



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 17126

February 23, 2018

Dear Secretary Rivera:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education's (the Department) assessment peer review process under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), which governed State assessments through the 2016-2017 school year. The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), which governs State assessments beginning in the 2017-2018 school year, maintains the essential requirements from NCLB that each State annually administer high-quality assessments in at least reading/language arts, mathematics, and science that meet nationally recognized professional and technical standards with a few additional requirements. I appreciate the efforts of the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in August 2017.

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

External peer reviewers and Department staff evaluated the PDE submission and found, based on the evidence received, that the general assessments for reading/language arts and mathematics in grades 3-8 and for reading/language arts, mathematics and science in high school met all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of section 1111(b)(1) and (3) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB. In addition, Department staff also has determined that these assessments meet the new assessment requirements under the ESEA, as amended by ESSA. Congratulations on meeting this important ESEA requirement; assessments that produce valid and reliable results are fundamental to a State's accountability system.

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 and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (Pennsylvania System of State Assessment (PSSA)): **Meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**
- Reading/language arts, mathematics and science general assessments in high school (Keystone Assessment): **Meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**

PDE also provided information regarding the alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (PASA) in reading/language arts, mathematics and science for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. Feedback regarding this component of your assessment system will be presented in a subsequent letter.

Please be aware that approval of the PDE Keystone and PSSA assessments under ESEA is not a determination that the system complies with Federal civil rights requirements, including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, and requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Finally, please remember that, if PDE makes significant changes in its assessment system, the State must submit information about those changes to the Department for review and approval.

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. We have found it a pleasure working with your staff on this review. Please accept my congratulations for your State's approved assessments under the ESEA. I wish you well in your continued efforts to improve student achievement in Pennsylvania.

If you have any questions, please contact Ashley Briggs of my staff at: OSS.Pennsylvania@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

Jason Botel
Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary,
Delegated the Authority to Perform the
Functions and Duties of the Assistant Secretary
of Elementary and Secondary Education

cc: Ray Young, State Assessment Director

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

August 2017 State Assessment Peer Review Notes for Pennsylvania, including resubmission evidence from 2012 and 2016 peer reviews



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, INCLUDING
RESUBMISSION EVIDENCE**

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS .	4
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students	4
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards	5
1.3 – Required Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only).....	6
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only).....	8
1.5 – Participation Data (reviewed by Department staff only).....	15
SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS	17
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	17
2.2 – Item Development.....	20
2.3 – Test Administration	22
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)24	
2.5 – Test Security	26
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....	27
SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....	29
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	29
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	31
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	32
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	33
SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER	35
4.1 – Reliability.....	35
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	36
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	37
4.4 – Scoring	38
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	40
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	42
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance.....	45
SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS	47
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	47
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	49
5.3 – Accommodations.....	50
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	51
SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .	52
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students	52
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....	54
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	55
6.4 – Reporting.....	57

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION EVIDENCE

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State.</p>	<p>NOTE: Requirement previously met for Keystone, PSSA.</p>	<p>Peer Notes/Comments (PASA):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PDE provides the SBE meeting minutes about the adoption of the PA academic instructional standards in the Final-Form Regulation: Chapter 4 (Academic Standards and Assessment) (Action Items). 2. File 004_Chapter 4 is a formal document for the state assessments. In (l), the state will develop guidelines for the participation of children with disabilities in the alternate assessments. 3. PA provides evidence to support the formal adaption of the alternate content standards in ELA, Mathematics, and Science.
<p>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> x </u> No additional evidence is required for Keystone, PSSA, PASA.</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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION EVIDENCE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science specify what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school to succeed in college and the workforce; contain content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.</p>	<p>NOTE: Requirement previously met for Keystone, PSSA.</p>	<p>Peer Notes/Comments (PASA):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> File 195 is a PP presentation about the process of AEC development, but no information about the broad stakeholders’ involvement. File 196 is a meeting agenda without evidence for the broad stakeholders’ involvement. Files 200-213 are the review notes by Browder in ELA and math by grade. No evidence is provided for the broad stakeholders’ involvement. File 038 is a report by the U of Pitt on the review and revision of science AEC and redesign of the corresponding assessments (4, 8, and 11). Files 197-199 are the external review notes for science by Browder and Duschl. File 039 is a table in math and ELA by grade with content standards, but without any explanation or evidence to support the vertical alignment. File 214 is a report by U of Pitt showing the connections by science standards across 4, 8, and 11. The state provides evidence on the development of alternate content standards based on the state core content standards. The AEC was reviewed internally by PA educators and by external content experts.
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for Keystone or PSSA</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed for PASA/provide brief rationale:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Although the submission indicated the broad stakeholders involved in the process for AEC, no support evidence is provided. For instance, the roster of participants. 		

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

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>1.3 – Required Assessments</p> <p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments (based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate academic achievement standards-AAAS) in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). 	<p>NOTE: Requirement previously met for Keystone, PSSA.</p> <p>Evidence that describes the annual assessments: Evidence that describes the annual alternate assessments in reading, mathematics, and science can be found on the PASA website. (See evidence 043 [a & b]_Annual [R-M & Science] Assessment Info from PASA Website)</p> <p>Evidence that describes the annual assessments: Further evidence that describes the annual alternate assessments in reading, mathematics, and science is provided via the homepage text and proposed testing dates found on PDE’s website. (See evidence 114_PASA Testing Dates Screenshot)</p> <p>Evidence that describes the annual assessments: Further evidence that describes the annual alternate reading and math assessments is also provided in the Reading and Math administration manual, Part 1, pages 2-6, and page A-1. (See evidence 045_PASA R-M Administration Manual)</p> <p>Evidence that describes the annual assessments: Further evidence that describes the annual alternate science assessments is also provided in the Science administration manual, pages 1 and 6. (See evidence 044_PASA Science Administration Manual)</p> <p>Evidence that describes the annual assessments: Further evidence that describes the annual alternate reading and math assessments is also provided in the online PASA test administrator training modules</p>	<p>PASA Initial Submission Documents address the critical element.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION EVIDENCE

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
	<p>introduction, slides 3-4 and 8-17. (See evidence 163_Online Introduction to the PASA – 2016)</p> <p>Evidence that describes the annual assessments: Further evidence that describes the annual alternate science assessments is also provided in the Science technical report, pages 13-14. (See evidence 040_2016 PASA Science Technical Report) Additional clarification gathered from: http://www.pattan.net/category/Educational%20Initiatives/Students%20with%20Significant%20Cognitive%20Disabilities/page/Alternate_Eligible_Content.html</p>	
Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
x No additional evidence is required for Keystone, PSSA, PASA.		

