



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Pedro A. Rivera  
Secretary of Education  
Pennsylvania Department of Education  
333 Market Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17101

January 6, 2017

Dear Secretary Rivera:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) assessment peer review process under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). We appreciate the efforts required to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in June 2016. As you know, State assessment systems provide essential information that States, districts, principals, and teachers can use to identify the academic needs of students, target resources and supports toward students who need them most, evaluate school and program effectiveness, and close achievement gaps among students. A high-quality assessment system also provides useful information to parents about their children's advancement against and achievement of grade-level standards. The Department's peer review of State assessment systems is designed to provide feedback to States to support the development and administration of high-quality assessments.

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

- Reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (PSSA):  
**Substantially meets requirements.**

**Substantially meets requirements** means that this component meets most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. The specific list of items required for Pennsylvania to submit is enclosed with this letter. The Department expects that PDE should be able to provide this additional information within one year. PDE must provide to the Department a plan and timeline by which it will submit the additional documentation within 30 days of the receipt of this letter.

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.*

If adequate progress is not made towards meeting the remaining requirements, the Department may take additional action.

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

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

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

[OSS.Pennsylvania@ED.gov](mailto:OSS.Pennsylvania@ED.gov).

Sincerely,

/s/

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

Enclosures

cc: Ray Young

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

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b>	<p>For the reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (PSSA), the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence it has addressed areas identified with weak alignment, such as the grade 3 mathematics collapsed assessment anchors (e.g., Geometry).</li> <li>• Evidence that the assessment design measures the full breadth and depth of the State’s academic content standards, including the speaking and listening aspect of the standards. [NOTE: PDE has received a speaking and listening waiver; therefore, the Department does not expect PDE to submit additional evidence regarding speaking and listening during the period of the waiver.]</li> <li>• Evidence on the rationale and procedure by which the Assessment Anchors and Eligible Content were developed in order to represent the State Core content standards in R/LA and mathematics.</li> </ul>
<b>2.3 – Test Administration</b>	<p>For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (PSSA), the PDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that test administrators completed the required trainings for test administration provided by the PDE.</li> </ul>
<b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b>	<p>For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (PSSA), the PDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of test administration monitoring conducted by the PDE, or evidence of outcomes resulting from the PDE monitoring (e.g., monitoring reports or summaries).</li> </ul>
<b>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</b>	<p>For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (PSSA), the PDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of procedures for ensuring that no individual's result can be imputed from publicly available aggregate data.</li> </ul>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b>	<p>For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (PSSA), the PDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See evidence identified in element 2.1, Test Design, above, which also applies to this element.</li> </ul>
<b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b>	<p>For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (PSSA), the PDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional empirical evidence of convergent and discriminant validity with respect to established measures, including measures that have linkages to career and workplace success.</li> </ul>
<b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</b>	<p>For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (PSSA), the PDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence demonstrating procedures for year-to-year equating for PSSA, or evidence of actual equating from the SY 2015–2016 administration to the SY 2014–2015 administration.</li> </ul>
<b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an</b>	<p>For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (PSSA), the PDE must provide:</p>

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Additional Evidence Needed</b>
<b>Assessment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of an ongoing evaluation of online vs. paper mode differences that include examination of impact on protected sub-groups, particularly those with disabilities (if online participation increases to permit those sufficient data to support these analyses).</li> <li>• Evidence of comparability of special versions (Spanish, Large Print, Braille, Text to Speech, American Sign Language) through empirical data or through external research supporting the use of these formats.</li> </ul>
<b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b>	<p>For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (PSSA), the PDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of plans for ongoing systematic monitoring of technical aspects of the PSSA (e.g., future TAC meeting dates, plans for special studies, item pool maintenance).</li> </ul>
<b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b>	<p>For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (PSSA), the PDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that it ensures the reported performance levels are aligned with what students should know and be able to do to succeed in work or college.</li> <li>• Evidence it collects data to establish an empirical link between PSSA proficiency designations and college and career readiness.</li> </ul>
<b>6.4 – Reporting</b>	<p>For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (PSSA), the PDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence it has developed a PSSA Test Score Interpretive Guide suitable for use by educators and parents; or an interpretative guide for the PSSA, if it already exists.</li> </ul>

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

## June, 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

## Contents

<b>SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS</b> .....	<b>3</b>
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students .....	3
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards .....	4
1.3 – Required Assessments(reviewed by Department staff only).....	6
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments(reviewed by Department staff only).....	7
1.5 – Participation Data(reviewed by Department staff only).....	10
<b>SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS</b> .....	<b>11</b>
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	11
2.2 – Item Development.....	13
2.3 – Test Administration .....	14
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration(reviewed by Department staff only) .....	15
2.5 – Test Security .....	16
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....	17
<b>SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY</b> .....	<b>18</b>
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	18
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	19
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure .....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables .....	21
<b>SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER</b> .....	<b>22</b>
4.1 – Reliability.....	22
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	23
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	24
4.4 – Scoring .....	25
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms .....	26
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment .....	27
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance .....	28
<b>SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS</b> .....	<b>29</b>
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities .....	29
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	31
5.3 – Accommodations.....	32
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations .....	33
<b>SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING</b> .....	<b>34</b>
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students.....	34
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....	35
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards .....	36
6.4 – Reporting.....	37

