The Honorable Julia Keleher  
Secretary of Education  
Puerto Rico Department of Education  
P.O. Box 190759  
San Juan, PR 00919-0759

Dear Secretary Keleher:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education’s (the Department) assessment peer review process under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), which governed State assessments through the 2016-2017 school year. The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), which governs State assessments beginning in the 2017-2018 school year, maintains the essential requirements from NCLB that each State annually administer high-quality assessments in at least reading/language arts (R/LA), mathematics, and science that meet nationally recognized professional and technical standards with a few additional requirements. I appreciate the efforts of the Puerto Rico Department of Education (PRDE) 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 carefully evaluated PRDE’s submission and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that the components of your assessment system meet some, but not all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of section 1111(b)(1) and (3) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and our own analysis of the State’s submission, I have determined the following:

- General assessments in mathematics and R/LA for grades 3-8 (META-PR): **Substantially meets requirements**
- General assessments in science in grades 4 and 8 (META-PR): **Substantially meets requirements**
- General assessments in high school (multi-subject or end of course in R/LA, mathematics, and science) (META-PR): **Substantially meets requirements**
Alternate assessments aligned with alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) for grades 3-8 and high school in R/LA, mathematics and science (META-PR ALTERNA):

- Partially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB. The META-PR ALTERNA does not meet the requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA.

Substantially meets requirements means that assessment components meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. As noted in the enclosure to this letter, I have noted several areas in which additional information is needed in order to conclude that the META-PR general assessments meet the requirements of the ESEA, as amended by both the NCLB and the ESSA. I expect that PRDE should be able to provide this additional information within one year.

Partially meets requirements means that assessment components do not meet a number of the requirements of the statute and regulations of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB. I have concluded, as noted in the enclosure to this letter, that the META-PR ALTERNA partially meets the requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB.

However, in its current design, the META-PR ALTERNA does not meet requirements of the ESEA, as amended by ESSA. Section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vi) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, only authorizes an individual State assessment to be based partially upon a portfolio. As you know, the META-PR ALTERNA is based entirely upon a portfolio of student work and therefore is not permitted in its current design under the statute. PRDE will need to redesign or replace the META-PR ALTERNA such that it complies with the statute. Under the orderly transition authority in section 4(b) of the ESSA, I am granting PRDE until December 15, 2020, to submit evidence of an AA-AAAS that meets the ESSA requirements for assessment format.

I have also determined that Puerto Rico’s alternate academic achievement standards must ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. I ask that PRDE provide evidence of meeting this requirement also by December 15, 2020.

I will place a condition on PRDE’s Title I grant for the 2018 fiscal year. This condition will remain in place until PRDE provides all of the remaining evidence required from the 2017 peer review. Additionally, the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) will monitor progress on matters pertaining to requirements in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) related to the participation of students with disabilities in Title I assessments. In particular, OSERS will monitor progress against critical elements 1.4, 2.1, 4.3, 5.1, 5.4 and 6.3. Insufficient progress to address such matters may lead OSERS to place a condition on PRDE’s federal fiscal year 2019 IDEA Part B grant award.

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

Thank you for your ongoing commitment to improving educational outcomes for all students. I look forward to our continued partnership as we move ahead with this critical work. I appreciate the work you are doing to improve your schools and provide a high-quality education for your students.

If you have any questions, please contact Megan Oberst of my staff at: OSS.PuertoRico@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

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

Enclosures

cc: Ada E. Hernández Guadalupe, Director of Assessment
### Critical Elements Where Additional Evidence is Needed to Meet the Requirements for Puerto Rico’s Assessment System

**Overall Finding:** For the META-PR ALTERNA of reading/language arts (R/LA), mathematics and science, evidence that the assessment format meets the requirements of Section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vi) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. This section of the statute prohibits an individual State assessment that is based entirely upon a portfolio.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Additional Evidence Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments** | For the META-PR and META-PR ALTERNA:  
  - Documentation of the policy on providing annual assessments in tested grades and subjects to students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| **2.1 – Test Design and Development**                  | For the META-PR:  
  - Evidence of a process built into test development for the general assessments to ensure appropriate inclusion of challenging content and complex demonstration or application of knowledge and skills.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| **2.2 – Item Development**                            | For the META-PR:  
  - Please see the requested additional evidence in 2.1.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| **2.3 – Test Administration**                         | For the META-PR:  
  - Detailed information about minimum and optimal hardware, software, and bandwidth requirements for the computer-based test administration system.  
  - Contingency plans for technology issues that may arise during the online administration of the META-PR.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| **2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration**              | For the META-PR and META-PR ALTERNA:  
  - Evidence of implementation (e.g., monitoring calendar, monitoring report with corrective actions, evidence that corrective actions have been implemented) of statewide monitoring of test administration for both the general and alternate assessments.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| **2.5 – Test Security**                               | For the META-PR:  
  - Evidence of specific consequences for test security violations.  
  - Evidence of the required frequency of test security training.  
  - Evidence of policies and procedures to remediate test security breaches and irregularities.  
  - Evidence of policies and procedures for responding to and investigating alleged or actual security lapses and test irregularities.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| For the META-PR ALTERNA:                              |  
  - Evidence of policies and procedures for ensuring portfolio security at the school and for detecting any portfolio assembly violations at the scoring site.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| **2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy** | For the META-PR:  
  - Evidence of documentation regarding security during test development activities.  
  - Evidence of documentation regarding how the schools transmit test data to the Puerto Rico Department of Education (PRDE) or how the data are stored.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
### Critical Element | Additional Evidence Needed
--- | ---
**For the META-PR ALTERNARE (continued)**: | **Evidence of documentation regarding how the schools transmit test data to PRDE or how the data are stored.**
**Evidence that the minimum reporting size (n< 20) is applied to the reporting for the alternate assessment.**

