



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

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

January 28, 2019

Dear Deputy Superintendent Gill:

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

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

External peer reviewers and Department staff carefully evaluated ODE's submission, which included several assessments. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and our own analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

- R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (Smarter Balanced). **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**
- R/LA and mathematics general assessments in high school (Smarter Balanced). **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**
- 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)). **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**
- Science AA-AAAS in grade bands 3-5, 6-8, and high school (ORExt). **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**

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

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

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 specific list of items required for ODE to submit is enclosed with this letter. Because ODE has not fully satisfied the condition placed on the State's Title I, Part A grant award related to its State assessment system, this condition will continue. To satisfy this condition, ODE must submit satisfactory evidence to address the items identified in the enclosed list. Within 30 days of the receipt of this letter, ODE must provide to the Department a plan and timeline by which it will submit the additional documentation. If adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action.

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

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

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 Knox of my staff at: OSS.Oregon@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank T. Brogan
Assistant Secretary for
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
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	For the Oregon Extended Assessment (ORExt): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the procedures for informing parents of the implications for graduation for students taking the ORExt alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards.
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	For the ORExt: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeed Act. ODE should provide this evidence by December 15, 2020.
6.4 – Reporting	For both general and alternate assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation that the State provides or ensures that individual student reports are available in alternate formats, upon request and to the extent practicable (e.g., communications to families of how they can receive a report in an alternate format if needed.)

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

February 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes

(resubmission of evidence based on 2016 Peer Review)



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

Contents

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.1 – Test Design and Development</p> <p>(stemming from 2016 review)</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 and mathematics at each grade level. 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). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Evidence #S021</i> – Evaluating Alignment in Large-Scale Standards-Based Assessment Systems <i>Evidence #S022 – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Common Core State Standards Analysis: Eligible Content for the Summative Assessment, Final Report</i> <i>Evidence #S023</i> – Race to the Top Application for New Grants Comprehensive Assessment Systems (p. 41) <i>Evidence #12b – Smarter Balanced Content Specifications for Mathematics</i> <i>Evidence #S024</i> – PCG - Claim/Target and Common Core Standard Associations Data Input Specifications <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Evidence Packet #S010 – Blueprint Fidelity</i> <i>Evidence #S029</i> – Summary of Smarter Balanced CAT Algorithm on Depth of Knowledge 	<p>Peers felt that S021 was not relevant for this request.</p> <p>S022 was previously provided and calls out 48 (R/LA) and 3 (Mathematics) standards as “not measurable.” However, they were judged “not measurable” using the item types proposed by SBAC: “A standard was considered measurable via on-demand summative assessment tasks if it can be assessed by any of the item types listed in the following subsection, as defined in the SBAC proposal (SBAC, 2010b, pp. 42, 52–53).” (p.9) Page 6 lists the item types. Peers feel that the standards should drive the item types / components of the assessment system. It seemed, however, that the item types were determining the assessable content, rather than the standards determining the item types / components. Regulation and Guidance clearly state “full depth and breadth for all of the academic standards.”</p> <p>S023 includes a statement of intent, not evidence for this CE.</p> <p>S024 described the new coding scheme for the items. Peers felt it was not relevant.</p> <p>Suggestion: SBAC might provide evidence of how the other components of the assessment system (formative, interim, benchmark) cover the standards deemed ineligible for the summative, AND that the states using the SBAC incorporate those other elements meaningfully into their assessment system. (That is, those other elements contribute to scores / performance levels.)</p> <p>Peers commend SBAC for conducting a thorough blueprint fidelity study, and for taking measures to correct the error identified for Grade 6 Math. We would like to see the blueprint fulfillment rates at the student level, in addition to the claim / content category level, as presented in S010a. In other words, we’d like data answering the question, “What percent of students received a test event conforming to the blueprint?,” rather than “What percent of test events fulfilled blueprint requirement X?”</p> <p>Peers feel that 100% blueprint fulfillment (at the student level) is implied by this CE. A reason for less than 100% blueprint fulfillment may reside in the way in the which algorithm treats blueprint fulfillment as described in S029 – that is, not as an absolute constraint.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p> <p>(stemming from 2016 peer review)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See evidence regarding DOK and item pools in element 2.1 above. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Evidence #015a</i> – Final Blueprint for Mathematics Summative Assessment <i>Evidence #015b</i> – Final Blueprint for ELA/L Summative Assessment <i>Evidence Packet #S010</i> – Smarter Balanced Blueprint Fidelity Study <i>Evidence #S011</i> – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Technical Report, 2015-2016 <i>Evidence Packet #S012</i> – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses 	<p>See Comments for 2.1.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See 2.1 B and C. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