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

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</p> <p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system; • For English learners (EL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment; ○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years. 	<p>Evidence as to the inclusion of all public students: Evidence of the requirement to include all grade-eligible students in the State’s assessments is found in 22 PA Code Chapter 4.51a, part (c), with specific reference to the alternate assessment in 4.51, part (l). (See evidence 004_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 (general assessment) administration handbook, “Student Participation in the Assessment” on page 7, and “Participation in the Pennsylvania Alternate System of Assessment” on page 8. (See evidence 110_2016 PSSA Handbook for Assessment Coordinators)</p> <p>Evidence as to the inclusion of all public students: Evidence of the requirement to include eligible students in the alternate assessments can be found in the assessment-coordinator training PowerPoint presentation, specifically the “PSSA Overview,” on slide 11. (See evidence 047_PDE Assessment Coordinator Training)</p> <p>Evidence as to the State’s considerations for the exclusion of students based on parental refusal: Evidence that the procedures that allow for a parent’s right to exclude a child from the assessments, based on a conflict with religious beliefs, are in alignment with State regulations can be found in Pennsylvania’s Chapter 4 regulations, specifically 4.4(d), parts 3 and 4. (See evidence 050_22 PA Code - 4 - 4.4)</p> <p>Evidence as to the State’s considerations for the</p>	<p>PASA Initial Submission-Notes:</p> <p>In 045 and 165, Native language assessment instructions don’t specify the 3 year requirement but only allow for native language instructions for ELA and entire assessment for math; neither specify any timeline for which native language assessments can be administered.</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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION EVIDENCE

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
	<p>exclusion of students based on parental refusal: Further evidence as to the regulations providing a religious exemption as the only reason for exclusion from annual statewide accountability assessment is provided in the Reading and Math administration manual, page G-1, and in the Science administration manual, page 7. (See evidence 045_PASA R-M Administration Manual; and evidence 044_PASA Science Administration Manual)</p> <p>Evidence as to the inclusion of all public students: Evidence as to the inclusion of all eligible public students in the annual accountability assessment through the PASA is provided in the Reading and Math administration manual, pages 2-3. (See evidence 045_PASA R-M Administration Manual)</p> <p>Evidence as to the inclusion of all public students: Evidence as to the inclusion of all eligible public students in the annual accountability assessment through the Science PASA is provided in Science administration manual, page 1: description of assessment; page 6: criteria for taking the PASA; page 28: allowance to provide an interpreter; and pages 29-31: low-incidence populations. (See evidence 044_PASA Science Administration Manual)</p> <p>Evidence as to the inclusion of all public students: Evidence as to the inclusion of all eligible public school students in the annual accountability assessments through the Reading and Math PASA is provided in the introduction to the online administrator training modules, slides 4-7. (See evidence 163_Online Introduction to the PASA)</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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION EVIDENCE

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
	<p>2016)</p> <p>Evidence as to the inclusion of all public students: Evidence as to the inclusion of all eligible public students in the annual accountability assessment through the Science PASA is provided in the enrollment training found on the PASA website. The enrollment training summarizes how assessment coordinators and assessors can verify PASA student rosters. (See evidence 215_PASA Science Enrollment Training)</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). (See evidence 004_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 annotated Individualized Education Program (IEP) template, Part IV “Participation in State and Local Assessments,” on page 21. (See evidence 046_Revised Annotated IEP 2017)</p> <p>Evidence as to the inclusion of all students with disabilities: Further evidence of the State’s requirement to include all students, including students with disabilities who are publicly placed in private schools, is identified in the 2017 Attribution Map. (See evidence 112_2017 Attribution Map)</p> <p>Evidence as to the inclusion of all students with disabilities: Further evidence of the State’s</p>	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION EVIDENCE

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
	<p>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. (See evidence 048_Accommodations Guidelines)</p> <p>Evidence as to the inclusion of all students with disabilities: Evidence as to the inclusion of all students with disabilities is provided in the PASA State Report Card, specifically in the tables on pages 7-19 that describe the demographics and range of disabilities of students enrolled in the PASA. (See evidence 053_PASA State Report Card)</p> <p>Evidence as to the inclusion of all students with disabilities: Further evidence as to the inclusion of all students with disabilities is provided in the PASA Science State Report Card, specifically in the tables on pages 3, 4 and 16 that describe the demographics and range of disabilities of students enrolled in the PASA. (See evidence 216_PASA Science State Report Card)</p> <p>Evidence as to the inclusion of all students with disabilities: Further evidence as to the inclusion of all students with disabilities is provided is provided in the Science administration manual, page 6: criteria for taking the PASA; page 28: allowance to provide an interpreter; and pages 29-31: low-incidence populations. (See evidence 044_PASA Science Administration Manual)</p> <p>Evidence as to the inclusion of all students with disabilities: Further evidence as to the inclusion of all students with disabilities is provided in the</p>	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION EVIDENCE

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
	<p>Reading and Math technical report, pages 7-13. (See evidence 041_2016 PASA Reading-Math Technical Report)</p> <p>Evidence as to the inclusion of all students with disabilities: Further evidence as to the inclusion of all students with disabilities is provided in the Science technical report, page 18: table 2, which shows the primary disability of students taking the PASA Science; and page 20: table 5, which shows the breakdown of examinees by tier and primary disability. (See evidence 040_2016 PASA Science Technical Report)</p> <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). (See evidence 004_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 assessment-coordinator training PowerPoint presentation, specifically the “PSSA Overview,” on slide 12. (See evidence 047_PDE 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 in the State’s assessments can be found on page 3 of the Accommodations Guidelines for ELLs. (See evidence 049_Accommodations Guidelines for English Language Learners)</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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION EVIDENCE

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
	<p>Evidence as to the inclusion of English Language Learners (ELLs): Evidence as to the inclusion of English Language Learners (ELLs) with significant cognitive disabilities in the alternate assessments is provided in the annual State Report Card, tables 12, 13, 14 on pages 16-18. (See evidence 053_PASA State Report Card)</p> <p>Evidence as to the inclusion of English Language Learners (ELLs): Evidence as to the inclusion of all students with disabilities, including ELLs, is also provided in the PASA Science State Report Card, tables 14-15 on page 6. (See evidence 216_PASA Science State Report Card)</p> <p>Evidence as to the inclusion of English Language Learners (ELLs): Further evidence as to the inclusion of English Language Learners (ELLs) with significant cognitive disabilities in the alternate assessment can be found in the PASA Reading & Math technical report, table 3 of page 12 (See evidence 041_2016 PASA Reading-Math Technical Report)</p> <p>Evidence as to the inclusion of English Language Learners (ELLs): Further evidence as to the inclusion of English Language Learners (ELLs) with significant cognitive disabilities in the alternate assessment can be found on page 27 of the PASA Reading and Math administration manual and on slides 15-18 of the adapted-version online training. (See evidence 045_2016 PASA R-M Administration Manual; and evidence 165_Online Training Adaptive Versions - 2016)</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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION EVIDENCE