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</b></p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 001_State Board Minutes 9-12-13 PCS (p. 13)</li> <li>• 002_State Board Minutes 11-19-15 AA/EC (p. 13-14)</li> <li>• 003_PA Core Standards ELA (p. 1)</li> <li>• 118_PA Core Standards ELA 6-12 March 201 (p. 1)</li> <li>• 004_PA Core Standards Mathematics Grades PreK-12 March 2014 (p. 1-3)</li> <li>• 007_RAF (CH 4 Final-Form FINAL) (p. 1)</li> <li>• 011_Chapter 4 Assessment (p. 4)</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>Additional Listed Evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 005_Grade 4 Assessment ELA Anchor and Eligible Content</li> <li>• 006_Grade 8 Assessment Mathematics Anchor and Eligible Content</li> </ul>	<p>Note that this review is only for Pennsylvania’s general ELA and Math assessments in grades 3-8.</p> <p>State has shown evidence of adoption of challenging Core Standards. However, the state’s Core Standards include Speaking and Listening, while the Assessment Anchors and Eligible Content (and thus the assessment) do not include Speaking and Listening. There is no evidence in this submission of a state application for waiver for Speaking and Learning content assessment. Although additional evidence is not requested here, evidence about the omitted Speaking and Listening standards <i>is</i> requested under Critical Elements 2.1 and 3.1.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</b></p> <p>The State’s academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science specify what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school to succeed in college and the workforce; contain content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.</p>	<p>Success in college and the workforce</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 007_RAF (CH 4 Final-Form FINAL) (p. 2-3)</li> <li>• 003_PA Core Standards ELA PreK-5 March 2014 (p. 1)</li> <li>• 118_PA Core Standards ELA 6-12 March 2014 (p. 1)</li> <li>• 004_PA Core Standards Mathematics PreK-12 March 2014</li> </ul> <p>Coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 003_PA Core Standards ELA PreK-5 March 2014</li> <li>• 118_PA Core Standards ELA 6-12 March 2014</li> <li>• 004_PA Core Standards Mathematics PreK-12 March 2014</li> <li>• 161_Mathematics Learning Progression Map</li> <li>• 162_Reading Learning Progression Map</li> <li>• 163_Writing Learning Progression Map</li> </ul> <p>Encourage the teaching of advanced skills</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 003_PA Core Standards ELA PreK-5 March 2014</li> <li>• 118_PA Core Standards ELA 6-12 March 2014</li> <li>• 004_PA Core Standards Mathematics PreK-12 March 2014</li> </ul> <p>Broad stakeholder involvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 007_RAF (CH 4 Final-Form FINAL) (p. 3-7)</li> <li>• 103_Demographics - PA Academic Review</li> <li>• 104-109_Math -Grade [3-8] Summary</li> <li>• 110-115_ELA - Grade [3-8] Summary</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>Additional Listed Evidence</p>	<p>Standards appear appropriately rigorous for success in college and the workforce. Standards appear coherent from grade to grade.</p> <p>Grade specialization and demographic diversity/representativeness of the standards development committee members is not well documented.</p> <p>The process of implementing revisions based on feedback from stakeholders is unclear. Ideally, evidence would be provided that showed that the numerous suggestions provide by stakeholders were used to guide revision of the standards.</p> <p>In ELA the documents (evidence 003, 118) containing the standards are clear that the content standards are shifting towards CCR, while math does not make such a connections clear (evidence 004, 161).</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 PENNSYLVANIA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 011_Chapter 4 Assessment</li> <li>• 119-123_Grade [3, 5-8] Assessment ELA Anchor and Eligible Content</li> <li>• 005_Grade 4 Assessment ELA Anchor and Eligible Content</li> <li>• 124-128_Grade [3-7] Assessment Mathematics Anchor and Eligible Content</li> <li>• 006_Grade 8 Assessment Mathematics Anchor and Eligible Content</li> </ul>	
<b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p><b>1.3 – Required Assessments</b></p> <p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments (based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate academic achievement standards-AAAS) in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12);</li> <li>• Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12).</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for grade/subject combinations listed in left column</p> <p>Evidence that describes the annual assessments: Evidence of the State’s required annual assessments is provided via homepage text and testing calendars found on PDE’s website—K-12; Assessment and Accountability. (See evidence 009_Annual Assessment Info from PDE’s Website)</p> <p>Evidence that describes the annual assessments: Further evidence can be found in the PSSA assessment coordinator’s handbook, “Part II - Participation Guidelines for All Assessments,” on page 7. (See evidence 010_2015 PSSA Handbook for Assessment Coordinators)</p>	<p>State’s assessment evidence only included up to grade 8. These grade levels were appropriate however missing information for high school assessments prevented a complete evaluation of PA’s state assessment system. Further review of materials indicated that State does have tests in place to meet requirements of this element.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p><b>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</b></p> <p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system;</li> <li>• For English learners (EL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment;</li> <li>○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column-SWD and EL</p> <p>Evidence as to the inclusion of all public students: Evidence of the State’s requirement to include all grade-eligible students in the PSSA is found in 22 PA Code Chapter 4.51a, part (c). (evidence 011_Chapter 4 Assessment)</p> <p>Evidence as to the inclusion of all public students: Further evidence of the inclusion requirements can be found in the PSSA assessment coordinator’s handbook, “Part II - Participation Guidelines for All Assessments, Student Participation in the Assessment,” on page 7. (evidence 010_2015 PSSA Handbook for Assessment Coordinators)</p> <p>Evidence as to the inclusion of all public students: Further evidence of the inclusion requirements can be found in the assessment-coordinator training PowerPoint presentation, specifically the “PSSA Overview,” on slide 7. (evidence 013_PSSA Assessment Coordinator Training)</p> <p>Evidence as to the State’s considerations for the exclusion of students based on parental refusal: Evidence that the State has clearly defined procedures that allow for a parent’s right to exclude a child from the assessments based on a conflict with religious beliefs can be found on page 9 of the PSSA assessment coordinator’s handbook. (evidence 010_2015 PSSA Handbook for Assessment Coordinators)</p> <p>Evidence as to the State’s considerations for the exclusion of students based on parental refusal:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies provided but only included up to grade 8 for review. High school assessments were not provided by the state in the evidence as it applies to the policies.</li> <li>• Science assessment policies were addressed in the revised annotated IEP but with minimum support for determining evidence.</li> <li>• Inclusion of all public student had very little evidence for support in their PSSA Assessment Coordinator Training (Powerpoint presentation)</li> <li>• Clear policies outlined for students with disabilities(SWD) and English learners (ELs) for the assessment system in PSSA Handbook.</li> <li>• PSSA and Keystone Exams had correlation and provided guidelines for PA</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
	<p>Further evidence that the procedures that allow for a parent’s right to exclude a child from the assessments are in alignment with State regulations can be found in Pennsylvania’s Chapter 4 regulations, specifically 4.4(d), parts 3 and 4. (evidence 511_22 PA Code - 4 - 4.4)</p> <p>Evidence as to the inclusion of all students with disabilities: Evidence of the State’s requirement to include students with disabilities is found in 22 PA Code Chapter 4, specifically 4.51(l). (evidence 011_Chapter 4 Assessment)</p> <p>Evidence as to the inclusion of all students with disabilities: Further evidence of the State’s requirement to include students with disabilities can be found in the PSSA assessment coordinator’s handbook, “Part II - Participation Guidelines for All Assessments, Participation with Accommodations,” on page 7. (evidence 010_2015 PSSA Handbook for Assessment Coordinators)</p> <p>Evidence as to the inclusion of all students with disabilities: Further evidence of the State’s requirement to include students with disabilities can be found in the annotated Individualized Education Program (IEP) template, Part IV “Participation in State and Local Assessments,” on page 21. (evidence 012_Revised Annotated IEP 2014)</p> <p>Evidence as to the inclusion of all students with disabilities: Further evidence of the State’s requirement to include students with disabilities can be found in the Accommodations Guidelines, “Federal and State Laws Requiring Participation by Students with Disabilities,” on page 5. (evidence 014_Accommodations Guidelines)</p>	