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

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

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

March 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes Resubmission



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

Note: Peer review notes provide the combined recommendations of the individual peers to the U.S. Department of Education (Department), based on the statute and regulations, 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 Resubmission

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS	3
1.5 – Participation Data	3
SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS	4
2.1 – Test Design and Development	5
2.2 – Item Development	7
2.3 – Test Administration	8
2.5 – Test Security	11
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	13
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes	15
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	17
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	18
SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER	20
4.1 – Reliability	20
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility	21
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum	22
4.4 – Scoring	23
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	24
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	25
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	28
SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS	31
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	31
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs	32
5.3 – Accommodations	33
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	34
SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING	36
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting	36
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	38
6.4 – Reporting	41

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

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

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 style="text-align: center;">1.5 – Participation Data</p> <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. 	<p>State provided spreadsheets which provided participation data for all requested assessments.</p>	<p>evidence sufficient for this critical element</p>
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u> </u>x<u> </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oregon Resubmission

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">2.1 – Test Design and Development</p> <p>See smarter balanced 2016/2018 review</p> <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><u>General</u>: Refer to Smarter Balanced submission (Note that OR has received a speaking waiver)</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS</u>:</p> <p>2015-2016 ORExt Technical Report, pp. 90-95</p>	<p><u>General</u>: Refer to Smarter Balanced submission</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS</u>:</p> <p>ODE indicates that descriptive statistics suggest that the test had an appropriate range of item difficulties represented, from easy to difficult, with item difficulties generally ranging from -4.0 to +4.0 on the Rasch scale. The peer reviewers wish to note that the blueprints for ORExt do not reference target distributions of item difficulty but did not regard this as an impediment to meeting this CE. Nevertheless, additional information regarding the lack of overlap of person and item distributions would have been helpful.</p> <p>The assessments performed as expected across all grades and content areas with the exception of Grade 7 mathematics (which will be revised to address this discrepancy; see p. 71). The item person distributions provided on pp. 91-95 demonstrate that the ORExt provides a performance continuum for participating students who participate. OR plans to include more complex items for ELA and science in the 2016-17 ORExt administration.</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 Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
__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 Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.2 – Item Development</p> <p>See smarter balanced 2016/18 review</p> <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><u>General</u>: Refer to Smarter Balanced submission</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS</u>:</p> <p>2.2_ORExt_TeacherRecruit_ODE.pdf</p> <p>ORExt 2015-2016 Technical Report, App. 2.2.1_ItemWriter_Training</p> <p>ORExt 2015-2016 Technical Report, App. 2.1_ORExtTestSpecs</p> <p>ORExt 2015-2016 Technical Report, App. 2..1C_ORExt_ItemDevt_Process</p>	<p><u>General</u>: Refer to Smarter Balanced submission</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS</u>:</p> <p>ODE indicates that Oregon teachers were recruited to serve as item writers via email to Qualified Assessor/Qualified Trainer listserves and follow-up University of Oregon on-campus recruitment. Recruitment information is clear and very specific in terms of qualifications, task/timeline, remuneration, etc.</p> <p>ODE provides adequate evidence of the procedures used to train item writers, including training agenda, PowerPoint slides, and test specifications. While the peer reviewers would have welcomed additional supporting materials such as sample items shared with item writers and the templates referred to in App. 2.2.1, the evidence provided is sufficient.</p>
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oregon Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of procedures for the mitigation of test procedure irregularities such as a contingency plan that shows how the State responds—or will respond—to different security incidents. 		