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
	<p>Evidence as to the inclusion of English Language Learners (ELLs): Further evidence as to the inclusion of ELLs in the annual accountability assessment through the PASA is provided in the Science administration manual, page 28: allowance to provide an interpreter. (See evidence 044_PASA Science Administration Manual)</p> <p>Evidence as to the inclusion of English Language Learners (ELLs): Further evidence as to the inclusion of ELLs in the PASA, as well as the exemption for students who are in their first year in the US, is provided on page 8 of the Science administration manual, which shows the website through which teachers can explain why the science assessment was not administered. (See evidence 044_PASA Science Administration Manual)</p>	
Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
<p><u> </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale for all State assessments: If the State administers native language assessments, the State must require that 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. The State must provide evidence that such requirement is communicated with districts and schools.</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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION EVIDENCE

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>1.5 – Participation Data</p> <p>The State’s participation data show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system. In addition, if the State administers end-of-course assessments for high school students, the State has procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates on each required assessment and provides the corresponding data.</p>	<p>NOTE: Requirement previously met for PSSA.</p> <p>Keystone Resubmission Evidence that all student groups are included in the assessments: Evidence of assessment participation by student subgroups can be found in the breakdown of the participation rates for the 2016 assessments by assessment type, grade, and student subgroups. Note: The “HS” (high school) column is representative of student participation in the Keystone Exams. (See “Evidence for 1.5_Statewide Participation Data”)</p> <p>PASA Initial Submission</p> <p>Evidence that all student groups are included in the assessments: Evidence that all student groups are included in the assessments is provided in the Reading and Math technical report in tables 2, 3, and 4 on pages 8-11. (See evidence 041_2016 PASA Reading-Math Technical Report)</p> <p>Evidence that all student groups are included in the assessments: Further evidence that all student groups are included in the assessments is provided in the Science technical report, table 2 on page 17 and tables 4-6 on page 20. (See evidence 040_2016 PASA Science Technical Report)</p> <p>Evidence that all student groups are included in the assessments: Further evidence that all student groups are included in the science assessments is also provided in table 1 of the Science technical report, which shows the percentage of students statewide who take the PASA and PSSA in the grades tested by</p>	<p>Keystone Resubmission Participation rate data for Algebra I and Biology EOCs are not provided. Data in CSPR for PA indicates high school assessment participation.</p> <p>Data for migratory students are not provided. Data in CSPR for PA indicates reporting for this category.</p> <p>Evidence requested from 2012 peer review notes that do NOT appear to be required include 1) data at the LEA and school level and 2) assessment results. Data in CSPR for PA verifies LEA and school level results.</p> <p>PASA Initial Submission Data for migratory students are not provided. Evidence is unclear about % of eligible students who were administered the assessment. . Data in CSPR for PA indicates reporting for these categories.</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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION EVIDENCE

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
	<p>the PASA Science. (See evidence 040_2016 PASA Science Technical Report)</p> <p>Evidence that all student groups are included in the assessments: Further evidence that all student groups are included in the assessments can be found in the annual PASA State Report Card in tables 3-15 on pages 7-19. (See evidence 053_PASA State Report Card)</p> <p>Evidence that all student groups are included in the assessments: Further evidence that all student groups are included in the assessments can also be found in the annual Science State Report Card in tables 1-16 on pages 1-7. (See evidence 216_PASA Science State Report Card)</p> <p>Evidence that all student groups are included in the assessments: Further evidence of assessment participation by student subgroups can found in the breakdown of the participation rates by assessment type, grade, and student subgroup. (See evidence 054_PASA Participation by Subgroup)</p>	
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2012 Peer Review (Keystone):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> evidence showing participation and assessment results for all students and for each of the required subgroups in its reports at the school, LEA, and State levels for the Algebra I and Biology EOCs. evidence that EOC results are not reported for any group or subgroup when these results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student. 		
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is needed for Keystone, PSSA, PASA.</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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION EVIDENCE

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.1 – Test Design and Development</p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; • Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design. 	<p>NOTE: Requirement previously met for Keystone.</p>	<p>Peer Notes/Comments (PSSA)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The state re-reviewed the alignment report with some explanations (R01). 2. The alignment study provides evidence to support that the PSSA measures the state content standards. The alignment results are acceptable. 3. According to the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (2014), the state assessment may not be able to measure all standards. 4. No additional evidence is needed for the alignment. 5. File R03 describe test development/review process. 6. PDE provides the list of participants without the background information, such as gender, race, education program, etc.. 7. The state’s plans for improving the DOK consistency of its G3 and G5 mathematics assessments are reasonable. Its rationale for not addressing the categorical concurrence alignment results in G3-8 is appropriate given the design and goals of its assessment. 8. The state has an approved waiver of Speaking & Listening assessment requirements. 9. Educator involvement is evident. The source of “Development of the Assessment Anchors and Eligible Content” is not clear. Is this part of the technical manual? It was unclear what task the developers of the

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>Assessment Anchors and Eligible Content were given. No specific information about the direction given to developers related to the purpose of development or degree of alignment to, or representation of, Core Standards was provided.</p> <p>Peer Comments (PASA):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Six purposes (004 – a; 041 and 040 Tech reports; 045 and 044 ad. Manuals; 163 Intro.) 2. Need interpretations of test scores. 3. The two technical reports (040 and 041) and 138-139 provide the test specifications for the content coverage and the structure of assessments in reading and math. 4. File 78 provides evidence about science item development, such as procedures and FT/pilot. No such report for R/M. 5. All: Not sure about routing to levels, in terms of appropriateness. The state provides evidence about the purposes of the alternate assessments. 6. The state provides evidence of the blueprint for each assessment with details, such as sample items. 7. The state provides evidence of the internal and external review, as well as the third party independent alignment study in ELA/Math, <u>but only internal and external review in science.</u>