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
	<p>Evidence as to the inclusion of English Language Learners (ELLs): Evidence of the State’s requirement to include ELL students is found in 22 PA Code Chapter 4, specifically 4.51(l). (evidence 011_Chapter 4 Assessment)</p> <p>Evidence as to the inclusion of English Language Learners (ELLs): Further evidence of the State’s requirement to include ELL students can be found in the PSSA assessment coordinator’s handbook, “Part IV – Completing Student Information, Demographics Item 6,” on page 17. (evidence 010_2015 PSSA Handbook for Assessment Coordinators)</p> <p>Evidence as to the inclusion of English Language Learners (ELLs): Further evidence of the State’s requirement to include ELL students can be found in the assessment-coordinator training PowerPoint presentation, specifically the “PSSA Overview,” on slide 12. (evidence 013_PSSA Assessment Coordinator Training)</p> <p>Evidence as to the inclusion of English Language Learners (ELLs): Further evidence of the State’s requirement to include ELL students can be found in the Accommodations Guidelines for ELLs, “Are ELLs required to take the PSSA,” on page 3. (evidence 016_ PSSA and Keystone Exams-Accommodations Guidelines for ELLs)</p>	
<b>Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>		
__x_ No additional evidence is required.		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p><b>1.5 – Participation Data</b></p> <p>The State’s participation data show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system. In addition, if the State administers end-of-course assessments for high school students, the State has procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates on each required assessment and provides the corresponding data.</p>	<p>Prompts for Reviewers:                      --data disaggregated by student group: ELA/Math/Science                      --Shows students tested and students enrolled for each breakout                      --for end-of-course HS, procedures to ensure each student is tested and counted in participation rate along with data                      --includes grade level tests and AA-AAAS</p>	<p>High school ELA and Math assessments were not reported by PA                      AA-AAAS results were not identifiable and impacted the outcome of the review                      High school science assessment were not provided for determining tested and enrolled for participation to show disaggregated by student group and assessment type.                      Information supported up to grade 8.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u> <u>  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:                      Although high school tests were not reviewed for other elements of technical quality, ED would prefer that participation data for the HS assessments be submitted.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA**

