the targeted distribution of item difficulty by content domain for each grade-subject test. <p>For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the Smarter Balanced test design aligns the assessments to the full depth and breadth for all of the academic content standards in R/LA (including speaking) and mathematics at each grade level. [NOTE: Oregon has received a speaking waiver; therefore, the Department does not expect Oregon to submit additional evidence regarding speaking during the period of the waiver.] • Evidence that the item selection procedures for the computer adaptive test (CAT) online assessment adequately deliver tests that meet test design requirements for the intended depth of knowledge (DOK) of the assessments (also applies to evidence requested for element 2.2). • Evidence that, for cases where an assessment includes off-grade level content, assessments produce grade level student achievement scores that are based only on grade-level content items. • Evidence that the item pools for all versions of the assessments (i.e., general, American Sign Language, Braille and Spanish) are sufficient to support the test design requirements.
2.2 – Item Development	<p>For the ORExt R/LA, mathematics, and science assessments for all grades, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the procedures used to select and train test item writers. <p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See evidence regarding DOK and item pools in element 2.1 above.
2.3 – Test Administration	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of a comprehensive contingency plan to address possible technology challenges during test administration.
2.5 – Test Security	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of procedures to document testing irregularities (e.g., application of a data forensics program).

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	<p>For the ORExt R/LA, mathematics, and science assessments in all grades, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation consisting of detail on the number of raters reviewing alignment for each content standard (to provide context for summary judgments). • Evidence of the results of an independent alignment study. <p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence as noted for all item pools in element 2.1 above. • Evidence that Smarter Balanced assessments that include off-grade level content conform to the on-grade level blueprint for the assessment. • Evidence of alignment of sample test forms for grades 3, 4, 6, and 7 in R/LA and mathematics. • Evidence of plans to improve alignment of the tests.
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes	<p>For the ORExt R/LA, mathematics, and science assessments in all grades, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation to support the assertion that ORExt includes items at different levels of cognitive complexity (e.g., cognitive labs, synthesis of feedback from external item review).
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	<p>For the ORExt R/LA, mathematics, and science assessments in all grades, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that provides additional detail on calibration procedures and measurement model applied to document the internal structure of the test. • Evidence to support subdomain reporting such as correlations among subscores, disattenuated correlations among subscores, and examination of dimensionality. <p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that documents the internal structure of the tests using operational data.
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	<p>For the ORExt R/LA, mathematics, and science assessments in all grades, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State assessment scores are related to other variables (other than extended assessment scores), and • Evidence that clarifies the meaning of the correlations reported for each grade level within the Technical Report. <p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that better supports the relationship of Smarter Balanced assessments to other variables, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reports of analyses that demonstrate convergent relationships between State assessment results and measures other than test scores, such as performance criteria, including college- and career-readiness (e.g., college-enrollment rates; success in related entry-level, college

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>credit-bearing courses; post-secondary employment in jobs that pay living wages); OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reports of analyses that demonstrate positive correlations between State assessment results and other variables, such as academic characteristic of test takers (e.g., average weekly hours spent on homework, number of advanced courses taken); OR ○ Reports of analyses that show stronger positive relationships with measures of the same construct than with measures of different constructs; OR ○ Reports of analyses that show assessment scores at tested grades are positively correlated with teacher judgments of student readiness at entry in the next grade level.
4.1 – Reliability	<p>For the ORExt R/LA, mathematics, and science assessments in all grades, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evidence of reliability, specifically overall standard errors of measurement, as well as classification consistency and classification accuracy measures.
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility	<p>For the ORExt R/LA, mathematics, and science assessments in all grades, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Documentation including additional evidence of examination of differential item functioning by student groups. <p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evidence of estimated reliability for students receiving accommodations using operational data.
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum	<p>For the ORExt R/LA, mathematics, and science assessments in all grades, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evidence that the tests provide an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, e.g., conditional standard error of measurement (CSEM) curves and related information. <p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● See evidence regarding DOK and item pools in element 2.1 above.
4.4 – Scoring	<p>For the ORExt R/LA, mathematics, and science assessments in grades 3-8 and HS, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evidence of procedures related to scoring training to reduce rater bias and procedures for quality assurance of scoring (e.g., second scoring, score-behinds, other quality control measures to ensure accurate/appropriate score decisions). <p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evidence that Smarter Balanced has clear, unambiguous criteria, including minimum thresholds, to ensure and document inter-rater reliability for States that are conducting hand-scoring of Smarter

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>Balanced performance items.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of procedures related to scoring training to reduce rater bias and procedures for quality assurance of scoring (e.g., second scoring, score-behinds, other quality control measures to ensure accurate/appropriate score decisions).
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	<p>For the ORExt R/LA, mathematics, and science assessments in all grades, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence regarding year-to-year equating procedures and results (for years subsequent to 2014–2015). This evidence should provide detailed technical information on the method used to establish linkages and on the accuracy of equating functions.
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	<p>For the ORExt R/LA, mathematics, and science assessments in all grades, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation including descriptive statistics on students taking the various forms. Additional justification for the absence of empirical evidence to address the comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. Additional documentation of the item development procedures for converting items to Braille format (including the criteria that determined when and why to eliminate a given item). Additional detail about the design and development process for alternate versions. <p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of the design and development of the item pools used to support multiple versions of the assessments, specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> computer-adaptive in ASL (R/LA listening only, Math) computer-adaptive in Braille (R/LA, math), computer-based fixed form in Braille (math), paper in Braille (R/LA, Math) computer-adaptive in Spanish (math), and paper in Spanish (math). Evidence that item pools for these additional computer adaptive versions can support the adaptive test design.
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	<p>For the ORExt R/LA, mathematics, and science assessments in all grades, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that ODE has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its alternate assessment system.
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	<p>For the ORExt R/LA, mathematics, and science assessments in all grades, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of notification to parents that students participating in ORExt do not receive a regular high school diploma.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs	<p>For the ORExt R/LA, mathematics, and science assessments in grades 3-8 and HS, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation concerning the means by which the procedures to ensure inclusion of English Learners (ELs) is communicated to parents, including any evidence that communication about participation in ORExt is available in languages other than English. <p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of guidance regarding selection of the Spanish version of the Smarter Balanced assessments for English learners, and evidence of procedures for communication of this guidance to districts, schools, teachers, and parents.
5.3 – Accommodations	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmation that no accommodation tool in the Assessment Consortium Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines (UAAG) is excluded.
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	<p>For all ODE general and alternate assessments in grades 3-8 and HS, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence to ensure that monitoring includes determining that students with disabilities, students served under Section 504 plans and English Learners receive accommodations that are consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice.
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting	<p>For the ORExt R/LA, mathematics, and science assessments in grades 3-8 and HS, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of the technical soundness of the achievement standards-setting process (e.g., complete appendices from the Auditors Comprehensive Report, or minutes of discussion from a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting regarding standard setting results).
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	<p>For the ORExt R/LA, mathematics, and science assessments in all grades, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of professional judgement that the AA-AAS represent the highest achievement standards possible for students with significant cognitive disabilities.
6.4 – Reporting	<p>For all ODE general and alternate assessments in grades 3-8 and HS, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of the availability of, or capacity to produce, Braille reports or those in languages other than Spanish, upon request. Evidence that 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.

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

August 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS .	3
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students	3
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards	5
1.3 – Required Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only).....	6
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only).....	7
1.5 – Participation Data (reviewed by Department staff only).....	9
SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS	10
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	10
2.2 – Item Development.....	13
2.3 – Test Administration	15
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)	18
2.5 – Test Security	19
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....	21
SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....	23
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	23
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	25
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	26
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	27
SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER	28
4.1 – Reliability.....	28
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	29
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	31
4.4 – Scoring	33
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	35
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	36
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	38
SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS	39
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	39
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	42
5.3 – Accommodations.....	43
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	45
SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .	47
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students	47
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....	49
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	50
6.4 – Reporting.....	51