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (PSSA): 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"> • Evidence it has addressed areas identified with weak alignment, such as the grade 3 mathematics collapsed assessment anchors (e.g., Geometry). • 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.] • 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. 		
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for Keystone, PSSA: <input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed for PASA/provide brief rationale: 1. The state must provide evidence of alignment for PASA Science conducted by an independent third party.</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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION EVIDENCE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.2 – Item Development</p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p>Note: Previously met for PSSA</p>	<p>Peer Notes/Comments (Keystone):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The process, such as continue item development, field test, and the cycle are described with the Webb’s alignment training PPs (2.2/3.1). 3. The PDE re-reviewed the alignment report and provided a very brief plan for improvement. 4. The file 2.2 provides the system and procedures for item development and improving test quality. <p>Peer Notes/Comments (PASA):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The state provides evidence about the process for item development, but not for item selection. 2. Additional evidence is needed about tailored item type for SWD. 3. Content expertise: The PASA items are developed by U of Pitt staff and PA teachers who are experienced experts in SPED and in the corresponding subject areas (040 in science) and (080 in R/M). 4. PASA measures reading only. No evidence is provided for writing assessment or test items measuring writing standards. 5. The state provides evidence to support the item development and review process.
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2012 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evidence of a system for monitoring and improving the on - going quality of the Algebra I, Literature, and Biology EOCs. • evidence of the ongoing procedures PA will use to maintain and improve alignment between the EOCs and academic content standards over time. 		
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for Keystone <input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed for PASA/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION EVIDENCE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are no criteria for the use of classical item statistics in item review and selection; and no DIF analysis to supplement to the bias review in reading and in mathematics. 2. Evidence should be provided to support the use of item statistics to select items for test form assembly in terms of matching the blueprint in the content and the difficulty level of the test and to support that there is no statistical adjustment across test forms. 3. There is no evidence to support the development of items that measure writing standards. 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>Note: Previously met for Keystone.</p>	<p>Peer Notes/Comments (PSSA):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PDE provides a chart (R05) only without any evidence about the procedures that verify the participation of training. 2. It is not clear how the usage report shows that test administrators have completed required training. Number of TAs in the state or other evidence confirming that the numbers certified on the site conforms to numbers of administrators needed to be trained would be helpful. <p>Peer Notes/Comments (PASA):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Training: PA provides multiple, different trainings prior to operations for coordinators and assessors. 2. R&M Level assignment – how is this done for new students? Grade-span appropriate Skills Checklists? Need info on validity of checklists. 3. Evidence needed that EL accommodations are offered and appropriate. Evidence needed that all administrators are receiving training. Evidence needed regarding what to do for technology challenges and disruptions.
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</p> <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"> • Evidence that test administrators completed the required trainings for test administration provided by the PDE. 		
<p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>[X] The following additional evidence is needed PSSA/provide brief rationale</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The state provides the number of participants in the PSSA test administration training; however, it is unknown what should have been the total number of participants needing to be trained and the consequences for those who missed the training. <p>[X] The following additional evidence is needed for PASA/provide brief rationale</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The state reported that the 99.3% of test coordinator and assessors completing the PASA training in reading and math., but no information in PASA science. 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Evidence should be established with a contingency plan to address possible technology challenges during PASA test administration. 3. Additional validity evidence and empirical data are needed to support the appropriate decisions on determining test levels in PASA reading and math and tiers in PASA science. 4. The state provided an action plan, but evidence is needed about the training for ELs accommodations in PASA science.

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

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p>Note: Previously met for Keystone.</p> <p>PSSA Resubmission Evidence that the State adequately monitors the administration of its assessments: Evidence of the outcomes from the State’s policies for monitoring the assessments can be found in the documentation that summarizes the State’s 2016-2017 monitoring effort. (See evidence R06_Summary of 2016-17 Monitoring Program)</p> <p>PASA Initial Submission</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. Note: The Bureau of Curriculum, Assessment and Instruction and the Bureau of Special Education coordinate the monitoring of test administration of the general assessments. Separately, the Bureau of Special Education conducts monitoring of the alternate assessment. (See evidence 025_Summary-Evaluation Report of 2014-2015 PDE Monitoring Program)</p> <p>Evidence that the State adequately monitors the administration of its assessments: Further evidence of the State’s policies for monitoring the assessments, as well as a summary of its alternate-assessment monitoring activities during the 2015-2016 school year, can be found in the monitoring process, tools, and data provided by the Bureau of</p>	<p>PSSA Resubmission PDE provided a summary of their monitoring program and processes. Data are provided on the number and percentage of schools that require a plan but there is not data on the types of issues in which schools were not meeting expectations, the number or percentage of schools that submitted plans as required, or evidence of schools responding to/addressing issues. Given the templates providing and indication that monitoring occurred, response is sufficient.</p> <p>PASA Initial Submission Evidence covers processes and results for monitoring of accommodations.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION EVIDENCE

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
	<p>Special Education. (See evidence 026_ Peer Review PASA Monitoring and Accommodation Process; evidence 027_ PASA Accommodations Monitoring Template Final ; evidence 028_ PASA Accommodations Monitoring Data 2016; and evidence 089_ PASA Accommodations Monitoring - Summary Findings 2016)</p> <p>Evidence that the State adequately monitors the administration of its assessments: Further evidence that the state adequately monitors the administration of its assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools is found in the score validation data summarized on pages 89-91 of the Science technical report. (See evidence 040_2016 PASA Science Technical Report)</p> <p>Evidence that the State adequately monitors the administration of its assessments: Further evidence that the state adequately monitors the administration of its assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity is found in the scorer application and proficiency test process. (See evidence 159_PASA Science Scorer Application Proficiency Tests 2016)</p>	
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</p>		
<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"> • Evidence of test administration monitoring conducted by the PDE, or evidence of outcomes resulting from the PDE monitoring (e.g., monitoring reports or summaries). 		
<p>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for Keystone, PSSA, or PASA.</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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION EVIDENCE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.5 – Test Security</p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. 	<p>Note: Previously met for Keystone, PSSA.</p>	<p>Peer Notes/Comments (PASA):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PA uses ED’s document and CCSSO Test Security Handbook as references to determine the procedures for test security. 2. Required trainings of test security and related policies for all coordinators and assessors (091) 3. PA has a comprehensive plan (098) to secure test items. 4. The state provides evidence about the policy for test security. 5. The state provides evidence for the procedure to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results. 6. The state provides test security training for LEAs. 7. The state provides a summary report of the investigation of issues in test security.
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> x </u> No additional evidence is required for Keystone, PSSA, or PASA.</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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION EVIDENCE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 	<p>Note: Previously met for Keystone.</p>	<p>Peer Notes/Comments (PSSA):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. File 018 is a chart of participation rate at the state level across grades 3-8 for accountability. 2. It is not clear if the state reported publicly at the district and school level for individual student test result. 3. No documentation is found for protecting data integrity and privacy. 4. Report indicates that the state does not publish results when n is <10. (A written policy to this effect would be useful.) <p>Peer Notes/Comments for PASA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PA has a comprehensive security plan (098) for test items, in the process for test development, electronic item bank, item review committee access, test materials printing, distribution in operation. 1. PA provides evidence for protecting privacy of individual student test scores. 2. Protect student information in reporting: PA has a procedure to protect against the release of any personally identifiable information in assessment, limit score reporting to 2 levels. Only the aggregated results at the state level are released to the public. 3. The state provides evidence of policies and procedures to protect the integrity and confidentiality of test materials, test-related data, and personal identifications. No additional evidence is needed.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION EVIDENCE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (PSSA), the PDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of procedures for ensuring that no individual's result can be imputed from publicly available aggregate data. 		
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>[X] No additional evidence is needed FOR Keystone and PASA</p> <p>[X] The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale FOR PSSA</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The state should provide documentation to support the state's policies and procedures for ensuring that no individual's results can be imputed from publicly reported aggregated data. 		