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

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 Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.5 – Test Security</p> <p>(See also smarter balanced 2016/18 review)</p> <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). 	<p><u>General:</u></p> <p>OR-20_2014-2015 Test Impropriety Database</p> <p>OR-21Redacted Sample Letter of Final Determination</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS: N/A</u></p>	<p><u>General:</u></p> <p>ODE provides some evidence of procedures to document testing irregularities in a timely fashion and to utilize this information to inform policies and procedures in the future. ODE tracks individual infractions (and their consequences) and uses that data to inform training and administration. The Test Impropriety Database includes, among other information, for each episode the type of impropriety, whether it involved student(s) and/or adult(s), and the disposition of test results. However, the State has not clarified who is responsible for identifying and recording this information, nor provided any guidelines for detecting testing irregularities. Beyond documentation of irregularities, more information on procedures (including roles/responsibilities) is needed. For example, peer reviewers would expect to see some evidence that clarifies what behaviors test administrators should look for, what analyses are conducted on data to detect possible cheating, etc.</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS: N/A</u></p>
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 Oregon Resubmission

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"> Specific information on procedures/guidelines for identifying and documenting testing irregularities (for example, a document indicating roles/responsibilities, behaviors that may be indicative of testing irregularities, etc.) 		

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

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 See also smarter balanced 2016/18 review</p> <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). 	<p><u>General</u>: Refer to Smarter Balanced submission</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS</u>:</p> <p>2015-2016 ORExt Technical Report, App.3.1A_DIRLinkageStudy appendix</p> <p>3.1_Selection Links AlignmentORExt Spring 2017</p>	<p><u>General</u>: Refer to Smarter Balanced submission</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS</u>:</p> <p>ODE identifies the number of raters reviewing alignment for each content standard (3 for ELA, 3 for Math [4 for grade 6] and 4 for science), and thus adequately provided the requested documentation. Reviewers did have some concern that an insufficient number of raters (2-3) were involved in Evaluation 3 (see 3.1, p. 6, Table 1), but did not feel this necessitated additional evidence.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of the results of an independent alignment study. 	<p>3.1_Selection Links AlignmentORExt Spring 2017</p>	<p>The evidence submitted describes the conduct and results of an independent alignment study.</p>
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oregon Resubmission

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 Resubmission

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>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). 	<p><u>General</u>: N/A</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS</u>:</p> <p>2015-2016 Technical Report, pp. 16-20, 21, 91-95</p> <p>App.1.1_EAF_UserGuide</p> <p>3.1_Selection Links AlignmentORExt Spring 2017, pp. 7-8, 9</p> <p>ORExtContentCoverage2016</p> <p>PracticeTest</p>	<p><u>General</u>: N/A</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS</u>:</p> <p>ODE asserts in the Index document that the Essentialized Assessment Frameworks (EAFs) upon which ORExt is based underlies item development at three different levels of cognitive complexity.</p> <p>Some examples of the relationship between a particular standard for the general student population and its essentialized version are cited and examples of L/M/H levels of complexity are given (2015-2016 Technical Report, pp. 16-20).</p> <p>Each EAF document (ELA, Math, & Science) conveys the Essentialized Standards used to develop the new ORExt. However, not all CCSS and NGSS/ORSci standards were essentialized. Rather, standards were identified that were either (a) the most important to learn or (b) given the most opportunity to learn.</p> <p>Document 3.1, in particular, provides considerable evidence of the strategies used by the State to ensure that the cognitive complexity of the ORExt is appropriately</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 Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>challenging for SWSCD.</p> <p>However, peer reviewers remain concerned about the reduction (sometimes dramatic) in the number/percentage of CCSS or NGSS that have been essentialized for high school (see ORExtContentCoverage2016, p. 1). Some explanation to address this is desirable.</p> <p>ODE is commended for including practice tests as examples of ORExt item designs; however, without supporting information on alignment (which essentialized standard is addressed by each item and its analogue in general academic content standards) and complexity level (L/M/H), these examples are far less useful than they might be.</p>
Section 3.2 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More compelling documentation of the rationale for excluding particular standards beyond the criteria given (see a and b above) is needed 		