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all subjects</p> <p><u>General Assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence # OR 01 (State Board Minutes for Adoption of the Common Core State Standards) • Evidence # OR 02 (State Board Docket for Adoption of the Common Core State Standards) • Evidence # OR 03 (Common Core State Standards Adoption News Release) <p><u>Alternate Assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • App1.1 (<i>Essentialized Assessment Frameworks (EAFs) 2015-16 User Guide</i>) • App1.4A.2 (<i>Oregon Administrative Rules 581-022-0102</i>) 	<p>Oregon provided separate submissions for their assessment of the general student population (although this set of files includes information on the alternate assessment as well) and for their alternate assessment of students with significant cognitive disabilities (SWSCDs).</p> <p><u>General Assessment:</u> Under this section, the submission contains only a brief statement to the effect that Oregon adopted the CCSS in 2010. Three documents are referenced as evidence.</p> <p>The ODE notes that Science is not addressed in this Peer Review submission.</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> The submission takes the form of a document titled <i>2014-2015 Technical Report: Oregon’s Alternate Assessment Peer Review Document: Critical Elements 1-6</i>. Peers identified only App.1.4.A2 (which documents State adoption of SBAC, the framework of which is based on CCSS) as evidence that Oregon has formally adopted challenging academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science and—through alternative standards aligned with those standards—applied them to SWSCD as well as those students participating in the general assessment. The document intended as evidence, <i>The Essentialized Assessment Frameworks User Guide</i>, merely indicates that the EAFs were developed by Behavioral Research & Teaching (BRT) at the University of Oregon in concert with ODE. Peer reviewers were unable to find evidence of the formal adoption of the ESs by the State in the report or supporting documents submitted.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 1.1 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"> • Documentation of formal approval of alternate standards for SWSCD 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science specify what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school to succeed in college and the workforce; contain content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all three subjects</p> <p><u>General Assessment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence # OR 04 (ELA Standards) • Evidence #OR 05 (Math Standards) <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> No evidence directly provided</p> <p>Through secondary link provided, peer reviewers consulted OR <i>English Language Arts Essentialized Assessment Frameworks</i> ELA Essentialized Assessment Frameworks 2015</p>	<p><u>General Assessment:</u> Oregon notes their adoption of the CCSS in reading/language arts and mathematics in 2010 and indicates stakeholder involvement (teachers, administrators, college faculty, etc.) in the creation and review of those standards.</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> The submission (Index document) takes the form of a document titled <i>2014-2015 Technical Report: Oregon’s Alternate Assessment Peer Review Document: Critical Elements 1-6</i>. Peer reviewers would have found it helpful if the same name was used to refer to documents also referenced under the General Assessment Index document (or at least identified as being the same).</p> <p>This report indicates in a brief overview that the Oregon Extended Assessment (ORExt) was redesigned in 2014-15 and is aligned to new Essentialized Standards based on the CCSS. However, reviewers’ ability to evaluate this relationship was impeded by the fact that links in the report then referred to other links—among them, three files: one for ELA, one for Math, and one for Science. The file coded as providing evidence of this CE (App1.2_FordhamCCSSReview.pdf) does not appear relevant.</p>
<p>Section 1.2 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"> • Documentation of the relationship between the CCSS that underlies Oregon’s general assessment (SBAC) and the State’s alternative standards (ES) 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>1.3 – Required Assessments</p> <p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments (based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate academic achievement standards-AAAS) in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). 	<p>(OR.1.3) Oregon Department of Education’s Response: Oregon requires school districts to administer Oregon’s statewide general assessments (Smarter Balanced) in English language arts and mathematics annually at grades 3 – 8 and 11 during a statewide test window that runs from February through June. For students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, school districts are required to administer Oregon’s Extended Assessments (our alternate assessments) in English language arts and mathematics to eligible students annually during a statewide test window that runs from February through April. Evidence #OR-06 – 2015-16 Oregon Statewide Test Schedule provides the 2015-16 statewide test windows for both Smarter Balanced and the Oregon Extended Assessment administration by grade. As stated in Section 3 of OAR 581-022-0610 (Evidence #OR-07 – OAR 581-022-0610: Administration of State Tests), school districts must administer Oregon’s statewide assessments in accordance with the statewide test schedule.</p>	<p>Requirements met</p>
<p>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/>_x_ No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</p> <p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system; • For English learners (EL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment; ○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years. 	<p>(OR.1.4) Oregon Department of Education’s Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #OR-07 – OAR 581-022-0610: Administration of State Test • Evidence #OR-08 – 2015-16 Oregon Test Administration Manual • Evidence #OR-09 – 2015-16 Oregon Accessibility Manual • Evidence #OR-10 – House Bill 2655 • Evidence #OR-11—30-Day Notice for Oregon’s Statewide Assessments and Opt-out Letter • Evidence #OR-12—Executive Numbered Memorandum #003-2015-16 - Exemption from Statewide Summative Tests Update • Evidence #OR-59 – OAR 581-015-2260 	<p>Requirements met.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
x No additional evidence is required.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>1.5 – Participation Data</p> <p>The State’s participation data show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system. In addition, if the State administers end-of-course assessments for high school students, the State has procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates on each required assessment and provides the corresponding data.</p>	<p>(OR.1.5) Oregon Department of Education’s Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Evidence #OR-14 – Inclusion Rules for Accountability</i> • <i>Evidence #OR-51 – Subgroup Definitions for State Assessment Results</i> • <i>Evidence #OR-47 – Accountability Webpages (including State participation data)</i> 	<p>State provided evidence of appropriate disaggregation and participation reporting procedures and reports. Only item missing was assessment type of AA-AAAS.</p>
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u> </u>x<u> </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that indicates the overall statewide participation in the State’s AA-AAAS. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.1 – Test Design and Development</p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; • Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>General Assessment:</u> N/A</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 2.1 (<i>Oregon Extended Assessment Item Development Information & Specifications 2014-2015</i>) • Appendix 2.1.A (<i>Oregon Extended Assessment 2014-2015 Decisions Related to Scale Scores</i>) • Appendix 2.1.B (<i>Oregon Extended Assessment Test Blueprint 2015-2016</i>) • Appendix 2.1.C (<i>Oregon Extended Assessment Item Development Process</i>) 	<p><u>General Assessment:</u> Oregon indicates in their submission that evidence for this CE applies only to their Alternate Assessment since they have implemented the summative assessment component of the Smarter Balanced assessment system. For all factors (2.1-2.4) see the SBAC submission for additional evidence needed, based on peer review. In peer review notes for SBAC, reviewers ask that individual states provide evidence of a waiver to use SBAC due to the exclusion of Speaking (part of the domain of Speaking/Listening in the CCSS).</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> 2.1.1: The stated purpose of the Oregon Extended Assessment is to provide the state technically adequate student performance data to ascertain proficiency on grade level state content standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities. The results of the assessment are published at four performance levels: Level 1, Level 2, Level 3, and Level 4. Levels 3 and 4 denote a proficient level of performance, while Levels 1 and 2 denote performance that is not proficient. BRT and ODE developed a scaled score interpretation guide to assist stakeholders in interpreting the meaning of the scaled scores generated by the Oregon Extended Assessment, supported by the state's achievement level descriptors. This guidance is published in <i>Appendix 2.1A</i>.</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 OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>2.1.2: The State provides a test specifications document for the Oregon Extended Assessment (see <i>Appendix 2.1</i>). The document includes Oregon’s approach to reducing the depth, breadth, and complexity (RDBC) of grade level content standards, an overview of the essentialization process and Essentialized Assessment Frameworks documents, the planned test design for the Oregon Extended Assessment, test development considerations, sample test items, item specifications, and universal tools/designated supports/accommodations. The State also includes as evidence Appendix 2.1.B, a test blueprint document. Although this document outlines the distribution of items across domains, it does not provide detail on coverage of specific Essentialized Standards (identified in a resource not designated as evidence by the State—see comments under CE 1.1 above). It also does not provide the targeted distribution of item difficulty by domain.</p> <p>2.1.3: The test development process implemented for the Oregon Extended Assessment is conveyed in <i>Appendix 2.1C</i>. This includes detail on standard selection and validation, item development, item review, review of all Oregon teacher feedback and updating of items, and scaling and item selection.</p> <p>2.1.4: N/A</p>
Section 2.1 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"> • Documentation to address coverage/distribution within and across grade levels of all Essentialized Standards • A waiver to use SBAC due to the exclusion of speaking in the assessment • Additional evidence called for in the Smarter Balanced peer review • Documentation to address targeted distribution of item difficulty by domain 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.2 – Item Development</p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>General Assessment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence # OR 08 (2015-16 Oregon Test Administration Manual) • Evidence # OR 60 (Test Specifications and Blueprints) <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 2.2.1 (<i>Oregon Extended Assessment-Item Writer Trainings</i> [PowerPoint]) • Appendix 2.2.2 (<i>Part I-Vertical Scaling Plan</i>) • Appendix 2.2.3 (<i>Sample Items for the Oregon Extended Assessment</i>) 	<p><u>General Assessment:</u> Oregon indicates their use of the Smarter Balanced summative assessments, citing and including as evidence the SBAC test blueprints.</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> The item development process followed is elaborated in <i>Appendix 2.2.1</i>, which is the PowerPoint used in training all Oregon item writers. While the process is generally sound (particularly related to RDBC grade level standards), peer reviewers were unable to find evidence of training on/and attention to the specific Essentialized Standards. Perhaps this exists in a training manual not included in this submission.</p> <p>Although the Index document indicates that the pool of item writers included both content and special education experts, reviewers could find no detail supporting this assertion.</p> <p>A major concern to peer reviewers is that the item development process described and items that serve as illustrations suggest that ORExt is heavily dependent upon visual stimuli; the reviewer could find no evidence of other strategies for both presenting and responding to item response options besides picture cards. This is critical since among SWSCD are those with visual impairment from mild to severe.</p>
<p>Section 2.2 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"> • Documentation for 2.2 as indicated in the Peer Review Notes for SBAC • Additional detail to document item writer selection process and criteria • Evidence that training was sufficient in regard to writing items that capture accurately and fully the intent of ESs • An explanation of how item writers attend to the needs of students with visual impairment or a justification for limiting response option stimuli to 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
picture/word cards <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More detail and specific guidelines for item writers (e.g., information within a style guide) 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>General Assessment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence # OR 08 (2015-16 Test Administration Manual) • Evidence # OR 09 (2015-16 Oregon Accessibility Manual) • Evidence # OR 15 (2015-16 DTC Training Materials) • Evidence # OR 44 (2015 Oregon Extended Assessment Technical Report) • Evidence # OR 45 (2015 Oregon Extended Technical Report Appendices) <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 2.3A.1 (<i>Oregon Accessibility Manual</i> [Includes SBAC and ORExt]) • Appendix 2.3A.2 (<i>Accommodations Manual 2013-2014</i>) • Appendix 2.3A.3 (<i>Oregon Extended</i> [procedures for reducing depth, breadth, and complexity of items]) • Appendix 2.3B.1 (<i>Extended Assessment: Qualified Trainer Training 2014-15</i>) • Appendix 2.3B.2 (<i>Oregon Extended Assessment PowerPoint</i>) 	<p><u>General Assessment:</u> Oregon provides adequate evidence of communication of established procedures for administration of SBAC, including administration with accommodations (2.3.1). The State has also sufficiently documented procedures for training and monitoring the results of test administrators. Peers note, however, that Peer Review of the SBAC submission identified additional evidence that is needed.</p> <p>Oregon notes their adherence to SBAC processes; however, to provide coherence across assessment programs, these test administration protocols and policies have been incorporated into various customized Oregon documents (see in particular the 2015-16 Test Administration Manual and 2015-16 Oregon Accessibility Manual).</p> <p>Oregon adheres to Smarter Balanced technology requirements as described in SB.2.3.3 for the administration of the Smarter Balanced English language arts and mathematics assessments. These requirements are communicated to school districts through the publication of Oregon’s customized Test Administration Manual.</p> <p>The State has noted the need for an analysis of accommodated versus non-accommodated administrations in order to demonstrate that the provision of language accommodations is not providing any advantage to students with limited English proficiency, nor any disadvantage to other participants. The State notes that this type of analysis should be feasible once accommodations information is collected during data entry (planned for the 2016 administration of the Oregon Extended assessments).</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>2.3.3: Peer reviewers could find no evidence of contingency plans in place specifically in Oregon to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> Oregon has adequately documented their policies and procedures for standardized test administration of the Oregon Extended Assessment (for both 2.3.1 and 2.3.2); The State does not administer this assessment via technology at present, although piloting on tablet use is taking place.</p> <p>In the Extended Index document, Oregon provided detail to document the effectiveness of training, and noted that assessors had the greatest difficulty passing the Administrative assessments (69% passing on first attempt, with all passing on second attempt). The General Assessment Index Document includes detail to clarify that new assessors, or returning assessors who needed further training again in 2014-15, were required to pass five proficiencies with a score of 80% or higher. These five proficiencies were in Administration, Reading, Math, Writing, and Science. Returning QAs or QTs for the 2014-15 school year only needed to pass a Refresher Proficiency, again with a score of 80% or higher.</p> <p>Peer reviewers would encourage the State to continue to monitor and document performance of assessors after training, and for the State to consider examining live scoring performance in the context of Administrative training results.</p> <p>The State has acknowledged the need for additional research in various areas, including an analysis of accommodated versus non-accommodated administrations (see under General Assessment,</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		above).
Section 2.3 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"> • Additional evidence called for in the Smarter Balanced peer review • Contingency plans for technology challenges/failures for both, general 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 OREGON