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

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. 		<p>Peer Notes/Comments for Keystone:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Similar comments on CE 2.5, file 2.2 provides the system for monitoring and improving test quality, but not sure about the on-going process. <p>Peer Notes/Comments for PSSA: Please see the comments for CE 2.1</p> <p>Peer Notes/Comments for PASA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The alignment for reading and math provides evidence about the content coverage that associated to the AEC. No alignment study was conducted in science. 2. The state provides evidence from internal and external expert review of items. 3. No evidence is provided that PASA measures the full-range of ELA standards, such as writing. 4. The state provides evidence of the alignment study in reading/math to link the AEC to the state content standards and the alignment of test items to AEC. 5. The state provides a proposal only for the alignment in science. State needs to submit results of and response to science alignment study. 6. The state provides evidence of the internal item review involving PA educators for reading/math and in the process for science.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2012 Peer Review: See item under 2.2 above regarding procedures State will use to maintaining and improving alignment (2012-High school test review)</p>		
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: See evidence identified in element 2.1, Test Design, above, which also applies to this element.</p>		
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for Keystone and PSSA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed for PASA/provide brief rationale</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The state must provide evidence of the alignment of PASA science with the AEC by the independent third party. 2. The state must provide evidence that PASA measures AEC in English language arts, including writing. 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>Note: No evidence required for Keystone or PSSA.</p>	<p>Peer Notes/Comments for PASA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The alignment for R/M reviewed the DOK level if an item matches to AEC by yes/no (076). 2. The alignment is not available in science by independent evaluation about the cog. complexity for science items. 3. The state provides evidence to support the cognitive complexity of test items by testing level in reading and math. 4. The state provides evidence about the cognitive complexity of test items beyond the Recall Level through professional review in reading and math. The state may consider exploring the appropriateness for each grade level as represented in the state’s academic content standards.
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for Keystone and PSSA</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed for PASA/provide brief rationale</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The state must provide evidence of the alignment of PASA science to the AEC for the content and cognitive complexity by the independent third party. 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p>Note: Requirement previously met for PSSA</p>	<p>Peer Notes/Comments for Keystone: Peers note that the Technical Manual identifies the correlations between the Algebra I modules as problematic and potentially misleading when reporting these as two separate measures (p. 181, 189).</p> <p>Peers note that scoring and reporting structures may be affected by the assumptions that the two modules assess different content but are set on the same scale, as indicated in evidence 4.1(f) p. 14-15 of the TAC notes.</p> <p>PA should provide documentation about how they intend to address both of these issues.”</p> <p>Peer Notes/Comments for PASA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on files 055 and 056, student performance on the PASA is reported with scale scores and four performance levels. The Performance Profile in R/M seems to be over-interpretation since it is based on scoring rubric at the item level rather than based on sub-content domains or subscores. 2. Empirical evidence would be helpful in evaluating structural elements of validity.
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2012 Peer Review: evidence that the scoring and reporting structures are consistent with the subdomain structures of its academic content standards (i.e., are item interrelationships consistent with the framework from which the test arises)..</p>		
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for Keystone and PSSA.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed for PASA/provide brief rationale:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Empirical evidence is needed to demonstrate the consistency between the reporting structure and the sub-content domain structure of the test. 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>		<p>Peer Notes/Comments for Keystone:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The investigation of consequential validity is comprehensive (3.4) using appropriate method. The summary of this study provides validity evidence to support the use of Keystone tests in HS level (pp.2-4). 2. The study also identified negative outcomes on student and instruction (p. 5). <p>Peer Notes/Comments for PSSA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The supplemental analysis provides some convergent validity evidence, but nothing about the discriminant validity evidence. 2. The relationship between PSSA and NAEP seems to be irrelevant to validity evidence, nor from the standard setting (R15). <p>Report gives correlations and predictive relationships within subject area between PSSA (G8 ELA, G8 math) & Keystone (Literature, Algebra I) assessments. While relationships are as expected, no analysis of evidence supporting discriminant validity (e.g., relationship b/w ELA and Algebra I) is provided. Relationships between percent at or above cuts for NAEP and PSSA at tested grades are provided and are reasonable. Relationships within content area between PSSA and the CDT, GRADE, and Terra Nova assessments are also reasonable – again, no evidence of discriminant validity is provided, although it would be feasible to run those correlations. The state collected teacher ratings of student proficiency based on the PLDs and compared them to test-based student proficiency levels, with moderate relationships found. While these studies lend credence to the validity of inferences from the PSSA, without any exploration of the relationships between tests of different subject matters (discriminant validity), the validity argument</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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION EVIDENCE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>is weakened; the data are available for such an analysis (and is in the technical manual. Need interpretations of evidence.</p> <p>Peer Notes/Comments for PASA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No evidence is provided. 2. Empirical evidence of relationship between PASA and other variables is needed, including both convergent and divergent evidence (e.g., correlation between PASA and teacher ratings of performance in classroom at appropriate, specific grain size across and within content areas; relationship between nature of disability and test score (for divergent validity evidence).
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2012 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evidence that the decisions based on the results of its assessments are consistent with the purposes for which the assessments were designed. • evidence that the state has ascertained whether the assessments produce intended and unintended consequences for the Algebra I, Literature, and Biology EOCs, including results of the proposed 2013 consequential validity study. 		
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</p> <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"> • Additional empirical evidence of convergent and discriminant validity with respect to established measures, including measures that have linkages to career and workplace success. 		
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for Keystone.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale for PSSA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Although the state provides the correlations to address the convergent validity evidence, explanations/interpretations are needed. 2. The state did not provide the discriminant validity evidence. 3. The state should provide the linkage between PSSA and Keystone to address CCR success with interpretations. <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed for PASA/provide brief rationale</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Empirical evidence is needed to support that the assessment scores are related as expected with other variables, for instance, the PASA scores with teachers' ratings in tested skills. 		