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results;</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills);</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.</li> </ul>	<p>Statement(s) of the purpose(s) and Intended Interpretations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 011_Chapter 4 Assessment (p. 1)</li> <li>• 017_Technical Report for the 2015 PSSA (p. 1-2; 179-190; 221-227)</li> <li>• 010_2015 PSSA Handbook for Assessment Coordinators (p. 41-44)</li> <li>• 019_ PSSA Score Interpretation Guide</li> </ul> <p>Blueprints</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 005-006_AA/EC [for ELA and Math]</li> <li>• 023-024_Test Design [for ELA and Math]</li> <li>• 021-022_Content Blueprints [for ELA and Math]</li> </ul> <p>Tailored to Content Standards, Challenging Content, &amp; Complex Demonstrations/Applications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 017_Technical Report for the 2015 PSSA (p. 6-11)</li> <li>• 025_PSSA Third-party Independent Alignment Study Report</li> <li>• 023-024_Test Design</li> <li>• 021-022_Content Blueprints [for ELA and Math]</li> <li>• 137-138_Detailed Test Design</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>Additional Listed Evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 017_Technical Report for the 2015 PSSA (p. 5-24, 78-90, 179-190)</li> <li>• 026-027 and 116_117_[ELA and Mathematics] Item and Scoring Sampler - Grade [4 and 8]</li> </ul>	<p>The assessments are generally well aligned to the Assessment Anchors and Eligible Content. However the Assessment Anchors and Eligible Content do not address the full range of the Core Standards, particularly those in Speaking and Listening.</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 PENNSYLVANIA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide plans to address areas of identified weak alignment, such as the grade 3 Math collapsed assessment anchors (e.g., Geometry).</li> <li>• Provide evidence of plans for remediation of the lack of Speaking and Listening content in assessments, including, but not limited to, submission of waiver request to US DOE, or a plan for development of Assessment Anchors and Eligible Content on the Speaking and Listening Standards, as well as items aligned to those Assessment Anchors and Eligible Content.</li> <li>• Provide evidence on the rationale and procedure by which the Assessment Anchors and Eligible Content were developed in order to represent the Core Standards.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.2 – Item Development</b></p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 017_Technical Report for the 2015 PSSA (p. 13-22; 30-62; C1-C5; E1-E4)</li> <li>• 028_Background of WestEd and DRC Item and Test Development Teams</li> <li>• 029a_Presentation_Item Writing Handscoring Workshops</li> <li>• 135 and 136_Establishing a Measure of Text-Dependent Analysis [paper and presentation]</li> <li>• 152_Item Development Processes Letter</li> <li>• 167_Meeting Recruiting Process</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>Additional Listed Evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 021-022_Content Blueprints [for ELA and Math]</li> <li>• 025_PSSA Third-party Independent Alignment Study Report with PDE Response</li> <li>• 026-027 and 116_117_[ELA and Mathematics] Item and Scoring Sampler - Grade [4 and 8]</li> <li>• 168_PSSA PLD_ELA_Math Attendee list FEB 2015</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The item development process is well documented and thorough.</li> <li>• Although DIF analyses are not mentioned as part of the item data review (Appendix C), there is a field for DIF results on the item review card (Appendix D) suggesting that they were used in the process.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>• Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments;</li> <li>• If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>	<p>Communicates Procedures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 013_PSSA Assessment Coordinator Training (slides 22-30)</li> <li>• 031 - 034_Directions for Administration</li> <li>• 035_Administration Training Notification</li> </ul> <p>Procedures to Insure Training</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 010_2015 PSSA Handbook for Assessment Coordinators (p. 4-5)</li> <li>• 035_Administration Training Notification</li> <li>• 036_Online Test Administrator Training</li> <li>• 139_PSTAT Help Guide 2015-2016</li> <li>• 149_PSTAT Announcement</li> </ul> <p>Procedures for Technology-Based Administration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 164_Testing Support and Issues Communication Plan</li> <li>• 041_Technology User Guide</li> <li>• 042_Technology Training PowerPoint</li> <li>• 037 - 040_Online Directions for Administration</li> <li>• 013_PSSA Assessment Coordinator Training</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>Additional Listed Evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 043_Information and Screenshots of Online Tools Training</li> <li>• 044_Information and Screenshots of the Online Tutorial</li> </ul>	<p>The submitted evidence suggests clear communication processes and rich training materials, but there is not evidence of a process for verification of participation in training by test administrators.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of procedure(s) that verify that test administrators have participated in the required training.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p><b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p>_____ policies and procedures apply to all grade-level and AA-AAAS in all subjects</p> <p>Evidence that the State adequately monitors the administration of its assessments: Evidence of the State’s policies for monitoring the assessments, as well as statistics relating to its monitoring activities during the 2014-2015 school year, is found in PDE’s overview document of the test monitoring plan. (evidence 047_Summary-Evaluation Report of 2014-2015 PDE KE-PSSA Monitoring)</p> <p>Evidence that the State adequately monitors the administration of its assessments: Evidence that all District Assessment Coordinators are notified of the State’s monitoring process can be found in the PowerPoint presentation from the required, annual assessment-coordinator training, slides 13-14. (evidence 013_PSSA Assessment Coordinator Training)</p>	<p>PA provided evidence of communication for the required training in their monitoring plan. However, evidence of their procedures to follow-up on the effectiveness of the training was missing.