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p>(OR.2.4) Oregon Department of Education’s Additional Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #OR-08 – 2015-16 Test Administration Manual • Evidence #OR-20 – Redacted Test Impropriety Log • Evidence #OR-21 Redacted Sample Letter of Final Determination <p>The ODE maintains a rigorous training system to support standardized test administration for the ORExt (AA-AAAS), located at https://or.k12test.com (secure website, but sample screens provided in submission)</p>	<p>Requirement met.</p>
<p>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u> </u>x_ No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.5 – Test Security</p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS</p> <p><u>General Assessment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #OR-08 (2015-16 Test Administration Manual) • Evidence #OR-15 (2015-16 DTC Training Materials) • Evidence #OR-20 (Redacted Test Impropriety Log) • Evidence #OR-21 (Redacted Sample Letter of Final Determination) <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> Appendix 1.4.2 (<i>Test Administration Manual 2014-2015</i>)</p>	<p><u>General Assessment:</u> For all factors under CE 2.5, Oregon adheres to the test security guidelines described in the SBAC submission. Test security requirements and protocols are communicated primarily through Oregon’s Test Administration Manual. Peers note, however, that Peer Review of the SBAC submission identified additional evidence that is needed.</p> <p>ODE tracks all reported test improprieties and irregularities in a log that captures critical information (e.g, reporting school district and school; the district test coordinator’s name; the impacted student(s)’ enrolled grade and SSID; the impacted test(s)’ grade, subject, and unique Result ID; the nature of the test impropriety, whether it was adult- or student-initiated, and the outcome).</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> 2.5.1: Test security policies and consequences for violation are addressed in the Test Administration Manual on an annual basis.</p> <p>2.5.2: The Test Administration Manual describes use of a localized monitoring system where school test coordinators oversee building-level administration by trained, Qualified Assessors, and report to centralized district test coordinators, who are then responsible for reporting any confirmed violations to ODE.</p> <p>However, this document focuses on the reporting of test irregularities, but not the <u>detection</u> of test irregularities, although examples of such irregularities are described. Peer reviewers were unable to find evidence of specific procedures for detection of test irregularities.</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 OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>2.5.3: The submission describes adequate procedures for remediation following test security incidents.</p> <p>2.5.4: The submission describes adequate procedures for investigation of test irregularities. The State notes that additional information regarding 2.5.3 and 2.5.4 can be located in the general assessment system Peer Review evidence submission.</p>
Section 2.5 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"> • Additional evidence called for in the Smarter Balanced peer review, specifically evidence of application of those aspects of the data forensics program for which Oregon has the requisite data to implement • Documentation of specific procedures for detection of test irregularities (e.g., monitoring by external trained staff) 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS</p> <p><u>General Assessment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence # OR 08 (Test Administration Manual) • Evidence # OR 52 (AIR Contract) • Evidence # OR 24 (Executive Numbered Memorandum HB2715) • Evidence # OR 25 (Executive Numbered Memo 005-2015-16) • Evidence # OR 28 (ODE Policy 581-101) • Evidence # OR 29 (ODE Policy 581-116) <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 2.6A (ORExt Grades 3-8 & 11 Secure Tests Guide) • Appendix 2.6B (ORExt Grades 3-8 & 11 Data Entry Guide) • Appendix 2.6C (Report Card Rating Policy and Manual) 	<p><u>General Assessment:</u></p> <p>2.6.1: Oregon indicates their adherence to the procedures for the protection of integrity of test materials and related materials described in the SBAC submission. Protocols are communicated to districts through the Test Administration Manual. ODE communicates to school districts about test security protocols through its Test Administration Manual. ODE’s contract with its test vendor for Smarter Balanced, the American Institutes for Research (AIR) also indicates requirements for vendor handling of secure test data.</p> <p>Peers note that Peer Review of the SBAC submission identified additional evidence that is needed.</p> <p>2.6.2:</p> <p>Oregon indicates adherence to SBAC procedures as well designed to protect student privacy and confidentiality. Additional evidence is provided related to handling of student data by various parties (volunteers, employees, contractors, etc.). Peers note that Peer Review of the SBAC submission identified additional evidence that is needed.</p> <p>2.6.3: Oregon indicates adherence to SBAC procedures documented in that submission. Various State documents are provided as additional evidence. The State indicates that it does not report achievement for groups of students with 5 or fewer members, and it suppresses achievement data when the percentage of students meeting standard is above 95% or below 5%. The State notes that these two rules ensure that individual student results will be masked when data is reported by ODE.</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 OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u></p> <p>2.6.1: Adequate evidence is provided that test materials are maintained via secure file servers (password-protected) managed by BRT at University of Oregon. A secure platform is used for item reviews. For the 2014-2015 school year, all secure test distribution and data entry was hosted by the secure website used for training and proficiency testing.</p> <p>2.6.2: Student level data is adequately protected by relevant training and through a secure data system in which all data entry is conducted online using password-protected, secure procedures. Only trained users with a vested educational interest who have signed test security agreements are authorized to access online data entry systems.</p> <p>2.6.3: All confidential, personally identifiable student information is protected by policy and supported by training. The State provides detail on minimum numbers required for reporting subgroups.</p> <p>Peer reviewers note that the State has indicated that additional information regarding test security is located in the general assessment system evidence submission; thus, the same considerations regarding reliance on the SBAC submission should be addressed.</p>
Section 2.6 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"> • Additional evidence called for in the Smarter Balanced peer review 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>General Assessment:</u> N/A</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> Appendix 3.1A (Linkage Study 2014-2015) Appendix 3.1B (Distributed Item Review)</p> <p>Appendix 2.1B provides additional evidence (although not designated as evidence for this CE by the State)</p>	<p><u>General Assessment:</u> The State has not submitted an Index Document nor identified evidence for this Critical Element (all factors). Peer reviewers therefore direct the State to the peer review of the SBAC submission for needed additional evidence. Reviewers would have liked for the State to have included an Index document for this and other Critical Elements for which they had no additional evidence, simply stating that fact, in order to avoid confusion/concern over missing files.</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> 3.1.1: The State refers to their alternate assessment item development process as primary evidence of adequate alignment between their academic standards and ESs. The test blueprint (Appendix 2.1B) indicates coverage at the domain level, but not at the standard level. Peer reviewers note that resources available by links provided in other evidence (rather than for this CE) indicate without explanation some limits in the range of standards addressed. In addition, without indicating the number of raters assigned to review the alignment between CCSS and ES, the State’s definition of adequate linkage (score of 1 or 2 by two raters) is impossible to evaluate (see p. 40 of BRT Technical Report).</p> <p>Of concern to peer reviewers is the lack of external evidence of alignment, since the ORExt alignment study was overseen by the same party that developed the ES based on the CCSS.</p> <p>3.1.2: From the evidence provided, peer reviewers are unable to confirm adequate linkage of AAS (ES) to the State’s academic content standards (CCSS). The ELA and Math Essentialized Assessment</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>Frameworks 2015 should be included as evidence. Test items are designed to address different levels of cognitive complexity deemed suitable for SWSCD (remember, understand, apply).</p> <p>Peer reviewers needed to see more detail on actual test administration of the ORExt, including elaboration on the four levels of support mentioned in the Index Document (p. 37). Reviewers were unable to find detail on response mode (physical, verbal/non-verbal oral, eye gaze, etc.) that might impact evaluation of technical quality and other CEs.</p>
Section 3.1 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"> • Additional evidence called for in the Smarter Balanced peer review • For the Alternate Assessment, more specific detail on number of raters reviewing alignment for each content standard (to provide context for summary judgments) • External evaluation of alignment 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>General Assessment:</u> N/A</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> No resources to supplement Technical Report provided as support for this CE</p>	<p><u>General Assessment:</u> The State has not submitted an Index Document nor identified evidence for this Critical Element (all factors). Peer reviewers therefore direct the State to the peer review of the SBAC submission for needed additional evidence.</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> The State provides evidence of attention to different levels of cognitive complexity in the development of items for ORExt, and points to the comprehensive item development and review process as evidence that ORExt items are tapping into intended cognitive processes. Peer reviewers would like to see this assertion supported with additional evidence.</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"> • Additional evidence called for in the Smarter Balanced peer review • Additional evidence to support the assertion that ORExt includes items at different levels of cognitive complexity (e.g., cognitive labs, synthesis of feedback from external item 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 OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>General Assessment:</u> N/A</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> No resources to supplement Technical Report provided as support for this CE</p>	<p><u>General Assessment:</u> The State has not submitted an Index Document nor identified evidence for this Critical Element (all factors). Peer reviewers therefore direct the State to the peer review of the SBAC submission for needed additional evidence.</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> Evidence provided is missing details on calibration procedures/software and measurement model applied.</p> <p>Given that subscores are reported, there needs to be an explanation of what the “RIT Correlations” on page 59 of the Technical Report represent.</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"> • Additional evidence called for in the Smarter Balanced peer review • Additional detail on calibration procedures and measurement model applied • Additional evidence to support subdomain reporting including correlations among subscores, disattenuated correlations among subscores, and examination of dimensionality 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>General Assessment:</u> N/A</p> <p><u>Alternative Assessment:</u> No resources to supplement Technical Report provided as support for this CE</p>	<p><u>General Assessment:</u> The State has not submitted an Index Document nor identified evidence for this Critical Element (all factors). Peer reviewers therefore direct the State to the peer review of the SBAC submission for needed additional evidence.</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> The State reports results of correlation analysis within and across subject areas (reading/ELA, mathematics, science). While the State took the “first step” by examining inter-test correlations between tests of different subject areas, relationships with other variables need to be documented as per the CE to provide criterion-related validity evidence (e.g., math to math).</p> <p>There is not enough technical information to explain the correlations on pages 58-59 of the Technical Report. For example, what are the “RIT Correlations”?</p>
<p>Section 3.4 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"> • Additional evidence called for in the Smarter Balanced peer review • Documentation of evidence of relationships with variables other than extended assessment tests • A technical explanation of correlations on pages 58-59 of the Technical Report 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.1 – Reliability</p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>General Assessment:</u> N/A</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> Only one supplementary source of evidence provided (Appendix 4.1B [History of ORExt 2016]); not clearly applicable to this CE factor.</p>	<p><u>General Assessment:</u> The State has not submitted an Index Document nor identified evidence for this Critical Element (all factors). Peer reviewers therefore direct the State to the peer review of the SBAC submission for needed additional evidence.</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u></p> <p>4.1.1: Some reliabilities appear to be unacceptably low, particularly for a high-stakes assessment. However, peers acknowledge that this may be typical of assessments of SWSCD. Any documentation that this is in fact the case or a justification would be useful.</p> <p>4.1.2: Conditional but not overall standard error of measurement has been provided.</p> <p>4.1.3: Relevant statistics were not provided (classification consistency measures and classification accuracy measures).</p> <p>4.1.4: N/A</p>
<p>Section 4.1 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"> • Additional evidence called for in the Smarter Balanced peer review • Overall standard errors of measurement • Classification consistency measures and classification accuracy measures 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>General Assessment:</u> N/A</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u></p> <p>Appendix 4.2 (<i>Fall Membership Report, ORExt Technical Report</i>); not clear how this connects, since it’s not cross-referenced in Technical Report that serves as submission for the State’s alternate assessment.</p>	<p><u>General Assessment:</u> The State has not submitted an Index Document nor identified evidence for this Critical Element (all factors). Peer reviewers therefore direct the State to the peer review of the SBAC submission for needed additional evidence.</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> The State has documented their bias and sensitivity review procedures during item development. To address accessibility, BRT conducted analyses to compare average performance by students in different disability categories.</p> <p>Peer reviewers noted the acknowledgement in the BRT Technical Report that “some students may not be appropriately participating in the ORExt, as evidenced by the percentages of students who have SLD or CD participating in the ORExt. This concern has led to a revision of the eligibility criteria used by IEP teams to make test participation decisions in Oregon for the 2015-16 school year.” More information (e.g., what criteria had been used, what follow-up to confirm or correct those decisions was conducted, what new/revised criteria are) is needed.</p> <p>While the report included a comment about the student-item match for ELA (pointing to the need for more challenging items), there is no comment related to mathematics, where the reverse appears to be the case.</p> <p>The peer reviewers note the need for the State to examine differential item functioning by student groups.</p>