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

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.1 – Reliability</p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement. 	<p>Note: Requirement previously met for Keystone and PSSA.</p>	<p>Peer Notes/Comments for PASA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The reliability of test scores and overall SEM are provided based on the CTT are presented in science vary greatly by tier (Tier 1- .86-.94; Tier 2- .72-.77). These variations in the magnitude across levels and grades are unexpected. 2. The reliability of test scores and overall SEM based on CTT are presented for R/M (041) by grade and test level (pp. 74-78). 3. The teacher scoring consistency was conducted based on a small sample on video recordings (pp. 88-89) by grade, gender, race, tier, and disability type (pp.88-89). 4. No evidence is provided on the accuracy and consistency of classifications for PASA. 5. Needs conditional SEM, classification accuracy & consistency. N is large enough. Science IRT scaling permits CSEM at cut scores.
<p>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for Keystone and PSSA</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed for PASA/provide brief rationale</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Empirical evidence should be provided for CSEM and the accuracy and consistency of classifications. 2. The state should explore the unexpected lower reliability for Tier 2 in science (.72-.77 vs. .94). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION EVIDENCE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<p>Note: Requirement previously met for Keystone and PSSA.</p>	<p>Peer Notes/Comments for PASA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. File 041 indicates that items are reviewed based on content standards, DOE, accessibility, and bias. 2. File 045 provides the clear procedure, the role and responsibilities of reviewers, the guideline for administering PASA to improve the accessibility to encourage partial participation. 3. In science, DIF was performed with MH by gender, race, tier, and disability (040, pp.123-126), but no DIF in R/M. 4. R&M: Needs DIF analysis. S: Evidence of more broad-based bias review needed (panelists, n, etc.). Alignment study will also provide some of this. 5. The state should consider providing special training for Bias and Sensitivity review.
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/>_x_ No additional evidence is required for Keystone and PSSA</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed for PASA/provide brief rationale</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Bias and Sensitivity of item review was conducted in reading and math, but not in science. 2. The DIF analysis was performed in science, but not in reading and math. 3. More details in the DIF process, such as minimum sample size, content review for flagged items by DIF, and decision rules for newly-developed items are expected. 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>Note: Requirement previously met for Keystone and PSSA.</p>	<p>Peer Notes/Comments for PASA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The multiple levels or tiers design seem to cover the full ranges with more accessibility for SWD. Are there any statistical procedures to ensure the comparability of test scores across levels or tiers over time since the averages are quite different across years within a grade? 2. Similarly, the math average scores (074) are quite different between the two years, indicating no equating or any adjustments were made. 3. CSEM could be estimated for both tests (look up CSEM for CTT-based tests). Both – evidence regarding good measurement for students who are pre-symbolic or don't have consistent communicative skills; for students at lowest end of performance continuum. 4. The empirical evidence suggests that low-achieving students were not measured on all knowledge and skills in all three assessments across grades, especially in Level A and Tier 1 (147 and 148).
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for Keystone and PSSA</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed for PASA/provide brief rationale</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The empirical evidence suggests that low-achieving students were not measured across the full performance continuum in reading, math, and science across grades, especially in Level A and Tier 1 (147 and 148). 2. The state must provide sufficient evidence to support that students are assessed across the full performance continuum. The state should review the test design and development for improvement. 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>Note: Requirement previously met for PSSA.</p>	<p>Peer Notes/Comments for Keystone:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PDE provided information (4.4) in scoring to support the same process for PPT and CBT, but did not recognize potential issues due to the different administration conditions, such as quality of writing, readability, online functions, and available accommodated test conditions, may have impacts in scoring. 2. It would be more helpful if there is empirical evidence to support the statements. 3. No evidence of scoring consistency was provided; the “evidence” is a description of the processes that were followed, no source document given/indicated. 4. No evidence regarding results in terms of academic achievement or procedures for invalidating test results. <p>Peer Notes/Comments for PASA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The PASA is one-on-one test administration. Videorecording is required for monitoring the process and double scoring based on selected sample. 2. Training was provided for teachers on rubric and scoring process (150-153; 186-188; 225). 3. No evidence is provided to support the interpretations and to facilitate interpretations. 4. R&M – measures of agreement in addition to %, (e.g, weighted kappa), would be good to have test scoring – not clear what the final scale is; report is non-standard. No rationale, linking item stability checks, evaluation of vertical scale, etc.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION EVIDENCE

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"> 5. Standard setting report is not clear on procedures or results. Both – no evidence regarding results in terms of academic achievement or procedures for invalidating test results. 6. The state provides evidence of the rater consistency based on a small sample of video recording for re-scoring. 7. It is suggested that students should be given partial credit for the correct response with assistance.
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2012 Peer Review: evidence of scoring consistency between test modes (PPT and CBT), specifically the constructed response scoring.</p>		
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for PSSA.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed for Keystone/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is difficult for the peers to evaluate the process for P/P and CBT since no specific issues of each are recognized. Thus, no specific procedure was developed to handle those issues. A research-based analysis and/or empirical evidence should be collected to examine the mode effects on student performance. <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed for PASA/provide brief rationale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The state should provide the rationale for the inconsistency of the scoring rubric, which includes partial credit, and the use of 0/1 score categories for calibration and scoring of items. 2. Clarification is needed about the scaling design, item performance, and the resulting scale used for reporting. 3. Additional evidence is needed to support the interpretations of test results based on scoring. 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p>Note: Requirement previously met for Keystone</p>	<p>Peer Notes/Comments for PSSA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Technical Report (R10) provides detailed information about equating over multiple forms specific to the approach and procedures. 2. However, the low correlation in Table 15-3 (.68) and the Figure 15-1 for grade 3 mathematics was obviously an issue, but without any explanation provided. 3. With the current approach, the criterion and procedures used to exclude items with parameter drifting over time are not included. <p>Peer Notes/Comments for PASA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Multiple forms: No linking or equating across forms (102, P. 7). Thus, the comparability across multiple forms is questionable, in both content and psychometrics. 2. File 040 indicates that items will be used to link the test tiers in science (p 126). However, there is not sufficient information to support the comparability between tiers across test forms. 2 There is no equating in science across forms, but there is a plan for future consideration (084). 3 No plan or process to link multiple forms used in the three areas. 4 R&M scaling report is not clear. It’s hard to understand how scores on different levels (A, B, C) have comparable interpretations when they are deliberately different in difficulty – e.g., a score of proficient on C does not mean the same thing as a score of proficient on B.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION EVIDENCE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (PSSA), the PDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 		
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for Keystone.</p> <p>[X] The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale for PSSA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The state should provide explanations for unexpected low correlation between the two years for grade 3 mathematics (R10, Table 14-3 and Figure 15-1). 2. The state should clarify the figures on page 183 for the consistency between the results of analysis and the text of interpretations for grade 3 mathematics (R10). <p>[X] The following additional evidence is needed for PASA/provide brief rationale</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on the peers’ review, PASA provided three levels in reading and math and two Tiers in science. Separate scales are used for reporting by level or by tier for each assessment within grade, this yielded serious technical issues and fail to meet the federal requirements. For example, the state developed three sets of PLDs, three sets of cut scores, and three sets of achievement levels within each grade in PASA reading and mathematics. Content and statistical linkages were not established across the three levels. Thus, no evidence is provided to support the comparability of test scores across levels in reading and mathematics or between tiers in science based on the parallel test construct to facilitate the interpretations of test results. 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 		<p>Peer Notes/Comments for Keystone:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Similar comments can be found in 4.4. Scoring. For 4.6 request: the file (4.6/5.3) provides information about the purpose, appropriate methods (e.g., DIF), and findings of the evaluation studies for Alg-I, Bio, and Lit tests. Validity evidence is provided (pp.25-26; pp. 26-27; pp.21-22). PA provides sufficient evidence to support the overall comparability of test scores on Keystone Exams between P/P and CBT. Additional monitoring was recommended by the research study. The results of independent multiple analyses of internal structure in each content area indicate that overall, accommodations on the 3 Keystone exams allow for inferences comparable to those arising from non-accommodated forms. <p>Peer Notes/Comments for PSSA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> It is not clear if the P/P version was calibrated separately from the online version (R10, Appendix S). If the N is reasonable, separate calibration seems to be a possibility. The infit/outfit may not be appropriate to the purpose of mode effects. Comparability of test scores and the differences in proficiency, particularly for borderline students, should be examined Preliminary reviews of online and paper-based scores using DIF and DPF statistics do not indicate a mode effect (see summary on page 680), although small effects were more prevalent for students with an IEP. However, state doesn't provide a