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

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>See also smarter balanced 2016/18 review</p> <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. 	<p><u>General</u>: Refer to Smarter Balanced submission</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS</u>:</p> <p>App.2.2.2_ORExtVertScale</p> <p>App.2.1B_ORExt_TestBlueprint_2016</p>	<p><u>General</u>: Refer to Smarter Balanced submission</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS</u>:</p> <p>ODE provided information in the Index on how calibration procedures were conducted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence to support subdomain reporting such as correlations among subscores, disattenuated correlations among subscores, and examination of dimensionality. 	<p><u>AA-AAAS</u>:</p> <p>2015-2016 ORExt technical report (pp. 67-69)</p>	<p><u>AA-AAAS</u>:</p> <p>The State provided correlations among subscores in the 2015-2016 Technical Report.</p> <p>ODE indicates that subdomain reporting is only done in ELA, for reading and writing. Based on evidence in the technical manual (p. 60), ODE indicates that the ORExt assessments appear to be measuring separate constructs, as intended, indicated by the correlations.</p>
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>See also smarter balanced 2016/18 review</p> <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 that the State assessment scores are related to other variables (other than extended assessment scores), and 	<p><u>General:</u> Refer to Smarter Balanced submission</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS:</u></p> <p>ORExt_ORA_Admininstruct2016_V11</p> <p>ORExt_ORA_2016_V11</p>	<p><u>General:</u> Refer to Smarter Balanced submission</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS:</u></p> <p>ODE describes correlation analyses done between ORExt and the Oregon Observational Rating Assessment (ORora). The State also conducts an annual consequential validity survey and cites results of that survey.</p> <p>While the evidence provided is adequate, peer reviewers suggested that stronger external validity evidence may be obtained from a more representative sample of students in at least two ways: 1) administer ORora to a random sample of students regardless of ORExt scores; and 2) correlate ORExt scores with student grades.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that clarifies the meaning of the correlations reported for each grade level within the Technical Report. 	<p><u>AA-AAAS:</u></p> <p>201502016 ORExt technical report (p. 67)</p>	<p><u>AA-AAAS:</u></p> <p>ODE provides an adequate explanation that clarifies the meaning of the correlations reported.</p> <p>Also see under CE 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 Oregon Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 3.4 Summary Statement		
__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 Resubmission

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.1 – Reliability</p> <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. 	<p><u>General:</u> N/A</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS:</u></p> <p>2015-2016 ORExt technical report (pp. 74-75) and evidence index document.</p>	<p><u>General:</u> N/A</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS:</u></p> <p>ODE provides adequate evidence to address this factor/CE.</p>
<p>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>__X__</u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oregon Resubmission

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 See also smarter balanced 2016/18 review</p> <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><u>General</u>: Refer to Smarter Balanced submission</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS</u>:</p> <p>ORExt_DIFAnalyses_2016</p> <p>2016DIF_Results</p> <p>2016DIFflaggeditems</p>	<p><u>General</u>: Refer to Smarter Balanced submission</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS</u>:</p> <p>ODE provides adequate evidence of their examination of differential item functioning for those groups of sufficient sample size (white/nonwhite, male/female).</p>
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" 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 Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p> <p>See also smarter balanced 2016/18 review</p> <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><u>General</u>: Refer to Smarter Balanced submission</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS</u>: 2015-2016 technical report (pp. 74, 91-95)</p> <p>2016_ORExt_CSEMplots</p> <p>2016TIFs_wCuts</p>	<p><u>General</u>: Refer to Smarter Balanced submission</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS</u>: ODE provides adequate evidence to demonstrate that the ORExt provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>See smarter balanced 2016/18 review</p> <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><u>General:</u> Refer to Smarter Balanced submission</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS:</u></p> <p>2015-2016 technical report (pp. 28, 32-34, 29-30)</p>	<p><u>General:</u> Refer to Smarter Balanced submission</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS:</u></p> <p>ODE provides a clear explanation of annual training requirements and training results for all ORExt test administrators and supports this explanation with adequate evidence from the technical report.</p> <p>However, reviewers could find no evidence of any procedures for quality assurance of operational scoring (e.g., second scoring, score-behinds, recalibration) to confirm that standards set during training for scoring performance were being maintained.</p>
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explanation of quality assurance procedures during operational scoring, with supporting data to illustrate. 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</p> <p>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. 	<p><u>General:</u> N/A</p> <p><u>AA-AAAAS:</u></p> <p>No supporting documents; explanation in Index document only</p>	<p><u>General:</u> N/A</p> <p><u>AA-AAAAS:</u></p> <p>ODE explains that equating procedures are not conducted since items for all administrations after 2014-15 are anchored to the same scale using Rasch modeling. This explanation is sufficient to address this CE. Peer reviewers would have liked to have seen some additional detail about this in the Technical Report, however.</p>
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oregon Resubmission