<p>Section 4.2 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 OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional evidence called for in the Smarter Balanced peer review • More detail on eligibility criteria that had been used by IEP teams to make test participation decisions, and evidence that new/ revised criteria are likely to address flaws in such decisions • Evidence of examination of differential item functioning by student groups 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>General Assessment:</u> N/A</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> No resources to supplement Technical Report provided as support for this CE</p>	<p><u>General Assessment:</u> The State has not submitted an Index Document nor identified evidence for this Critical Element (all factors). Peer reviewers therefore direct the State to the peer review of the SBAC submission for needed additional evidence.</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> The State cites the decreased percentages of zero scores across all content areas as evidence of increased access to the assessment by the majority of students, but notes that there remains a subgroup of students who cannot access an academic assessment with RDBC at low-medium-high difficulty. ODE has therefore commissioned BRT to design and implement an observational rating scale for this group of very low-performing students, called the Oregon Observational Rating Assessment (ORora) for the spring 2016 administration. The ORora will target communication (expressive and receptive) and basic skills. Peers concur that this should provide data on that student cohort.</p> <p>Peer reviewers would have found valuable a fuller report of item reviewers’ feedback on items that provide more detail on the adequacy of ORExt to address the full performance continuum. Sample comments suggest that reviewers’ insights/observations would be a useful data source.</p> <p>Peer reviewers wonder why the report did not cite the standard errors across levels (which are included elsewhere in the Technical Report) as evidence that the tests are appropriate for students across the full performance continuum. This is a reasonable expectation in reporting. Furthermore, peers expected to see conditional standard error of measurement curves.</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 OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 4.3 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"> • Additional evidence called for in the Smarter Balanced peer review • Conditional standard error of measurement curves and tabulated information 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>General Assessment:</u> N/A</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> No resources to supplement Technical Report provided as support for this CE; resources identified under other CEs include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 2.3 (<i>Oregon Extended Assessment Administration Manual</i>) • Appendix 2.3B.10 (<i>Consequential Validity Study</i>) • Appendix 6.4C (<i>Individual Student Reports</i>) • Appendix 2.1.A (<i>Oregon Extended Assessment 2014-2015 Decisionmaking Related to Scaled Scores</i>) 	<p><u>General Assessment:</u> The Index document provided by Oregon indicates the State’s adherence to all the standardized test scoring procedures and protocols established by SBAC, as described in their submission. Peer reviewers therefore direct the State to the peer review of the SBAC submission for needed additional evidence.</p> <p>Oregon notes that they provided de-identified operational scored test record at the examinee and item level to SBAC for the purpose of Consortium-level research/reporting.</p> <p>In the SBAC submission, the account of scoring processes includes a statement to the effect that MI employs many experienced readers and recruits new ones. This general statement should be substantiated with detail relevant to the scoring of the State’s assessment (e.g., how many experienced raters were engaged in scoring the assessment, what kind of previous scoring experience had they had).</p> <p>MI uses three formats for training: in-person training, distance webinar training with a live trainer, and remote self-training. It would be helpful to know what analyses have been done—if any—to compare performance (both in training and live scoring) of raters trained under those different conditions.</p> <p>Anonymity of students whose responses are being scored is only one way to reduce/eliminate bias. More information on features of training that attend to reduction in rater bias is advisable.</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> Scoring procedures are described in a general way (students receiving a 0 for an incorrect response or a 1 for a correct response),</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 OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>and the State refers to input from the field gathered from review of a Consequential Validity study that demonstrates that the assessment scoring procedures are much more clear and easier to implement.</p> <p>The Technical Report notes that BRT was also commissioned to develop a scaled score interpretation guide.</p> <p>Peer reviewers were unable to find any documentation of scoring training procedures or means of monitoring/confirming or correcting trained raters' scores. Unlike handscoring of the general assessment, which has numerous procedures for ensuring reasonable consistency/accuracy rates among raters, there do not appear to be any procedures in place for score-behinds or means of quality control for trained raters' score decisions during the administration of the ORExt.</p>
Section 4.4 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"> • Additional evidence called for in the Smarter Balanced peer review • Further detail related to (i) the qualifications of raters (specific previous scoring experience), (ii) evidence of analyses of performance of raters under different training conditions used in scoring, and (iii) evidence that training includes strategies to reduce rater bias • Documentation of scoring training procedures and means of monitoring/confirming or correcting trained raters' scores (e.g., second scoring, score-behinds, other quality control measures to ensure accurate/appropriate score decisions) 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>General Assessment:</u> N/A</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> No resources to supplement Technical Report provided as support for this CE</p>	<p><u>General Assessment:</u> The State has not submitted an Index Document nor identified evidence for this Critical Element (all factors). Peer reviewers therefore direct the State to the peer review of the SBAC submission for needed additional evidence.</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> The State indicates that ORExt was administered in multiple test forms (five forms for Grades 3-5, four forms for Grades 6-8, and three forms for Grade 11) in 2014-15 as part of their oversampling approach to operational field testing (to ensure that only appropriately functioning items were used for accountability reports and standard setting). The State used a balanced vertical scaling design to ensure that performance across forms/grades could be mapped to the same measurement scale (see Appendix 2.2.2, not 2.2.1 as referenced in the Technical Report). According to the Technical Report that serves as the Index document for ORExt, future administrations will include only one form.</p> <p>Peer reviewers noted that the State provided a vertical scaling design but did not provide follow-up statistics on student performance across forms to adequately address comparability across forms or evaluate the scale itself. Peers also recommend that the estimation software and method be specified.</p>
<p>Section 4.5 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"> • Additional evidence called for in the Smarter Balanced peer review • Follow-up statistics on student performance across forms • Empirical evidence supporting the use of a vertical scale 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>General Assessment:</u> N/A</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> No resources to supplement Technical Report provided as support for this CE</p>	<p><u>General Assessment:</u> The State has not submitted an Index Document nor identified evidence for this Critical Element (all factors). Peer reviewers therefore direct the State to the peer review of the SBAC submission for needed additional evidence.</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> The State indicates that ORExt is provided in standard format but is also available in large print and Braille formats (in which they assert that test content is identical across all three versions, with an occasional item being eliminated on the Braille version due to inaccessibility).</p> <p>Peer reviewers are unable to evaluate BRT’s statement that substantive test comparability analyses are not appropriate given the small <i>n</i>-sizes of the samples involved in the alternative versions, because they do not know what those <i>n</i>-sizes are. It would have been useful for the Technical Report to include actual numbers of students taking different versions of the assessment, even if the numbers are small.</p> <p>Peer reviewers were unable to find documentation of item development procedures for converting items to Braille format, including the criteria that determined when and why to eliminate a given item.</p> <p>4.6.1: Given the heavy dependence upon visual stimuli for the assessment (both for items and response options), more detail about the design and development process for alternate versions is needed.</p> <p>4.6.2: Based on the information provided, peer reviewers were unable to determine if the omission of empirical comparability studies is defensible.</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 OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 4.6 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"> • Additional evidence called for in the Smarter Balanced peer review • Descriptive statistics on students taking the various forms • A more thorough justification for the absence of empirical evidence to address CE 4.6.2 • Documentation of item development procedures for converting items to Braille format, including the criteria that determined when and why to eliminate a given item • More detail about the design and development process for alternate versions 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>General Assessment:</u> N/A</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> No resources to supplement Technical Report provided as support for this CE</p>	<p><u>General Assessment:</u> The State has not submitted an Index Document nor identified evidence for this Critical Element (all factors). Peer reviewers therefore direct the State to the peer review of the SBAC submission for needed additional evidence.</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> The ORExt technical analyses that document reliability and validity are included in this technical report (see <i>Sections 3 and 4</i>, respectively). ODE and BRT staff reviews these analyses annually. Necessary adjustments to the assessment are determined prior to implementation of the subsequent year's work plan, which elaborates the areas of improvement as well as aspects of the testing program that will be maintained. This decision-making is supported by input from the field gathered from the Consequential Validity study (see <i>Appendix 2.3B.10</i>).</p> <p>However, peer reviewers find additional, regular external oversight missing. For example, peer reviewers could find no evidence of involvement by a TAC as support in monitoring, maintaining, and improving the technical quality of the alternate assessment. If this is an omission, peers would like to see documentation. If no TAC exists for the Alternate Assessment, the State should consider the advisability of such a resource.</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"> • Additional evidence called for in the Smarter Balanced peer review • Documentation of some source of external oversight addressing this CE 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards; • States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs; • Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment; • Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities; • Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities; • Includes instructions that students eligible to be 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS</p> <p><u>General Assessment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence # OR 08 (2015-16 Test Administration Manual) • Evidence # OR 09 (2015-16 Oregon Accessibility Manual) <p>In addition, for: 5.1.2: Evidence # OR 33 (Oregon IEP)</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 5.1B (<i>Oregon Extended Assessment Decision Making Guidance</i>) • Appendix 2.3A.1 (<i>Oregon Accessibility Manual</i>)/ same as Evidence #OR 09 	<p><u>General Assessment:</u> Oregon indicates adherence to the SBAC Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodation Guidelines as described in the SBAC submission. Peer reviewers therefore direct the State to the peer review of the SBAC submission for needed additional evidence.</p> <p>To provide coherence in accessibility support, the State has incorporated SBAC protocols and policies into customized Oregon documents (see evidence). Both documents include SBAC protocols as well as others specific to Oregon.</p> <p>5.1.1: Oregon provides and articulates criteria for participation in assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards (OR 08).</p> <p>5.1.2: The State has provided adequate evidence that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities are made by student’s IEP Team.</p> <p>5.1.3: Oregon adheres to the procedures as described in the SBAC submission under this factor for CE 5.1.</p> <p>5.1.4: Oregon asserts the availability of the Universal Tools, Designated Supports, and Accommodations described in the SBAC submission under this factor for CE 5.1.</p> <p>5.1.5: Oregon indicates adherence to the SBAC Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines to provide guidance on selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities.</p> <p>5.1.6-5.1.8: Addressed in BRT Technical Report</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments); • The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum. 		<p>(Extended Assessment Index Document) and supporting resources.</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u></p> <p>5.1.1: See above.</p> <p>5.1.2: The IEP team must address the eligibility criteria for participation in the Oregon Extended Assessment before determining that the assessment is the appropriate option (see <i>Extended Assessment Evidence Documents, Appendix 5.1B</i>).</p> <p>5.1.3: IEP teams make decisions regarding how students with disabilities participate in the Oregon statewide assessment program. At present, students participate in one of these two options: (a) student takes the general assessment with or without accessibility supports, or (b) student takes the Oregon Extended Assessment. Guidelines for these determinations are provided in the supporting evidence.</p> <p>5.1.4: The State provides adequate information to address this factor for SWSCD.</p> <p>5.1.5: The State provides adequate evidence that guidance regarding appropriate accommodations is provided as appropriate.</p> <p>5.1.6: ODE’s eligibility guidelines make it clear that all SWDs are eligible for the ORExt, regardless of disability category, and that specific disability category membership should not be a determining factor for considering participation.</p> <p>5.1.7: The State provides evidence that parents are informed about the nature of ORExt as an alternate assessment and the instructional implications of 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 OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>program. However, peer reviewers could find no evidence that the consequences of participating in the alternate assessment are explained to parents (e.g., that their child will not receive a regular high school diploma). Peers did note that the modified diploma is mentioned in the Administration Manual—but this is not available as an information source for parents.</p> <p>5.1.8: The State cites linkage study results as evidence of linkage between ORExt and the CCSS. See concerns raised earlier regarding adequacy of coverage of the full range of standards as appropriate for SWSCD.</p>
<p>Section 5.1 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 of notification to parents that students participating in ORExt do not receive a regular high school diploma 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS</p> <p><u>General Assessment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence # OR 08 (2015-16 Test Administration Manual) • Evidence # OR 09 (2015-16 Oregon Accessibility Manual) <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> no additional evidence that is applicable to 5.2</p>	<p><u>General Assessment:</u> For all factors under this CE, Oregon indicates adherence to the SBAC Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodation Guidelines as described in the SBAC submission. Peer reviewers therefore direct the State to the peer review of the SBAC submission for needed additional evidence and cite as further evidence the customized Oregon documents that incorporate those guidelines/ protocols as well as protocols for other statewide assessments as well, including ORExt (for SWSCD).</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment</u> (all factors grouped in Index; not addressed separately): The State indicates that although the ORExt is currently published in English, an appropriately qualified interpreter can provide the assessment to any SWSCD from diverse language backgrounds, including American Sign Language. The Index cites a training module to increase the standardization of ASL administration for its statewide assessments and provides a link, but access is restricted and thus peer reviewers were unable to examine the content of that training. Peers were unable to determine the relevance of evidence cited to this CE (App. 1.4 and App. 1.4.1).</p>
<p>Section 5.2 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"> • Additional evidence called for in the SB peer review. Oregon peer reviewers believe it would be sufficient to indicate in the Usability and Accessibility guidelines that the Guidelines pertain to all students, including ELs • Evidence of means by which the procedures to ensure inclusion of ELs is communicated to parents, including any evidence that communication is available in languages other than English 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities (SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS;</p> <p><u>General Assessment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence # OR 08 (2015-16 Test Administration Manual) Evidence # OR 09 (2015-16 Oregon Accessibility Manual) Appendix 2.3.A.1 in Extended Assessment Evidence Documents <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix 2.3.A.1 (Oregon Accessibility Manual, pp. 36-40 and Appendix E) 	<p><u>General Assessment:</u> For all factors under this CE, Oregon indicates adherence to the SBAC Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodation Guidelines as described in the SBAC submission. Peer reviewers therefore direct the State to the peer review of the SBAC submission for needed additional evidence. The SBAC review calls for confirmation from States that no accommodation tool in the SBAC UAAG is excluded.</p> <p>The State cites as further evidence the customized Oregon documents that incorporate those guidelines/protocols as well as protocols for other statewide assessments as well, including ORExt (for SWSCD).</p> <p>For all factors/sub-factors, see under Alternate Assessment, below.</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> All statewide accommodation guidance is published in the Accessibility Manual, which outlines the universal tools and designated supports, available to all students, and accommodations, available only to students with disabilities or students served by Section 504 Plans. In addition, the manual defines the supports as embedded, where they are essentially provided by the online test engine, e.g., calculator, text-to-speech (not relevant to ORExt), or non-embedded, where they must be provided by a qualified assessor (e.g., read aloud, scribe). The manual also makes it clear that these supports are content-area specific, as a universal tool in one content area may be an accommodation in another.</p> <p>5.3.1: The State provides adequate evidence to address this factor for CE 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 OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>5.3.2: The State provides adequate evidence to address this factor for CE 5.3. Of particular note is the annual review of the appropriateness of supports and a process for requesting an additional accommodation.</p> <p>5.3.3: The State provides adequate evidence to address this factor for CE.5.3. Of particular note is the State's plan by spring 2017 to collect specific accommodations codes for the ORExt in order to make performance comparisons feasible.</p> <p>5.3.4: ODE has a formal process stakeholders can use to request accommodations that are not already published in the Accessibility Manual (see Appendix 2.3A.1, Appendix E, p. 109-11).</p>