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>comparison of ppt and cbt – just because it shows no misfit within mode, an explanation of how this means the modes are comparable needs to be provided. The state may want to consider other approaches for providing this evidence.</p> <p>4. The conclusion from independent multiple analyses of internal structure of accommodations, for versions requested that had large enough n -- Spanish and read-aloud -- for each assessment are reported as: “we conclude the accommodations provided allow for meaningful interpretations of results for students who need and receive accommodations and those who do not need and do not receive accommodations.” (p. 58) A possible exception is the Spanish version of the G3 assessment. PA should consider reviewing that assessment to see what may be creating non-comparability.</p> <p>5. The state provides sufficient evidence to support the comparability of test scores with multiple versions for PSSA (082). The reviewers recommend continued monitoring of comparability for grade 3 Spanish math based on the high-stakes nature of the PSSA.</p> <p>Peer Notes/Comments for PASA:</p> <p>1. PASA science offered multiple versions: blind, deaf and hard of hearing, and non-verbal. Unfortunately, no evidence is provided about parallel constructs across versions or the comparability of test scores based on content (test specifications) and statistical linkage and/or adjustment to</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION EVIDENCE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
support the interpretations.		
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2012 Peer Review: results of the 2013 study to document that the use of accommodations for the Algebra I, Literature, and Biology EOCs will allow for valid inferences about students’ with disabilities knowledge and skills.</p>		
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (PSSA), the PDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). • 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. 		
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required FOR KEYSTONE EXAMS</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed for PSSA/provide brief rationale</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The state should provide explanations about the comparability between test modes in addition to the results from the current analysis (infit/outfit). 2. Other approaches should be considered to examine the mode effects for evidence. The mode effects also should be performed by subgroups with reasonable sample size. <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed for PASA/provide brief rationale</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The state provides alternative test versions to meet the special needs of students. Evidence is needed to support the item review process for replacement in terms of item content and difficulty level based on the same test specifications. 2. No evidence is provided to support the comparability of test scores across multiple versions to facilitate the interpretations. 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>		<p>Peer Notes/Comments for Keystone:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PDE provides the same file for CE 2.2, 3.1, 4.4, and 4.7. 2. Please see the peer comments on 2.2 and 3.4. 3. The results of independent multiple analyses of internal structure in each content area indicate that overall, accommodations on the 3 Keystone exams allow for inferences comparable to those arising from non-accommodated forms. <p>Peer Notes/Comments for PSSA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On-going maintenance seems to be a list of routine technical quality checks; nothing is specific (R13). The state should include a plan or a list of analyses/research for the improvement of the PSSA. 2. The PDE could adopt the TAC agenda items, presentations/discussion, and TAC recommendations on the current issues for PSSA as the action plan. 3. The NCIEA SOW shows that the TAC will meet 3 times a year. The “Plan for PSSA Special Studies” lays out existing studies that are contained in the technical manual and asserts that these studies will continue annually. Not sure the degree to which the Item Bank Maintenance Plan is part of the contract with test/item developer – seems like a reasonable plan. 4. The state should consider the follow-up to the TAC recommendations with a plan for actions. <p>Peer Notes/Comments for PASA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The state provides very limited information about scaling,

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>particularly failing to address the process, criteria, and results of linking for vertical scaling in reading and mathematics.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PA has three TAC meetings each year with 10 experienced TAC members (107). However, the state’s on-going maintenance is basically routines in psychometrics. 2. There is limited evidence to support the clear technical criteria and their applications for PASA.
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2012 Peer Review: See evidence requested for 2012 peer review under element 2.2 above.</p>		
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (PSSA), the PDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). 		
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required FOR KEYSTONE EXAMS</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed for PSSA/provide brief rationale</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The plan for the maintenance is acceptable, but it may not be sufficient. The Peers suggest the state develop a systematic plan. 2. Evidence is needed on the implementation of the plan with an estimated timeline, such as for item pool (e.g., new items and examining drifting over time) and special studies and analyses. <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed for PASA/provide brief rationale</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No evidence is provided for <i>systematic</i> monitoring, maintenance, and improvement of the technical quality for PASA. 2. Additional evidence is needed to support the vertical scaling in reading and mathematics with rationales. 		

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

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards; • States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs; • Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment; • Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities; • Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with 	<p>Note: Requirement previously met for PSSA.</p>	<p>Peer Notes/Comments for Keystone:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. File 5.1 provides guidelines for SEA in the process and decisions for the access of SPED students to the HS EOC tests. 2. File 5.1 (pp.18-19) provides detailed guidelines. However, no evidence to support that SEA’s implementations with the IEP teams was provided. 3. Perhaps a monitoring system and/or data collection would provide the state with empirical evidence about the implementation. 4. Page 23 of Revised Annotated IEP 2017 lists the various forms of assessments, but there is no discussion of the differences or effects of state and local policies. 5. The power point, Selection and Use of Accommodations, does not provide guidelines for when an alternate should be used or discussion of the effects of local and state policies. <p>Peer Note/Comments for PASA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evidence is provided about the state policy for PASA based on the AEC (004) and the Annotation for IEP (046). 2. Evidence is provided about the 1% of SWD are assessed by PASA, which is the decision of IEP team in R, M, and S. 3. Guidelines are provided about accommodations and the policies for testing by PASA. 4. The state provides trainings (144 and 165) to help SEAs make decisions about accommodated or non-accommodated and using general or alternate assessments.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>disabilities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA; Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments); The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum. 		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The state provides accessibility tool features. The state informed parents about state policy of PASA. The state provides evidence about the alignment of the AEC to the state content standards in reading, math, and science. The state provides various accommodations for the inclusion of students with disabilities.
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2012 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guidelines for IEP Teams to use in deciding when an individual student should be assessed on the basis of alternate achievement standards. Evidence that the SEA has provided IEP teams with a clear description of the differences between assessments including effects of state and local policies. 		
<p>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for PSSA.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale FOR KEYSTONE EXAMS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence about the guidelines for IEP teams to use in deciding-making when an individual student should be assessed based on alternate achievement standards for Algebra I, Literature, and Biology EOCs. <p>[X] The following additional evidence is needed for PASA/provide brief rationale</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Although the state provides some instructions for the inclusion of SWD, the state should develop formal guidelines for the inclusion of SWD in the state alternate assessments. 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. 	<p>Note: Requirement previously met for PSSA and Keystone.</p>	<p>Peer Notes/Comments for PASA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The state provides policies and guidelines for ELs participating in general assessments, PASA, and Keystone. The state also provides the policies for special exemptions. 2. The state did not provide evidence about the accessible accommodations for ELs who participate in PASA.
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>x No additional evidence is required for Keystone and PSSA.</p> <p>[X] The following additional evidence is needed for PASA/provide brief rationale</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The state should provide the guidelines for the inclusion of ELs in PASA. 2. The state provides some accommodations for the ELs in reading and math, but no evidence in science. 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.3 – Accommodations The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities (SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 	<p>Note: Requirement previously met for PSSA.</p>	<p>Peer Notes/Comments for Keystone:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Files 4.6 and 5.3 provide evidence as requested. Similar comments can be found in CE 4.6 for multiple versions of an assessment. Studies cited in 4.6 included EL accommodations. <p>Peer Notes/Comments for PASA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The state provides evidence of appropriate accommodations for SWD in PASA. The state provides training for selection and use of accommodations for SWD and ELs in PASA. However, there is no evidence to support the appropriateness of assigned accommodations for SWD or ELs. The state provides students with opportunity of adaptations of a test in reading and math for SWD and ELs, such as accommodations, modifications, and testing mode. Additional evidence should be provided for the appropriateness of such adaptations and modifications. The state provided various accommodations for SWD in all three tests.
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2012 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> results of the 2013 study to document that the use of accommodations for the Algebra I, Literature, and Biology EOCs yield meaningful scores (also noted under 4.6 above). results of the 2013 study to document that the use of accommodations for the Algebra I, Literature, and Biology EOCs will allow for valid inferences about English learners’ knowledge and skills. 		
<p>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for PSSA and Keystone. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed for PASA/provide brief rationale</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The state provided accommodations for ELs in reading and math, but no evidence is provided in science. 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. 	<p>Note: Requirement previously met for PSSA and Keystone.</p>	<p>Peer Notes/Comments for PASA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The state provides evidence to support the monitoring process that is consistent with the state policy for PASA. 2. The monitoring system includes teacher interview questions for individual students about the IEP decisions, and classroom observation about instruction. 3. The state provides a summary of accommodations and adaptations in the monitoring process. However, no explanations and no evidence to support the consistency of used accommodations assigned by IEP were presented. 4. The state provides the procedures for supplemental monitoring of accommodations for SWD on PASA with a selected student sample (086). 5. The state provides instructions, procedures, and training for monitoring test administration for special populations. No additional evidence is needed.
<p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>x_ No additional evidence is required for Keystone, PSSA and PASA.</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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION EVIDENCE