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence of the actual outcomes or activity of monitoring by the State.</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 PENNSYLVANIA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.5 – Test Security</b></p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 010_2015 PSSA Handbook for Assessment Coordinators (p. 22-23; 42)</li> <li>• 013_PSSA Assessment Coordinator Training (slides 18-21)</li> <li>• 035_Administration Training Notification</li> <li>• 036_ Online Test Administrator Training</li> <li>• 031_Directions for Administration -- ELA Grade 4 (p. 1-2)</li> <li>• 051_Handbook for Secure Test Administration</li> <li>• 049_Educator Discipline Act</li> <li>• 058_Test Development Security Plan</li> <li>• 141_PA Secure Materials Accountability Process</li> <li>• 054_Data Forensics for the Pennsylvania Assessments</li> <li>• 057_Process for Handling Test Irregularities</li> <li>• 158_Testing Impropriety Follow-Up</li> <li>• 056_Summary of 2015 PSSA Test Irregularities</li> </ul>	<p>Approach to data forensics by the testing vendor appears comprehensive (054), but there is no evidence showing the application of these analytic methods to actual data.</p> <p>The state should consider developing specific guidelines for identification of potential assessment irregularities, if it does not have such guidelines already in place. Such guidelines should also acknowledge that assessment irregularities need to be addressed on a case-by-case basis.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</b></p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results;</li> <li>• To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> <li>• To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 060_Pennsylvania Comprehensive Security Plan</li> <li>• 058_Test Development Security Plan</li> <li>• 141_PA Secure Materials Accountability Process</li> <li>• 131_DRC Data Privacy Policy</li> </ul>	<p>The primary focus of these documents is on the security of materials and electronic records. Evidence is needed that explains, in greater clarity, how aggregate reporting procedures prevent inferences at individual student level. For example, if no student in an identified demographic subgroup is proficient, then knowing a student is in that demographic subgroup is tantamount to knowing his or her performance level.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describe procedures for ensuring that no individual's result can be imputed from publicly available aggregate data.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> <li>• If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 017_Technical Report for the 2015 PSSA (p. 13-22; Chapter 19: Validity; Chapter Sixteen: Scores and Score Reports, p. 183 – 185)</li> </ul> <p>Alignment - Standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 003_PA Core Standards ELA PreK-5 March 2014</li> <li>• 118_PA Core Standards ELA 6-12 March 2014</li> <li>• 004_PA Core Standards Mathematics PreK-12 March 2014</li> </ul> <p>Alignment – Assessment – Assessment Anchors &amp; Eligible Content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 025_PSSA Third-party Independent Alignment Study Report with PDE Response</li> <li>• 119-123_Grade [3, 5-8] Assessment ELA Anchor and Eligible Content</li> <li>• 005_Grade 4 Assessment ELA Anchor and Eligible Content</li> <li>• 124-128_Grade [3-7] Assessment Mathematics Anchor and Eligible Content</li> <li>• 006_Grade 8 Assessment Mathematics Anchor and Eligible Content</li> </ul>	<p>The state should consider how the evidence currently collected can be better integrated to support the intended interpretations of the assessment scores. That is, the state should develop a validity argument that synthesizes the collected validity evidence. In a similar vein, the state should develop plans, aligned with the plans present under Critical Element 4.7, for the ongoing identification and collection of key validity evidence.</p> <p>As mentioned under Critical Element 2.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state academic content standards contain Speaking and Listening, which is not present in the Assessment Anchors and Eligible Content.</li> <li>• Items need to be developed to address weaknesses in alignment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>  </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:As noted under Critical Element 2.1,             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide plans to address areas of identified weak alignment, such as the grade 3 Math collapsed assessment anchors (e.g., Geometry).</li> <li>• Provide evidence of plans for remediation of the lack of Speaking and Listening content in assessments, including, but not limited to, submission of waiver request to US DOE, or a plan for development of Assessment Anchors and Eligible Content on the Speaking and Listening Standards, as well as items aligned to those Assessment Anchors and Eligible Content.</li> <li>• Provide evidence on the rationale and procedure by which the Assessment Anchors and Eligible Content were developed in order to represent the Core Standards.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 025_PSSA Third-party Independent Alignment Study Report with PDE Response</li> <li>• 017_Technical Report for the 2015 PSSA (Chapter 3, pages 30-42; Chapter 4, pages 43-48; Chapter 11; and Appendix C. Appendix , F1-F98, pages 145-146)</li> <li>• 029_Sample Item Writer Training Materials</li> <li>• 136_Establishing a Measure of Text-Dependent Analysis</li> <li>• 061_PSSA Relation to Other Variables Analysis Plan</li> </ul>	<p>Evidence for most items is based on expert judgment of the items conducted as part of the item writing process. The state would be well served to develop plans to gather additional evidence on cognitive processes (e.g., cognitive labs or relationships to measures that require similar levels of cognitive complexity in the content area) for a purposefully selected set of items. One immediate solution would be to create plans to draw on the evidence from Validity Study 2 detailed in 061_PSSA Relation to Other Variables Analysis Plan to provide evidence based on cognitive processes.