Section 5.3 Summary Statement

No additional evidence is required or

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Additional evidence called for in the Smarter Balanced peer review
- Confirmation by the State that no accommodation tool in the SBAC UAAG is excluded

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS;</p> <p><u>General Assessment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence # OR 08 (2015-16 Test Administration Manual) • Evidence # OR 09 (2015-16 Oregon Accessibility Manual) <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> N/A</p>	<p><u>General Assessment:</u> For all factors under this CE, Oregon indicates adherence to the SBAC Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodation Guidelines as described in the SBAC submission (captured in customized State documents covering all statewide assessments that are offered as evidence). Peer reviewers therefore direct the State to the peer review of the SBAC submission for needed additional evidence.</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> The Extended Assessment Index document indicates that this CE is elaborated within the general assessment Index document and is therefore not addressed separately.</p> <p>However, peer reviewers were unable to find any evidence under the general assessment as referenced in the Extended Assessment Index document that there is monitoring to ensure fidelity to test administration procedures in terms of assignment of correct scores by QAs on ORExt or any process for confirming/correcting spot-checked scores as a result of monitoring (See CE 4.4)</p> <p>Peer reviewers wish to point out that the SBAC submission omitted original factor 5.4.3 (Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice) and instead, labeled factor 5.4.4 as 4.4.3 and labeled factor 5.4.5 as factor 5.4.4. Both SBAC and all State partners should ensure that their submissions address this factor— bearing in mind that CE 5.4 is primarily a state responsibility.</p>
<p>Section 5.4 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 OREGON

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"> Documentation that the State monitors compliance with all factors, including original factor 5.4.3 as noted above 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; • The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>General Assessment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence # OR 37 (State Board Minutes for Adoption of SB Achievement Standards) • Evidence # OR 38 (State Board Docket for Adoption of SB Achievement Standards) • Evidence # OR 39 (State Board Adoption of the SB Achievement Standards News Release) • Evidence # OR 42 (State Board Actions from June 2015 Meeting-Adoption of Alternate Achievement Standards) • Evidence # OR 43 (State Board Docket for Adoption of Alternate Achievement Standards) • Evidence #OR 40 (Alternate Mathematics Achievement Standards) • Evidence # OR 41 (Alternate ELA Achievement Standards) <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 6.1.A.1 (State Board of Education agenda June 25, 2015—adoption of alternate achievement standards) • Appendix 6.1.A.2 (Alternate Achievement Standards, ELA) 	<p><u>General Assessment:</u></p> <p>6.1.1: Oregon indicates State Board adoption of the achievement standards set by SBAC (Evidence # OR 39).</p> <p>6.1.2: The State provides adequate evidence that it applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students, with the exception of SWSCD, for whom alternate achievement standards apply.</p> <p>6.1.3: The State provides adequate evidence of the adoption of achievement standards and achievement level descriptors (four levels) for their general assessment.</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u></p> <p>6.1.1: Oregon provides evidence of the adoption of alternate academic achievement standards to apply to Oregon’s Extended Assessment (for SWSCD) in ELA and Mathematics, Grades 3-8 and HS (App. 6.1.A.1).</p> <p>6.1.2: Oregon applies alternate academic achievement standards for SWSCD.</p> <p>6.1.3: The State provides adequate evidence of the adoption of alternate academic achievement standards and achievement level descriptors (four levels) for their alternate assessment.</p> <p>The needed evidence to address the Alternate Assessment was provided/referred to in the General Assessment Index Documents and Evidence; peer reviewers were puzzled as to why that evidence was</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 OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		not referenced in the Extended Assessment Index Document or included among Evidence files to be consistent with the rest of the submission.

<p>Section 6.1 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"> •

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>General Assessment:</u> none</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> Appendix 6.2.2 (Auditor’s Comprehensive Report)</p>	<p><u>General Assessment:</u> Oregon asserts adherence to the achievement standard setting process and protocols established for SBAC, as described in their submission. No additional evidence was required of SBAC for this CE.</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> The State identifies a method and a nine-step process that was implemented for standard setting for the Alternate Assessment based on Hambleton & Pitoniak (2006) as reported R.L. Brennan’s <i>Educational Measurement</i>, 4th Edition (pp. 433-470). Panelists selected had appropriate experience in teaching special education or content area expertise, including 76% with some experience with SWSCD. However, there is no detail to indicate if any panelists had prior experience setting academic achievement standards.</p> <p>Peer reviewers were unable to adequately evaluate this CE because essential information, referenced the Table of Contents of the Auditor’s Comprehensive Report was not in fact included in the version of this document included as part of the State’s submission.</p>
<p>Section 6.2 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"> • Appendices A-O from the Auditor’s Comprehensive Report OR minutes from a TAC meeting (if held) where confirmation of technical soundness is provided 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>General Assessment:</u> N/A</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> no additional sources of evidence; however, Index Document refers to Appendix 3.1.A (Oregon Extended Assessment Linkage Study)</p>	<p><u>General Assessment:</u> The State has not submitted an Index Document nor identified evidence for this Critical Element (all factors). In the absence of any statement by Oregon that they are adhering to policies/practice of SBAC for evidence to support this CE, peer reviewers cannot refer to that submission in regard to the general assessment, although they are aware that SBAC has indicated that the Consortium provided the evidence that could be reasonably expected of them at this early stage in the program. This CE should be addressed more fully as the program develops.</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u> The State provides adequate evidence of linkage between alternate academic achievement standards and the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards. Peer reviewers would like to see more evidence, however, of professional judgment that these are the highest achievement standards possible for SWSCD (especially in light of teacher comments about the need for items at higher level of demand/cognitive complexity).</p>
<p>Section 6.3 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 professional judgment that these are the highest achievement standards possible for SWSCD 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.4 – Reporting</p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration; • The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results; • The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement; ○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors); ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; ○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>General Assessment:</u></p> <p>6.4.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence # OR 50 (How to Read Report Cards) • Evidence # OR 55 (Student Centered Staging Webinar) • Evidence # OR 56 (How to Read Report Card Ratings) • Evidence # OR 57 (Sample School Details Report) • Evidence # OR 58 (Sample School Report Card) <p>6.4.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence # OR 14 (Inclusion Rules for Accountability) • Evidence OR 49 (2014-15 Assessment Reporting Schedule) • Evidence # OR 50 (How to Read Report Cards) • Evidence # OR 54 (Assessment & Accountability Checklist) • Evidence # OR 55 (Student Centered Staging Webinar) • Evidence # OR 56 (How to Read a Report Card) • Evidence # OR 57 (Sample School Details Report) • Evidence # OR 58 (Sample School Report Card) <p>6.4.3:</p>	<p><u>General Assessment:</u> Adequate evidence is provided that the State reports assessment results in timely and appropriate ways to various constituencies (and in multiple languages).</p> <p>6.4.1: Adequate evidence is provided.</p> <p>6.4.2: Oregon publishes, besides school and district report cards and rating details, resources for parents, teachers, principals, and district administrators in interpretation and appropriate use of results.</p> <p>6.4.3: The State adequately provides for the production and delivery of individual student reports that meet nearly all CE factor 6.4.3 sub-criteria. However, peer reviewers were unable to find evidence of the availability of, or capacity to produce, Braille reports or those in languages other than Spanish.</p> <p>6.4.4: The State provides adequate evidence of a process to ensure that reports are produced and available in a timely fashion.</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u></p> <p>6.4.1: Adequate evidence is provided that assessment results for SWSCD are reported to the public, following the policy to not report subgroup results when these results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student, and following the calculation that the number of students in the subgroup must meet the minimum cell size requirement for each AMO decision: participation, achievement in English language arts and math, attendance, and graduation, where appropriate.</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 OREGON