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; • The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels. 	<p>Note: Requirement previously met for PSSA and Keystone.</p>	<p>Panel Notes/Comments for PASA:</p> <p>CE 6.1</p> <p>1. The state formally adopted the PASA achievement standards Four levels are used (124 a & b) in each of the three levels in R and M and for each of the two tiers in science by grade. These achievement standards are not equivalent across levels (e.g., proficient on level A does not require the same degree of KSAs as proficient on level B) or tiers. The results in differential achievement being expected of students based on the severity of their disability.</p> <p>2. Because the use of multiple sets of achievement standards within the AA-AAS is not allowed, the process for setting these sets of achievement standards and their adoption is moot.</p>

Section 6.1 Summary Statement

 x_ No additional evidence is required for **Keystone and PSSA**.

[X] The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale

1. Due to the issues addressed in CE 4.5 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment, no summary is provided for Critical Element 6.1-6.4 about achievement standards and reporting. The state must resubmit evidence for CE 6 once it has implemented a single system of achievement levels for each content area in its AA-AAS. In some cases. Peer notes/comments have been retained in CE 6 to provide some feedback for the State.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION EVIDENCE

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR PENNSYLVANIA, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION EVIDENCE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p>Note: Requirement previously met for PSSA and Keystone.</p>	<p>Panel Notes/Comments for PASA:</p> <p>CE 6.2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Same comments as in 6.1 2. The list of the participants and their background information were not found for R/M 3. The method and process are acceptable, but there are some fundamental issues in test design, such as the comparability of cut scores across levels or tiers, which must be clarified.
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for Keystone and PSSA.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed for PASA/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>. The method and process are acceptable, but there are some fundamental issues in test design, such as the comparability of cut scores across levels or tiers, which must be clarified.</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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION EVIDENCE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p>Note: Requirement previously met for Keystone.</p>	<p>Peer Notes/Comments for PSSA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The information from R07 and 017 do not provide required evidence or a plan to ensure that PLDs capture what students should know and be able to do to be success in work or college. 2. No data collection plan was submitted to establish the empirical link between PSSA success and CCR. 3. See notes earlier. Predictive validity study is a bit weak, but it’s a start. A plan for collecting additional data would be helpful. No evidence was provided regarding plan for reflection of CCR in PLDs. 4. <p>Peer Notes/Comments for PASA: CE 6.3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please see peers’ comments for CE 6.1. 2. Additional evidence is needed to support the challenging achievement standards for each level in R and M and for each tier in Sci.
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (PSSA), the PDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Evidence it collects data to establish an empirical link between PSSA proficiency designations and college and career readiness. 		
<p>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required for Keystone</p> <p>[X] The following additional evidence is needed for PSSA/provide brief rationale</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The state should provide evidence to ensure the PLDs aligning to CCR. <p>[X] The following additional evidence is needed for PASA/provide brief rationale</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. evidence that 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 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
the most significant cognitive disabilities.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.4 – Reporting</p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration; • The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results; • The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement; ○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors); ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; ○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., 		<p>Peer Notes/Comments for Keystone:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. File 6.4 is a memo for the distribution of the report, but no timeline is provided. 2. The memo for the spring 2011 administration is dated September 7, 2011, which seems to be late, not “as soon as possible.” In addition, the memo states, “The parent/guardian copy should be distributed at your earliest convenience,” again, not consistent with “as soon as possible.” <p>Peer Notes/Comments for PSSA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. File 019 provides information for families to understand the student report. 2. The file 143 is a guideline in Spanish. 3. No information or evidence is provided for a plan to improve public access to assessment data. Score interpretive guides in English and Spanish are provided. <p>Peer Notes/Comments for PASA:</p> <p>Although the reporting structure is not consistent with the regulations (see notes/comments on 6.1), the peers have these additional comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. File 037 provides a resource of reporting system for PASA and a calendar for reporting PASA results in R/M (130) and in science (129) 2. PA provides a guide for science scores report (134); but File 053 for R/M is a collection of tables without interpretations and any comparisons. 3. The state reports results in R/M and science at the state level,

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. 		<p>including the number of participants and percentage of the performance levels. Reports are also available by subgroup, such as gender, race, disability type, ELs, and accommodated testing.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstration or description is needed to appreciate the function of data interaction for LEAs (132). File 131 is PASA score report in 2012 for meaningful way in reporting. There was no evidence regarding PA reporting on PASA assessments that is current. PA should provide state policies on test security and about released items. No information is found about alternate format report for parents.
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2012 Peer Review: evidence that student reports for the EOCs will be delivered to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as possible after the assessment is administered.</p>		
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (PSSA), the PDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 		
<p>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>[X] The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale FOR KEYSTONE EXAMS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The state should submit evidence about the state policies for reporting with timeline. <p>[X] The following additional evidence is needed for PSSA/provide brief rationale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The state should provide a plan to improve public access to and understanding of state assessment data. 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>[X] The following additional evidence is needed for PASA/provide brief rationale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that reports for parents are available in alternate formats if requested. • Interpretative guides for PASA in R/LA and math. • Current (newer than 2012) samples of PASA reports for science 		

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