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 017_ Technical Report for the 2015 PSSA (134-144; 224-236)</li> <li>• 023-024_ Test Design [for ELA and Math]</li> <li>• 003-004 PA Core Standards</li> <li>• 005-006 AA/EC</li> <li>• 021-022 content blueprints</li> <li>100-101 Individual Student Reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The correlations, PCAs and Parallel Analyses, and EFAs generally reflect strongly unidimensional ELA and Mathematics measures, but also suggest some limited value for subscores. This finding shows that the assessments have struck a good balance between overall reliability and matching the blueprint structure.</li> <li>• Analytic methods were used to examine the structure of the test along five of the ELA Reporting categories (Reading, Writing, Text-Dependent Analysis, Literary Text and Informational Text). The “subdomains” of Reading and Writing should be investigated in a similar manner to lend the same level of support to the remaining ELA reporting categories.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet 017_Technical Report for the 2015 PSSA (Ch. 19 Validity)</p>	<p>Studies in progress include relationships between PSSA and state Classroom Diagnostic Tools Test and Teacher Ratings. Additional evidence could include relationships between national tests (e.g., NWEA, ACT) that perhaps can be obtained from districts using those measures.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plans for collecting empirical evidence of convergent and discriminant validity with respect to <i>established</i> measures, including measures that have linkages to career and workplace success.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.1 – Reliability</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement.</li> </ul>	<p>Test Reliability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 017_ Technical Report for the 2015 PSSA (p. 197-220, P1-P28)</li> </ul> <p>Overall and Conditional SEM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 017_ Technical Report for the 2015 PSSA (p. 210-213)</li> </ul> <p>Classification Accuracy and Consistency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 017_ Technical Report for the 2015 PSSA (p. 213-216)</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</b></p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 017_ Technical Report for the 2015 PSSA (39-42; 43-48; 55-59; Chapters 3-5: Item Review, Universal Design, DIF Analyses)</li> <li>• 154_ DRC Fairness In Testing Manual</li> <li>• 156_ Online Accessibility (all pages, but especially p. 292-303)</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b></p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>017_ Technical Report for the 2015 PSSA (p. 150-157, 210-213; Ch. 12, 18 Wright Maps, CSEM graphs)</li> </ul>	<p>There are more items at the very low end of the difficulty scale than at the very high end, with the result that low-achieving students are measured with greater precision (as shown through the smaller conditional SEMs at the lower end of the scale) than students at the very high end of the scale (with larger conditional SEMs). Whether very-difficult items should be developed/added to improve measurement precision at the top of the scale was discussed, but there was not consensus on the need for action.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 017_ Technical Report for the 2015 PSSA               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Chapter Eight (esp. p. 73-83);</li> <li>○ Chapter Twelve: Rasch Item Calibration (p. 133-158)</li> <li>○ Chapter Thirteen: Performance Level Setting (p. 159-163)</li> <li>○ Chapter Fourteen: Scaling (p. 163-168);</li> <li>○ Chapter Fifteen: Linking 171-175;</li> <li>○ Chapter Sixteen: Scores and Score Reports (p. 179)</li> <li>○ Chapter Eighteen: Reliability (p. 217-219)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 165_ TAC Doc - Math and ELA Reportable Scales Specifications</li> <li>• 166_ Math-ELA Reportable Scales_Documentation and Summary</li> <li>• 072_ June 2015 equating document (entire document, but especially p. 39 - 49)</li> <li>• 077_Scope Statement - Third-Party Equating and Scaling of the 2014 PSSA</li> <li>• 078_Third-Party Checking of 2014 Scaling and Equating PSSA</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</b></p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 017_ Technical Report for the 2015 PSSA (94-107; 172-175; Chapters 9 and 15)</li> <li>• 155_ Breach Forms Process</li> <li>• 072_June 2015 equating document</li> <li>• 077_Scope Statement - Third-Party Equating and Scaling of the 2014 PSSA</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>Additional Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 070_June 2014 equating document</li> <li>• 077_Scope Statement - Third-Party Equating and Scaling of the 2014 PSSA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The descriptions of equating/linking were often unclear, particularly in that it was difficult to tell what applied to just Science or both Science and ELA/Math.</li> <li>• The documentation does not indicate how future administrations will be equated to the current year (e.g., how will future tests be placed on the same scale as the current test?). E.g., will the state be using the same design used currently for Science and previously for ELA/Math?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State plans for future year-to-year equating for PSSA Math/ELA.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b></p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>017_Technical Report for the 2015 PSSA (p. 63-65; 94-104; Chapters 6 and 9)</li> <li>063_PSSA Spanish Translation Methodology</li> <li>064_PSSA Large-print Production Methodology</li> <li>065_PSSA Braille Production Methodology</li> <li>066_PSSA Text-to-Speech (TTS) Production Methodology</li> <li>067_PSSA Video Sign Language (VSL) Production Methodology</li> <li>068_PSSA Mode Comparability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given that there is insufficient data to permit empirical examinations of comparability of the Spanish Translation, Large Print, Braille, Text-to-Speech and Video Sign Language forms, the state could bolster its evidence by providing literature supporting the validity of these alternate form approaches.</li> <li>There are small, but consistent differences between propensity matched paper and online form groups (.02 per item on average) suggesting online ELA form may be more difficult.</li> <li>Plan for paper vs. online mode comparability study depends on occurrence of sufficient online participation. Use of proposed .50 SD effect size criterion is not appropriate, much smaller differences will importantly bias results</li> </ul>