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>See smarter balanced 2016/18 review</p> <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. 	<p><u>General</u>: Refer to Smarter Balanced submission</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS</u>:</p> <p>No supporting documents; explanation in Index document only</p>	<p><u>General</u>: Refer to Smarter Balanced submission</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS</u>:</p> <p>ODE explains why the peer reviewers' questions (2016 review) are not applicable.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional justification for the absence of empirical evidence to address the comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<p>2015-2016 technical report (see Appendix 2.1A)</p>	<p>ODE clarifies that a single form at each grade/subject/year has been used since 2015-2016.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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). 	<p>Extended Assessments General Instructions Print to Braille_VF</p>	<p>ODE provides a clear explanation of the procedures used to convert items to Braille, supported by a concise instructions document; however, the reviewer could find no evidence of decision rules or other criteria used to determine suitability of items for the Braille form (the 1-3 items per year that cannot be accurately conveyed via Braille).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional detail about the design and development process for alternate versions 	<p>ORExt_TestBooklet_StyleGuide2015-16</p>	<p>ODE indicates that this detail is not relevant given that there are not multiple forms. Nevertheless, the State refers to a supplementary resource to provide</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 Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		additional documentation about test booklet development and style guide requirements.
Section 4.6 Summary Statement		
__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 Resubmission

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 Resubmission

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>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. 	<p><u>General</u>: N/A</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS</u>:</p> <p>App2.3B.10_ORExtCVStudy2015_16</p>	<p><u>General</u>: N/A</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS</u>:</p> <p>ODE addresses this CE by citing a number of strategies employed to collect and review information (log data, evaluations, other forms of collection) that can inform future training. A consequential validity survey helps ODE to gather information about the intended and unintended consequences of implementing the ORExt (the development of the ORora being an outgrowth of the 2015 CV study). Information was collected on SWSCD with higher communication skills in a language other than English, in order to determine if assessments in another language were required.</p> <p>Among the focuses of the consequential validity study, it allowed ODE to collect and analyze responses to a question (#2) about overall item and test design, student materials design, and accessibility of test questions (see pp. 8-9). That qualitative response item asked respondents to recommend one improvement that could be made to the 2015-15 ORExt. Across the 187 responses to this item, QAs and QTs</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 Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>recommended four areas of improvement (in order of greatest frequency to least):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The ELA assessment should include more difficult items in both reading and writing, and the math less difficult, with more practical/life skills focused items (n = 11); 2.An assessment for students who cannot reduced complexity academic tests due to severe limitations is needed, focusing on functional skills (n = 11) 3.A new assessment (or new items) should be developed to better meet the varying student abilities who are very low functioning (i.e., the current assessment is still too difficult for some students to show learning (i.e. depth and breadth doesn't reflect accurately) and too easy for others (i.e. there is yet to be a good middle-ground assessment for students who academically function 3-5th grade standards at the 11th grade level); (n = 9), and, 4.Including a more comprehensive ORora (i.e. expand on the ORora to include a scope and sequence of expressive and receptive language tasks and score on a consistent rating scale across tasks); (n = 5) <p>Peer reviewers did note that there were low means for several of the CV survey questions. They would have liked to know what is being done/will be done to address</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 Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>this.</p> <p>The peers also noted that at least some of the CV survey questions implied test purposes that are not explicit and may not be appropriate. For example, is it fair to ask if ORExt has improved access to extracurricular activities? One might more legitimately ask if ORExt has impeded access to extracurricular activities, as this gets to an unintended and undesirable test consequence.</p>
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oregon Resubmission

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>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. 	<p><u>General</u>: N/A</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS</u>:</p> <p>Faqs-2015-transition-book_final2 (elaborates upon information ODE shares with parents)</p>	<p><u>General</u>: N/A</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS</u>:</p> <p>ODE provides sufficient evidence to parents that students who participate in ORExt do not receive a regular high school diploma. Peer reviewers would recommend that this information be provided in as direct a form as possible (letter or email) rather than embedded in FAQs. Redundancy of information in this instance might also be considered to ensure that parents have this information.</p>
<p>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" 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 Resubmission