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence # OR 44 (Redacted Individual Student Report) <p>6.4.4: Evidence # OR 27 (State policy 581-022-1670 on Individual Student Assessment, Recordkeeping, Grading, and Reporting) Evidence # OR 49 (2014-15 Assessment Reporting Schedule)</p> <p><u>Alternate Assessment:</u></p> <p>6.4.1: No additional documents provided under this CE, but the Index Document references Appendix 2.6C</p> <p>6.4.2: Appendix 6.4C (Sample Student Report)</p> <p>6.4.3: No additional documents provided under this CE, but the Index Document references the following: Section 4.4 and Appendix 6.4.C Appendix 2.1A</p> <p>6.4.4: No evidence identified by State</p>	<p>6.4.2: Adequate evidence is provided that Oregon develops and disseminates individual student data upon final determination of accuracy.</p> <p>6.4.3: The State documents the production and delivery of student reports that provide valid and reliable information regarding achievement on the assessments relative to the AAS. However, peer reviewers could find no evidence of the availability of, or capacity to produce, Braille reports or those in languages other than Spanish (although there is a statement in the Index that “district representatives can translate results for parents as necessary”).</p> <p>6.4.4: Not addressed in the Index Document for the Alternate Assessment.</p>

Section 6.4 Summary Statement

No additional evidence is required or

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Evidence of the availability of, or capacity to produce, Braille reports or those in languages other than Spanish
- Provide evidence that 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

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

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

June, 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes Smarter Balanced Consortium Evidence



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Contents

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS	3
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	3
2.2 – Item Development.....	9
2.3 – Test Administration	11
2.5 – Test Security	14
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....	16
SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....	18
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	18
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	21
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	22
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	24
SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER	25
4.1 – Reliability.....	25
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	27
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	28
4.4 – Scoring	29
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	30
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	31
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	33
SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS	34
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	34
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	37
5.3 – Accommodations.....	38
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	40
SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .	41
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students	41
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....	42
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	43
6.4 – Reporting.....	44

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>by the statement “low percentages of fully aligned and mostly aligned ratings do not necessarily reflect poor alignment.”</p> <p>The peers recommend including a clear discussion and supporting tables demonstrating the SBAC summative assessments cover the full range of the CCSS standards. The evidence should display the full range of the CCSS standards and indicate which are covered by the SBAC summative assessments. Those standards not assessed should be noted with the reason for their exclusion stated.</p> <p>Although off grade level tests may be administered via the CAT system, the conditions under which off grade level items may be given is not clear. It is not clear to what extent students receiving a test event with off grade level items are receiving and/or being scored on a grade-level test event that complies with the blueprints.</p> <p>It is claimed that off grade level items are realigned to the on grade blueprint, but how this alignment was done and evaluated are not included among the evidence documents.</p> <p>The peers’ understanding is that the decision of proficiency vs. non-proficiency is based only on on-grade level testing. The determination of other measures (levels I and IV, or student growth) may be impacted by the use of off grade level items and states must take this into account when using the assessments for accountability purposes.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

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"> Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design. 	<p>Guidance p. 14 15a 15b 28 § 2.1-2.2</p> <p>Guidance Index 8 15a 15b 27 28 29 p. 8 30</p>	<p>The relative scarcity of DOK 3+ items in the assessments makes it difficult to conclude that they reflect “appropriate inclusion of challenging content” and requires “complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills)”</p> <p>There are notes specifying a minimum number of DOK 3+ items in the blueprints. However, from Evidence 28, it is unclear how DOK requirements are being implemented.</p> <p>The discussion of custom item pools in sections Evidence 28, § 2.1 and 2.2 suggests that some students will receive a test with a different blueprint from other students. The current documentation lends itself to the interpretation that this might occur even for students not receiving accommodations.</p> <p>Evidence 29 page 8 identifies the inadequacy of the item pools in providing assessments to the full range of students. This issue needs to be addressed.</p> <p>In Evidence 27, the number of ELA items developed are short of the order, although the Index claims that deliveries exceeded orders. The rationale for 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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>orders listed in Evidence 27 is not explained. Specifically, how was the pool size and item demand determined?</p> <p>The ELA shortfalls in Evidence 27 are not explained in terms of impact on standards coverage. There needs to be an identification of the DOK of these orders and the shortfalls.</p> <p>Evidence 29 states that not all assessments follow blueprint constraints. Please provide the remediation and the assurance that this is not happening in operation with actual students.</p> <p>Appendix B of Evidence 29 demonstrates that many students taking the Spanish language and Braille versions of the SBAC assessments may be receiving assessments not aligned to the blueprints.</p> <p>It is unclear from Evidence 29 if the algorithm used in the simulation would accurately reflect (or accurately reflected) that used in operational testing.</p> <p>Evidence 30 demonstrates issues meeting constraints for the performance tasks. This needs to be addressed – specifically, how the misalignment was resolved.</p> <p>Evidence 8, p. 6 states that states may use their own delivery engines. The peers agree that states will need to provide evidence either that they are using the SBAC engine or that their chosen delivery engine functions the same as the SBAC engine and conforms to the SBAC blueprints for tests being delivered. If a non-SBAC engine does not conform, then it is incumbent upon the state using it to provide all evidence beyond item development for their program. That is, the program will need to be treated as an assessment other than SBAC (although using 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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		SBAC pool).
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Further justification for Purpose 4. Purpose 4 is related to measuring student growth. Where appropriate (e.g., in § 3), evidence should be provided supporting (1) growth interpretations of assessment results, and (2) specific uses of growth estimates. b. Further justification for Purpose 5. Purpose 5 indicates that the assessment results will provide information about how instruction can be improved. This may be beyond the scope of a summative assessment system, since assessment results do not clearly indicate actions to improve instruction. Peers believe that this purpose should be restated or deleted. Alternatively, evidence can be provided where appropriate to support this interpretation / use of assessment results. <p>2.1.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Clarification concerning whether the range of total items by claim identified in the test blueprints is intended to be a tally across assessment targets, or an additional constraint. b. Documentation concerning the basis for exclusion of speaking in the ELA assessments. c. Documentation concerning the Consortium’s criterion for “sufficient alignment” (see Evidence 17 p. 31) and an explanation of how the results of the alignment study cited meets this definition. If sufficient alignment cannot be demonstrated, a remediation plan to achieve sufficient alignment. d. A clear discussion and supporting tables demonstrating the SBAC summative assessments cover the full range of the CCSS standards. The evidence should display the full range of the CCSS standards and indicate which are covered by the SBAC summative assessments. Those standards not assessed should be noted with the reason for their exclusion stated. e. Documentation supporting adherence to the grade level blueprint of assessments administered to students that include off grade level items. f. Documentation that a suitable methodology was implemented for realigning off grade level items to on grade level content for use in administration of off grade level content. <p>2.1.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Documentation supporting the claim that the DOK range of each assessment reflect “appropriate inclusion of challenging content” and requires “complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills)” b. Clarification regarding how DOK requirements are being implemented, for both CAT and fixed forms. <p>2.1.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Explanation of how the implementation of custom item pools described in § 2.1 and 2.2 of Evidence 28 cannot result in test events that are inconsistent with the test blueprints. If they can result in such test events, then a plan for how this will be remedied. b. Documentation with plan addressing the inadequacy of the item pools in providing assessments to the full range of students, identified on p. 8 of Evidence 29. c. An explanation of how DOK requirements are being implemented in the test delivery algorithm. d. An explanation of the basis for the item counts in the orders listed in Evidence 27. e. An explanation of the impact, if any, that the ELA shortfalls in Evidence 27 had / have on standards coverage. f. Documentation that all assessments in operation now conform to blueprints. g. Documentation regarding remediation of the issue that many students taking the Spanish language and Braille versions of the SBAC assessments may be 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>receiving forms or test events that do not conform to the blueprints.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> h. Documentation regarding remediation of the issue in meeting constraints for the performance tasks. i. Documentation that SBAC is appropriately guiding and supporting states in using the appropriate algorithm. Clarification that a state using a different algorithm cannot rely on evidence gathered through the SBAC algorithm. 	
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>2.1.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A waiver to use SBAC due to the exclusion of speaking in the assessment. <p>States should note: Educator evaluation is not a listed purpose of this assessment.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.2 – Item Development</p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>7 15a 15b 53</p>	<p>The documentation states revision based on the results of the cognitive labs, but does not specify what revisions were done or what changes were made to address issues identified (i.e. use of equation editor).</p> <p>There does not appear to be a specific statement about the mode of delivery for review of items. Since this is an electronic assessment, the items should have been reviewed on screen. The Consortium needs to specify the review mode in addition to the thorough documentation already provided.</p> <p>Page 3 of evidence 53 states that the ethnic make-up of the reviews reflects the diversity of the governing states, however the make-up of those states is not listed and the make-up of the math review panel is different from the ELA. While the peers are sensitive to the issues of recruitment, increased transparency would be helpful and support the positive outcome of the review. For example, listing the targets for ethnic make-up of panels and the efforts to recruit. If there were no targets for diversity, instead of claiming the panels matched the diversity of the governing states, simply state that this is the make-up based on the recruitment.</p> <p>The blueprints have a scarcity of items at DOK 3+. This leads the reviewers to question the level of inclusion of higher order skills.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 2.2 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>2.2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Documentation regarding how usability issues discovered during the cognitive labs (e.g., student difficulties using the equation editor) have been addressed. b. Documentation showing that the mode of delivery during item review was the same as that for test administration – in other words, that reviewers reviewed items exactly as they would have been seen by students. c. Documentation regarding the targets for ethnic make-up of panels and the efforts to recruit panels consistent with those targets or, if there were no targets for diversity, a statement to the effect. d. Documentation as per Summary Statement 2.1.3.a. 		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>None.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>11a p. 4 11b 65a 66 67 p. 24 68 pp. 36-41 69b 69c 69d 69e 77a 77b 76</p>	<p>The graphic on p. 4 of Evidence 11a is extremely helpful.</p> <p>Evidence 65a contains links that are important, however many are dead (the link to the collaboration site is not available to the reviewers).</p> <p>Since many documents are supplied as templates, the state will need to provide evidence that they are communicating clearly, effectively and accurately to its educators. These should include state-specific communications on the following issues: usability and accessibility guidelines, on-line test administration procedures, assessment technology requirements, test administrator manuals, and state specific procedures. These should include the content from the SBAC manuals as listed: on-line test administrator manual 67, usability accessibility and accommodations guide 68, UAA guidelines 11a 11b, state procedures manual 65a, test administrator users guide 66, paper pencil TAM 77a 77b, iPad guidelines 76, technology requirements training 69b, student interface training 69c, TA interface training modules 69d, ART training module 69e</p> <p>Evidence 67 p. 24: the thirty-minute timer mentioned in the first paragraph discussing the timeout, disagrees with the twenty-minute timer in the second paragraph. Please clarify.</p> <p>The definition of activity for the inactivity timer may be problematic since students can be clicking on 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 SMARTER BALANCED