**Section 4.6 Summary Statement**

<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supplement proposed analysis plan for ongoing evaluation of online vs. paper mode differences             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to include examination of impact on protected sub-groups, particularly those with disabilities as online participation increases to permit those analyses</li> <li>to account for the need for additional studies if and when online testing expands</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b></p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 076_Executive Summary PSSA Focus Group Notes 2015</li> <li>• 077_Scope Statement - Third-Party Equating and Scaling of the 2014 PSSA</li> <li>• 078_Third-Party Checking of 2014 Scaling and Equating PSSA</li> <li>• 129_PSSA TAC Document - Student Score Report Development</li> <li>• 075_ Winter 2016 Online Feedback Sessions – Summary</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>Additional Evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 157_Chapter 4 Academic standards</li> <li>• 070 &amp; 072_ PSSA TAC Document – Equating_June [2014 &amp; 2015]</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state has provided evidence that it has conducted monitoring of the equating processes used in prior versions of the PSSA, as well as implemented processes to improve the score reports and online administration system.</li> <li>• However, the state has not shown that these processes are part of a system for monitoring, maintaining and improving the assessments system, nor have they defined what criteria such a system will use. That is, the state has conducted technical analysis and maintenance in the past, but has not demonstrated it plans to do so in the future (i.e., in an ongoing fashion).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state should provide evidence of plans for ongoing systematic monitoring (e.g., future TAC meeting dates, plans for special studies, item pool maintenance for the PSSA ELA/Math).</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA**