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>See smarter balanced 2016/18 review</p> <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><u>General:</u></p> <p><u>AA-AAAS:</u></p> <p>2015-2016 technical report (Appendix 1.4A.1, pp. 35-39).</p> <p>NOTE: On p. 35, the document includes notice that ODE is currently reviewing this section of the EL Program Guide, and provides link to ELSWD web page for additional guidance: http://www.ode.state.or.us/search/page/?id=4255</p>	<p><u>General:</u></p> <p><u>AA-AAAS:</u></p> <p>ODE indicates that information on the determination and inclusion of ELS in the ORExt is made available and that information may be interpreted in parents’ home language during IEP meetings.</p>
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oregon Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">5.3 – Accommodations</p> <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. 	<p><u>General:</u></p> <p>OR-09_2015-16 Oregon Accessibility Manual, pp. 9-24</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS: N/A</u></p>	<p><u>General:</u></p> <p>ODE provides a statement of confirmation that no accommodation tool in the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines are excluded in the State’s administration of that assessment.</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS: N/A</u></p>
<p>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>__X__</u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oregon Resubmission

	<p>No supporting documents; evidence solely in Index text, section 5.4</p>	<p>ODE indicates that each district signs off on a form assuring that accommodations in the student’s IEP are being provided; districts are also monitored for procedural compliance to statewide assessment requirements for SWDs (including site visits). However, documentation of procedures is needed (e.g., review of assurance forms).</p> <p>It would be helpful to include a sample “assurance form” that accommodations recorded in an IEP are being provided, as well as documentation of monitoring for compliance and/or sample site visit notes to confirm what has been reported via ODE’s System Performance Review and Improvement (SPR&I).</p>
<p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For both general and alternate assessments, documentation of procedures to monitor, during test administration, that students with disabilities and ELs are placed into the appropriate assessment conditions (including accommodations) 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oregon Resubmission

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 style="text-align: center;">6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</p> <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). 	<p><u>General:</u> N/A</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS:</u></p> <p>ORExt_StandardSettingRept2015_VF, Appendices A-O, pp. 24-139</p>	<p><u>General:</u> N/A</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS:</u></p> <p>ODE has provided (as requested) the complete appendices from the Auditors Comprehensive Report, as evidence of the technical soundness of the achievement standard setting process.</p>
Section 6.2 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oregon Resubmission

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 Resubmission

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>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. 	<p><u>General:</u> N/A</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS:</u></p> <p>App6.2.2_ORExtSSAuditRept</p> <p>3.1_Selection LinksAlignmentORExt Spring2017, pp. 7-8, 15-17, 17-19</p>	<p><u>General:</u> N/A</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS:</u></p> <p>The independent audit of the standard setting process contains the statement that, “The essentialization process involves [the reduction in depth, breadth, and complexity] of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), Oregon's Science Standards, and the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) in order to establish a performance expectation that is relevant and accessible for students who participate in the ORExt, while maintaining the highest possible standards of rigor (the science tests will thus be dual-aligned to both the Oregon Science Standards and the NGSS)” (p. 7). The reviewer found more detail that serves as evidence of professional judgment that the ORExt assessments (ELA, mathematics, science) represent the highest achievement standards possible for SWSCD in the appendices to this document (see ORExt_StandardSettingRept2015_VF, Appendices A-O, pp. 24-139).</p> <p>The independent alignment study provides</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 Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		more supporting evidence of professional judgment that the assessment represents the highest achievement standards possible for SWSCD; reviewers do have some concern based on the very small number of participants in the study per grade, but finds the evidence adequate for this aspect of the CE.
Section 6.3 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Oregon Resubmission

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 Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		Braille reports, although that matter was addressed in another CE.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p><u>General:</u></p> <p>OAR 581-022-1670 Individual Student Assessment, Recordkeeping, and Reporting</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS:</u></p> <p>No supporting documents in addition to statement in the Index document.</p>	<p><u>General:</u></p> <p>ODE provides no supporting documents for this CE but a timeline for issuance of reports in the Index document. Peer reviewers felt that this constituted only minimal evidence of addressing this CE and would like to see such sample documents as a memo communicating timeline expectations.</p> <p>ODE cites but does not provide the text of the State’s legal requirement that school districts report students’ scores on assessments at least annually to parents/guardians for all students.</p> <p><u>AA-AAAS:</u></p> <p>ODE provides a statement simply indicating that individual student reports are developed</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 Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		and distributed to school districts by the end of May annually. There is no further detail to clarify process and timeline for delivering those reports specifically to parents, teachers, and principals.
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of guidelines on translations at district level to assure accuracy and consistency of translated reports across districts • Documentation that translations of reports are provided as needed by all districts • Further documentation of a process and timeline for delivering reports to parents, teachers, and principals. 		

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