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"> Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments; If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>66</p> <p>65a 66 69 70 p. 4</p>	<p>screen every minute and still time out due to the definition. Typical computer activity conventions just require mouse movement, not specific activity.</p> <p>Evidence 68: The guidance provided for the read-aloud accommodation (table on pp. 36-41) appears to be challenging to implement or to adhere to during a live administration.</p> <p>If modifications are made to the SBAC systems, what process is in place to inform states of the changes?</p> <p>States need to provide evidence of their state training requirements.</p> <p>Contingency plans need to give more details and clearer guidance on issues such as how to resume test administration in case of lost internet connectivity. SBAC needs to develop contingency guidelines and procedures to address a broad range of possible technology challenges during test administration, and submit these as evidence.</p> <p>The implementation readiness package was not ready based on the evidence provided. The package modules should have been ready beginning in spring 2015. Please provide evidence that the package is ready and the date when it was ready (Evidence 70 p. 4).</p> <p>Since states may use different administration vendors, each state should provide the customized contingency plans detailed for their state, and in alignment with SBAC’s guidelines.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>States need to provide evidence that test administrators have procedures and access to helpdesk/troubleshooting support.</p> <p>States need to provide evidence that they have determined that schools meet the readiness guidelines prior to operational utilization.</p>
Section 2.3 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>2.3.1</p> <p>a. A clarification to reconcile the disagreement, in Evidence 67 p. 24, between (1) the thirty-minute timer mentioned in the first paragraph discussing the timeout, and (2) the twenty-minute timer referenced in the second paragraph. Provision of the clarification to states.</p> <p>2.3.2</p> <p>a. Documentation of the communication plan (to states) when modifications are made to the SBAC systems.</p> <p>2.3.3</p> <p>a. Contingency plans addressing a broad range of technology challenges, providing more details and clearer guidance on issues such as how to resume test administration in case of lost internet connectivity.</p> <p>b. Documentation that the Implementation Readiness Package has been fully developed and released, together with the release date.</p> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>2.3.3</p> <p>a. A contingency plan detailed for their state, and in alignment with SBAC’s guidelines.</p> <p>b. Documentation that test administrators have technology failure contingency procedures in place and access to helpdesk/troubleshooting support.</p> <p>c. Documentation of school readiness for operational administration of technology-based assessments.</p>		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.5 – Test Security</p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS</p> <p>65a 65b 66 78</p>	<p>The documents appear to defer much of the test security and irregularity detection to the states. However, peers felt that this critical element implied that SBAC should have its own programs of post hoc assessment for irregularities (data forensics) and ongoing test security monitoring including social media monitoring.</p> <p>Information in 65b should be communicated to states</p> <p>SBAC should maintain a security log overall to ensure security of the summative assessment system itself.</p> <p>States need to provide evidence of their security policies and procedures in accordance with the investigation and remediation procedures for SBAC.</p>
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>2.5.1</p> <p>a. Documentation that SBAC has in place security protocols and procedures to protect SBAC items and assessments.</p> <p>2.5.2</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>a. Documentation that information in 65b is communicated to states.</p> <p>2.5.4</p>	<p>Documentation of the implementation of the security logging and the remediation plan for incidents that may impact the validity of the assessment (including communications).</p>	<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p>
<p>2.5</p>	<p>Documentation of state’s security policies and procedures and the relationship of the state’s policies and procedures to those of SBAC. In other words, a state’s security policies and procedures should reference SBAC’s policies and procedures and demonstrate coherence with these. It should be clear from all available documentation (regardless of source – SBAC or state) that all aspects of critical element 2.5 are addressed.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results; To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS</p> <p>65a 66 134</p> <p>133</p>	<p>SBAC needs to provide evidence that they are monitoring test item exposure and drift to ensure integrity on an ongoing basis. States must provide evidence of this item with respect to administration and use.</p> <p>Please detail what is the low risk item stated in Evidence 133 and explain what is being done about this issue or why the issue is not being addressed.</p> <p>States must provide evidence of this item.</p> <p>For reporting outside the SBAC system, states need to provide evidence of compliance with this item.</p>
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		
<p>2.6.1</p>		
<p>a. Documentation of monitoring of test item exposure and drift done by SBAC to ensure integrity of the assessment system.</p>		
<p>2.6.2</p>		
<p>a. Further explanation of the low risk item in Evidence 133, including any actions being taken to address it or a reason why it is not being addressed.</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p>		
<p>2.6.1</p>		
<p>a. Documentation of compliance with this item with respect to “administration” and “use of test results.”</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.6.2 a. All. 2.6.3		
For states reporting outside of the SBAC system, documentation of compliance with this item.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity; 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Guidance 7 17 104 105 124 pp. 86-89 131</p>	<p>Evidence 104 and 105 are the most direct evidence.</p> <p>How have the low ratings from 104 and 105 been addressed if at all?</p> <p>Evidence 124 achievement level feedback on pp. 86-89 suggests panels not understanding the standard setting process. How has this been addressed?</p> <p>The ELA shortfalls in evidence 27 are not explained in terms of impact on standards coverage. There needs to be an identification of the DOK of these orders and the shortfalls.</p> <p>Evidences 104 and 105 are the only alignment between standards and test items, however these studies do not encompass each grade level. Please provide evidence of alignment between operational tests at each grade level and the CCSS.</p> <p>Since the system allows student tests to include off grade level items, SBAC needs to report the rate at which it occurs and the impact on student scores as well as describe the implications for match to blueprints since presumably the blueprints were developed for on grade level test forms / events.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. 		<p>SBAC needs to demonstrate adherence to the guidance regarding off grade level testing condition #2 on page 14. (Some reviewers felt the guidance means off grade level items cannot be used for any score purpose while others felt the guidance means off grade level items can be used in determining scores but not proficiency) Only on grade level items are used for score production and the on grade level items used cover the full range of the standards at that grade level.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence demonstrating the CAT forms students are scored upon match the blueprints submitted as evidence. Please submit this evidence for operational tests instead of simulations with the plan for monitoring this process.</p> <p>To maintain a valid item bank, SBAC needs to monitor item exposure and run post hoc analyses to ensure the system has the same characteristics as designed and approved.</p> <p>N/A: State responsibility.</p>
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>3.1.1</p> <p>a. Documentation regarding how issues of low ratings in Evidence 104 have been addressed. Examples: Evidence 104, p. 18 shows SBAC has a low rating on</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>“high quality items and variety of item types.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Documentation regarding how the low ratings on panelist comprehension of the standard setting process (Evidence 124, pp. 86-89), was addressed. c. Documentation regarding the ELA item shortfalls in Evidence 27 affected the item pool and how those shortfalls were addressed. d. Evidence of alignment between operational tests and the CCSS for those grade levels not covered in Evidence 104 and Evidence 105. (There must be evidence of alignment for every grade level.) e. Documentation regarding the rate at which off grade level testing occurs, the impact of off grade level testing on student scores, and the implications of off grade level testing for blueprint satisfaction of test events. f. Documentation demonstrating adherence to the Guidance regarding off grade level testing condition #2 on p. 14. (Some reviewers felt the Guidance means off grade level items cannot be used for any score purpose while others felt the Guidance means off grade level items can be used in determining scores but not proficiency.) g. Documentation that the operational CAT test event that students are scored on match the blueprints submitted as evidence. A plan for monitoring the process of evaluating match to blueprint for all test events administered. h. Documentation of plan for monitoring item exposure and conducting post hoc analyses to ensure the system has the same characteristics as designed and approved. 	
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>3.1.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. All. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>7 25 130b</p>	<p>Cognitive labs are compelling and good evidence for this critical element.</p> <p>Documentation states that revisions were made based on the results of the cognitive labs, but does not specify what revisions were done or what changes were made to address issues identified (i.e. use of equation editor).</p>
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>x The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>3.2</p> <p> a. Documentation as per 2.2.a</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>None.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>7 61 130b 130c</p>	<p>The summary of evidence in Evidence 130b p. 8 is not compelling for meeting this critical element.</p> <p>DIF and biserial correlations calculated and used...good.</p> <p>Evidence 61 does not discriminate between interim and summative items. Please provide confirmation that this applies only to the summative items.</p> <p>Evidence 7 p. 166: Good evidence for unidimensionality but again not specific to summative vs other tests - please specify.</p> <p>Evidence 130c p. 5: Bias estimates are unacceptable for 3rd grade in ELA and some other grades. Also for Math claims 2 and 4. Please provide evidence the claim level classifications that are reported are not negatively impacted by the bias.</p> <p>Please provide model fit information based on operational assessment data instead of just pilot data.</p> <p>Please provide clarification that items removed from the dimensionality analysis were removed from the bank as well and not merely removed from the analysis.</p> <p>The item vector dimensionality study could have bene stronger if it included the possibility of more than two dimensions.</p> <p>Not clear if scaling at the claim level was considered.</p>
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide 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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Confirmation that Evidence 61 and Evidence 7 p. 166 apply to the summative items. b. Documentation that claim level classifications are not negatively impacted by large bias estimates in 3rd grade ELA, and for Math Claims 2 and 4. c. Model fit information based on operational assessment data. d. Confirmation that items removed from the dimensionality analysis were retired from further operational use. 	
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p>		
3.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen. 	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>7 p. 443 137 139 156</p>	<p>In Evidence 7 there is no clear explanation of how SBAC lines up with PISA or NAEP even though they used embedded items. The purpose appeared to be to ground the standard setting but how they actually helped to inform the process isn’t clear. It isn’t clear how inclusion of these items helped to show that “assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.”</p> <p>Evidence 7 p. 443: Not clear how the ACT benchmarks were projected on to the SBAC scale. Please clarify how this occurred and how this was used to provide the validity evidence relevant to this critical element.</p> <p>Evidence 139: The high pass rate for students who are failing the course does support this critical element.</p> <p>Evidence 137: Peers are not sure this is relevant to this critical element. The importance of the results was not presented.</p>
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>3.4</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Clarification of how inclusion of PISA and NAEP items in the standard setting, and how projection of ACT benchmarks onto the SBAC scale, helped to show that “assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.” b. Discussion of the high pass rates on the Smarter Balanced assessments for students failing the course in the Washington: Linking Course Grades to Smarter Balanced Cut Scores report, with respect to meeting this critical element. <hr/> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>3.4</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.1 – Reliability</p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>7 p. 472 130c pp. 14, 17, 22-34, 36-41</p>	<p>There needs to be additional information concerning which states were included in the calculations of reliability and categorical classification decisions. The calculations should include data from all states included in that round. Per follow-up communication, CT, MI, and NH were not included in these calculations.</p> <p>Per ED, this critical element implies a requirement for state-specific reliabilities. These state-specific reliabilities should be either in the submissions of the Consortium or the State.</p> <p>130c: Total score reliabilities are acceptable. Claim reliabilities are low, but impact is likely marginal. Total score reliabilities are low in Decile 1 for grades 7 and 11 in mathematics (p. 14) and 11th grade LEP and IDEA (p. 17).</p> <p>130c: CSEMs high for the low end (pp. 36-41), especially in relation to typical ranges for achievement levels (007: p. 472). Frequently the CSEM is about a 1/3rd of a typical range. This could impact achievement level accuracy for students and may limit the utility of the assessments for measuring student growth.</p> <p>130c: Classification accuracy for distinguishing between level 2 and 3 is low for ELA grades 3-5 (pp. 22-34). Since level 3 is proficient, this has an impact on proficiency designations.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