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards;</li> <li>• States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs;</li> <li>• Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment;</li> <li>• Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities;</li> <li>• Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 010_2015 PSSA Handbook for Assessment Coordinators (p. 7-9, 18-21)</li> <li>• 151_22 PA Code - 4 - 4.4, specifically 4.4(d), parts 3 and 4.</li> <li>• 012_Revised Annotated IEP 2014 (p. 21 – 26)</li> <li>• 014_Accommodations Guidelines (p.3, 4-16, 23-42)</li> <li>• 080_Guidelines for Selection and Use of Accommodations for Keystone Exams and PSSA Tests (p. 17-20.)</li> </ul>	<p>This submission is only for general population PSSA ELA and Mathematics exams. Similar guidelines for selection of students for the AA-AAAS are not included in the evidence reviewed at this time.</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 PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;</li> <li>• Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments);</li> <li>• The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> <li>• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;</li> <li>• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 016_PSSA and Keystone Exams- Accommodations Guidelines for ELLs) (p. 2-3, 7-11)</li> <li>• 010_2015 PSSA Handbook for Assessment Coordinators (p. 17-18)</li> <li>• 151_22 PA Code - 4 - 4.4, specifically 4.4(d), parts 3 and 4.</li> <li>• 016_PSSA and Keystone Exams- Accommodations Guidelines for ELLs (p. 7-11, particularly p. 5)</li> <li>• 014_Accommodations Guideline (p. 3, 23-42, particularly p. 23 on</li> </ul>	<p>This submission is only for general population PSSA ELA and Mathematics exams. As with the previous critical element, information on the identification of students to take AA-AAAS is not examined here.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.3 – Accommodations</b></p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504;</li> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);</li> <li>• Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> <li>• Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 014_Accommodations Guidelines (p. 5-8, 43, 50)</li> <li>• 080_Guidelines for Selection and Use of Accommodations for Keystone Exams and PSSA Tests)</li> <li>• 016_PSSA and Keystone Exams- Accommodations Guidelines for ELLs</li> <li>• 082_Accommodations Validity Study (p. 1-7, esp. 7)</li> <li>• 083_2016 Keystone PSSA Unique Accommodation Request</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b></p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 159_Monitoring for Special Populations</li> <li>• 145_PA Statewide Assessment Accommodations Monitoring Checklist</li> <li>• 146_Teacher Interview (special education)</li> <li>• 147_Classroom Observation</li> <li>• 148_School District FSA</li> <li>• 010_2015 PSSA Handbook for Assessment Coordinators (p. 18-21)</li> <li>• 017_Technical Report for the 2015 PSSA (115-123)</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</b></p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities;</li> <li>• The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply;</li> <li>• The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</li> </ul>	<p>084_State Board of Education July 2015 (p. 6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 095_Performance Level Descriptor Development Process</li> <li>• 011_Chapter 4 Assessment</li> <li>• 089_PSSA English Language Arts Performance Level Descriptors;</li> <li>• 090_PSSA Mathematics Performance Level Descriptors)</li> <li>• 100_Sample ISR - grade 4 and evidence</li> <li>• 101_Sample ISR - grade 8</li> <li>• 091_PSSA Final Scale Score Ranges</li> <li>• 094_Standard Setting Technical Report (esp. p. 35 -37)</li> </ul>	<p>Review concerned only PSSA Math and ELA exams.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b></p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 092_Observation and Reporting on PSSA Standard Setting</li> <li>• 095_Performance Level Descriptor Development Process</li> <li>• 093_State Board Presentation PSSA Cut Scores and Performance Level Descriptors</li> <li>• 094_Standard Setting Technical Report</li> <li>153_2015 PSSA Standard Setting Plan for TAC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The number of educators involved in the creation of the PLDs is somewhat low (p. 3 of evidence 092).</li> <li>• Males were under-represented on the standards setting committees, as were those of minority background. Reviewers discussed the appropriateness of including open-ended writing item in the bookmark process.,</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b></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 PENNSYLVANIA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 095_Performance Level Descriptor Development Process</li> <li>• 023-024_Test Design</li> <li>• 137-138_Detailed Test Design: and evidence 021-022_Content Blueprints [for ELA and Math]</li> <li>• 094_Standard Setting Technical Report</li> <li>• 095_Performance Level Descriptor Development Process;</li> <li>• 089_PSSA English Language Arts Performance Level Descriptors;</li> <li>• 090_PSSA Mathematics Performance Level Descriptors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As noted previously, this review only examines the grades 3-8 ELA/Math assessments. Alternate Assessments are not included in this review.</li> <li>• The text contained in the PLDs (performance level descriptors) in 089 and 090 is extensive and does describe skill that, presumably, a student needs in order to be successful in college and the workforce. However, the reported PLDs are shorter and missing some of the key information.</li> <li>• It is unclear how the PLDs, as well as the academic content standards based on these PLDs, relate to what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A plan to ensure PLDs capture what students should know and be able to do to succeed in work or college.</li> <li>• A plan to collect data to establish empirical link between PSSA proficiency designations and college and workforce success (or, similarly, college and career readiness).</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;</li> <li>• The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;</li> <li>• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;</li> <li>○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;</li> <li>○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 096_Reporting Timeline Bookmark for 2015</li> <li>• 160_Sample Parent Letter</li> <li>• 076_Executive Summary PSSA Focus Group Notes 2015</li> <li>• 129_PSSA TAC Document - Student Score Report Development</li> <li>• 130_PSSA State Level Data</li> <li>• 097_PSSA School Level Data</li> <li>• 018_Accountability Data from State RFRM</li> <li>• 142_2015 PSSA Data File Memo and Layout)</li> <li>• 098_Sample District Summary Report</li> <li>• 099_Sample School Summary Report</li> <li>• 102_Data Interaction summary</li> <li>• 100_Sample ISR - grade 4 and 101_Sample ISR - grade 8</li> <li>• 019_PSSA Student Report Guide</li> <li>• 017_<i>Technical Report for the 2015 PSSA</i> (P1-P28, 221-238, Chapter 10, tables 10.1 E, M, and S)</li> <li>• 143_PSSA Student Report Guide Spanish</li> <li>• 144_Reporting Timeline</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interpretation of results for mandated reporting groups would be facilitated by also reporting results for the students not in that group.</li> <li>• District (and where applicable, School) Reports may be more useful if performance within each grade is reported by student subgroups. Standard deviations should accompany the reporting of means.</li> <li>• Use of focus group to review score reports is noteworthy, but it was unclear whether revisions were made based on their comments.</li> <li>• Consideration might be given to construction of an interpretative guide for test reports if none exists.</li> <li>• Consideration might be given to a more visual, web-based interface that facilitates public exploration of test data.</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>		
<b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A plan to improve public access to and understanding of state assessment data</li> <li>• Test Score Interpretive Guide suitable for use by educators</li> </ul>		

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