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"> For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement. 		<p>Consistency estimates are not provided or addressed. The submission should include a statement or rationale for claiming that test procedure produces test forms meeting this requirement, especially in light of potential differences in results for different algorithms.</p> <p>There needs to be evidence that all of the data included in computing the reliability-related estimates are based on the same implementation of the same algorithm.</p>
<p>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>4.1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A statement responding to areas of low reliability and low accuracy (Either SBAC or the relevant state) Test reliability of the assessments estimated for each state separately and each subgroup within state (these estimates will also need to meet adequacy criteria) Estimates of consistency of classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results (these estimates will also need to meet adequacy criteria) 		
<hr/> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>4.1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (Either SBAC or the relevant state) Test reliability of the assessments estimated for each state separately and each subgroup within state (these estimates will also need to meet adequacy criteria) If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>11a 30 126</p>	<p>The evidence supports attention in design and development to ensure fairness and accessibility.</p> <p>Only simulation or field test data, showing no DIF or low DIF on the assessment.</p> <p>Peers agreed there should be ongoing tracking of DIF items that have been left in the pool.</p> <p>Accommodations are not tested; there are only lit reviews in Evidence 126.</p> <p>See notes on low IEP and LEP reliabilities.</p> <p>Evidence 11a is not prescriptive and does not provide data validating the use of the accommodations for certain students.</p> <p>Would like to see reliability estimates for students using accommodations, based on operational data.</p>
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>4.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Documentation supporting ongoing tracking of DIF items left in the operational pool, to ensure that any negative impact they have on fairness and accessibility remains minimal. b. Estimated reliability for students using accommodations, based on operational data. <hr/> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>4.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Index pp. 76-77 104 130c pp. 33-35</p>	<p>It is not clear how Evidence 104 addresses this critical element.</p> <p>Evidence 130c: The reported SEMs are large and CSEMs are especially high for certain deciles and grades.</p> <p>The bin analysis in Evidence #130c pp. 33-35 demonstrates a need for more representation at the low end of the scales. The need is very pronounced for mathematics.</p> <p>Comments on earlier critical elements addressing representation across the scale are relevant here as well.</p> <p>Index pp. 76-78 calls attention to lack of items at the low end, impacting the test’s ability to test those students. SBAC should follow through on stated plans to enrich the item bank at the low end.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>4.3 Documentation that Smarter Balanced has enriched the item bank such that the assessments can provide a more precise estimate of student performance for low-achieving students.</p> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>4.3</p> <p> a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>70</p>	<p>Evidence 70: The scoring module was not ready, per this document. We would like evidence that the implementation readiness package was made available and the dates on which each module was released, especially the scoring module.</p> <p>We would like additional evidence of standardized scoring procedures and protocols, specifically with respect to the use of the same CAT algorithm across states. (Scoring and item selection for test forms are interdependent for CATs.)</p>
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>4.4 Evidence of established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols, specifically:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Documentation that the implementation readiness package was made available and the dates on which each module was released, especially the scoring module. A plan to ensure timely future delivery of materials and modules necessary for third party administration vendors. b. Documentation of reliable and accurate scoring for alternate test forms (i.e. paper and pencil, paper braille). <hr/> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>4.4</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>Simulation studies provided evidence regarding adherence to blueprint (and those simulations did not always produce conforming forms).</p> <p>Need evidence that operational forms always produce conforming forms for all students.</p>
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>a. Documentation that the assessment system always produces blueprint conforming forms for all students who took an operational form or test event, regardless of format or accommodation.</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>42 49a 49b 50 51 70 130d 143 145 169</p>	<p>This critical element is largely redundant with the prior one, because of CAT. However, it is relevant to the paper-pencil version, Spanish version, ASL, and Braille versions.</p> <p>Noted systematic reviews for Spanish translations. Expected evidence of analogous reviews for ASL and Braille.</p> <p>We found no empirical evidence of this. For example, there was no analysis comparing descriptive statistics on students taking different versions, and discussion of results to address comparability. Some comparisons, for example adaptive Braille versus paper Braille versus CAT, are especially relevant.</p> <p>(We would expect to see this for operational data, now that it is available.)</p> <p>Has SBAC attended to comparability across devices empirically? Can it? (Is device information collected for test events?)</p>
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>4.6</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation that the Consortium followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments (i.e. evidence of systemic checking the ASL and Braille versions of items.) Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results (i.e. evidence of comparability between standard Smarter Balanced assessments, ASL, Braille, Spanish, and other versions of the assessment using operational data). Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results (i.e. evidence of comparability across the different devices allowed for standard Smarter Balanced assessments.) 		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>4.6</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Index 155</p>	<p>Useful to have advisory groups for different student populations.</p> <p>Evidence 155: Many of the proposed analyses seem standard for a tech report.</p> <p>Index (pp. 97-98): Outline of the review cycle.</p> <p>Unclear to the Peers whether a complete 2014-2015 Technical Report exists. We would like a complete technical report for 2014-2015 or an explanation for why it is still in process.</p> <p>For States using SBAC: 4.7 is covered by the SBAC submission.</p>
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: 4.7</p> <p>a. To support that the Consortium has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, a complete technical report for the operational administration of the Smarter Balanced assessments in 2014-15.</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states: None.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards; • States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs; • Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment; • Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS</p> <p>11a 11b 97 98 128</p>	<p>11a: SBAC should provide guidance when use of the SBAC test is not appropriate. This is not provided. (States also need to provide their specific guidance on this critical element for alternate assessment.)</p> <p>This critical element should be provided in the state-specific submission.</p> <p>126: This is met with respect to accommodations. See first bullet above.</p> <p>97 and 98: Evidence of this is provided. (States need to provide evidence that they have given appropriate guidance to their IEP teams.)</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>students with disabilities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities; • Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA; • Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments); • The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum. 		<p>128: Evidence of this is provided. (States need to provide evidence that they have given appropriate guidance to their IEP teams.) This is provided.</p> <p>Evidence of these last three critical elements should come from the state-specific or alternative assessment submissions.</p>
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u> </u>X_ No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>5.1.1</p> <p> a. States need to provide specific guidance associated with their AA-AAS.</p> <p>5.1.2</p> <p> a. All.</p> <p>5.1.3</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.1.4	a. States need to provide specific guidance associated with their AA-AAS.	
	a. States need to provide evidence of specific guidance provided to IEP teams.	
5.1.5	a. Documentation that the state adheres to the SBAC Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines, or state-specific evidence to address this part of the critical element.	
5.1.6	a. All.	
5.1.7	a. All.	
5.1.8	a. All.	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS</p> <p>11a 11b 97 98 126 128</p>	<p>Evidence 97: Guidance unclear and not helpful. Steps 3 and 4 do not help schools determine whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodations, and if so, which accommodations are appropriate.</p> <p>Evidence 128: Provided as evidence, but does not pertain to ELs</p> <p>Evidence 126: Provides a framework, but needs operationalization to meet this critical element</p>
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>5.2</p> <p>a. Documentation regarding how schools determine whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodations, and if so, which accommodations are appropriate.</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>5.2</p> <p>a. Documentation that the state adheres to the SBAC Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines, or state-specific evidence to address this part of the critical element.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities (SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS;</p> <p>11a 11b 65a 97 98 100a 100b 126 129</p>	<p>If a state excludes some accommodation tools, then the State needs to provide a rationale that it is still meeting this critical element.</p> <p>Points (i) and (ii) are not shown. Claim (iii) is not made or stated. There is no comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations. (And a discussion relevant to comparability in light of findings.)</p> <p>Suggestion: Meeting with the appropriate advisory group with information relevant to this critical element and soliciting their advice re need for follow-up investigation.</p> <p>65a: Consortium has a process, p. 15, which depends on the State having a process. The State needs to provide their process for requesting and reviewing.</p>
<p>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: 5.3.3</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 SMARTER BALANCED

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"> a. Documentation that the Consortium has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed. b. Documentation that the Consortium has determined that the accommodations it provides 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 (e.g., a comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations, and a discussion relevant to comparability in light of findings). 		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p>		
5.3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If the State does not adhere to the SBAC Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines, state-specific evidence to address this critical element. If a state excludes some accommodation tools, then the State needs to provide a rationale that it is still meeting this critical element. 	
5.3.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If the State does not adhere to the SBAC Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines, state-specific evidence to address this critical element. If a state excludes some accommodation tools, then the State needs to provide a rationale that it is still meeting this critical element. 	
5.3.4		
All.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS;</p> <p>96 97 98 99 126</p>	<p>Monitoring compliance with accommodation policies and procedures: State responsibility</p> <p>Monitoring appropriateness of accommodation (that they are continuing to function as intended): Consortium responsibility</p>
<p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>5.4</p> <p>a. Documentation of all aspects of this critical element as it relates to monitoring compliance with accommodation policies and procedures</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; • The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>49 86 95</p>	<p>States are responsible for first two critical elements.</p> <p>Evidence 86: This critical element is met for SBAC.</p>
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>6.1.1 a. All.</p> <p>6.1.2</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 SMARTER BALANCED

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet	<p>Evidence of a technically sound procedure has been provided.</p> <p>Please provide information re what the Consortium was targeting w/r/t panelist ethnicity distribution.</p>

Section 6.2 Summary Statement		
<p><u> x </u> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>6.2.</p> <p>a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</p> <p>(1) The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>(2) If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>86 106 107</p>	<p>The Consortium provided the evidence that could reasonably be expected of them at this early stage in the program. This critical element should be addressed more fully as the program develops – for example, through additional validity studies.</p> <p>This critical element is not relevant at the SBAC Consortium level. However, this needs to be addressed by states in their state-specific submission or through the submission of the alternate assessment consortium.</p>
<p>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>6.3.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.4 – Reporting</p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration; • The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results; • The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement; ○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors); ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; ○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>Responsibility for meeting this critical element lies principally with the State.</p> <p>There is evidence that SBAC had a plan to develop a tool (with Amplify) for reporting. States need to produce evidence to meet this critical element.</p> <p>The SBAC reporting system appears to meet sub-bullets 1 and 2. However, the states not using the SBAC reporting tools need to provide evidence to meet sub-bullets 1 and 2.</p> <p>All states need to provide evidence showing that sub-bullets 3 and 4 are being met.</p> <p>In regards to sub-bullet 4, the SBAC system provides Spanish and Vietnamese reports upon request.</p> <p>All states need to provide evidence of report delivery.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. 		<p>States must provide evidence for this critical element.</p>
<p>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p>		
<hr/> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>6.4.1 a. All.</p> <p>6.4.2 b. All.</p> <p>6.4.3 a. All documentation under this bullet and sub-bullets as it pertains to delivery of reports.</p> <p>6.4.3.1 a. All, if the state is not using the Smarter Balanced-hosted reporting system and the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium reporting system user guide.</p> <p>6.4.3.2 a. All, if the state is not using the Smarter Balanced-hosted reporting system and the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium reporting system user guide.</p> <p>6.4.3.3 a. All.</p> <p>6.4.3.4 a. All.</p> <p>6.4.4 a. All.</p>		

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