### 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes
- For the META-PR ALTERNARE:
  - *Evidence to document that the alternate assessment is tapping the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level.*

### 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure
- For the META-PR ALTERNARE, PRDE must provide:
  - *Evidence documenting that the scoring and reporting structures are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the academic content standards.*

### 3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables
- For the META-PR and META-PR ALTERNARE:
  - *Evidence that the State assessments are related with other measures as expected.*

### 4.1 – Reliability
- For the META-PR ALTERNARE:
  - *Reliability evidence that shows levels of reliability generally considered adequate by professional judgment regarding such assessments includes documentation such as:*
    - Internal consistency coefficients that show that item scores are related to a student’s overall score.
    - Correlations of item responses to student proficiency level classifications.
    - Generalizability evidence such as evidence of fidelity of administration.

### 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum
- For the META-PR ALTERNARE:
  - *Evidence that the test provides adequately precise estimates of student performance across the full continuum (e.g., a cumulative frequency distribution or histogram of student scores for each grade and subject on the most recent test administration).*

### 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment
- For the META-PR:
  - *Evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results; specifically—*
    - Whether the online administration used standardized hardware/software across unaccommodated test administrations; OR
    - Demonstrate score comparability across different devices.

### 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities
- For the META-PR ALTERNARE:
  - *Documentation that 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.*
  - *Evidence that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their child’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of possible consequences thereof.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Additional Evidence Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **5.2 – Procedures for Including Spanish Learners (SLs)** | For the META-PR and META-PR ALTERNA:  
| | • Evidence of procedures and guidance for determining whether a limited Spanish proficient learner should receive linguistic accommodations.  
| | • Evidence of guidance that supports local educators in selecting possible accommodations for limited Spanish proficient students. |
| **5.3 – Accommodations** | For the META-PR:  
| | • Evidence that PRDE 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; this may include evidence such as—  
| | o A summary of the frequency of use of each accommodation by student characteristics; OR  
| | o A summary of test performance for students using each accommodation (mean scale scores, standard deviations; reliability estimates).  
| | • Evidence of a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for the small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. |
| **5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations** | For the META-PR and META-PR ALTERNA:  
| | • Evidence to show that accommodations were monitored to ensure fidelity with allowable test administration procedures. Examples of this evidence may include:  
| | o Written procedures for monitoring the use of accommodations during test administration, such as guidance provided to districts; instructions and protocols for State, district and school staff; and schedules for monitoring; AND  
| | o Summary of results of monitoring for the most recent year of test administration in the State. |
| **6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards (additional requirement under section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA)** | For the META-PR ALTERNA:  
| | • Evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards ensure that a student who meets these standards is on track to pursue post-secondary education or employment. |
| **6.4 – Reporting** | For the META-PR and META-PR ALTERNA:  
| | • Evidence that test reports are available in alternate formats (e.g., braille or large print) upon request.  
| | • Evidence of a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. |
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.
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Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.
Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.
SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</td>
<td>PRDE 7 is a memo from the Undersecretary of Education outlining institutional responsibilities and also noting that standards were implemented in Spanish, math, English, and science (p. 3) during 2014-2015 and are to be applied to all students. PRDE 14b also refers to the fact that the standards are to be applied to all students. PRDE 1 (p. 47-61) includes the actual content standards, the development of which is also explained.</td>
<td>Peers could not locate a record of formal adoption of the standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 1.1 Summary Statement**

- The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
  - Record of formal adoption of academic content 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards                         | **General assessment:**  
PRDE 24 (p. 5) describes how standards were developed to be comparable in content and rigor to other national standards including Common Core and Next Generation science standards. PRDE 1 (p. 14) indicates that the standards were informed by international frameworks such as CEFR (for Spanish).  
PRDE 1 (p. 14) and 15 document the development of the academic content standards and involvement of content experts and various stakeholders.  
**Alternate assessment:**  
PRDE 31 (starting on p. 18) describes a crosswalk between the core standards and the PPEA (the former name for the Alt, now called META-PR ALTERNA) for Spanish, math, and science. On p. 97 there is a table showing which content standards were assessed but there is no indication of the coverage (i.e., what percent of the standards were assessed).  
PRDE 31 documents the development process for the alternate assessment and details stakeholder involvement. | Sufficient evidence was provided to address this critical element.                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |

**Section 1.2 Summary Statement**  
- **X** No additional evidence is required
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</th>
<th>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1.3 – Required Assessments**                    | PRDE 7  
- General assessment: pages 2-3  
- Alternate assessment: page 5  
PRDE 17 – page 13 (general assessment)  
PRDE 18 – pages 6-7, 18-19 (alternate assessment) | PR provides annual assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics in grades 3-8 and 11. PR provides annual science assessments in grades 4, 8, and 11. PR also provides an alternate assessment for students with significant cognitive disabilities that can't take the general assessment. |

**Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY**

_ x _ No additional evidence is required

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

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.

- 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):
  - 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.

**Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence**

- Reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (grades 3-8, 11) are administered annually to all students, including students with disabilities and linguistic limitations. Science is also administered (grades 4, 8, and 11) annually to all students, including those with disabilities and linguistic limitations.

- PR does not explicitly state whether it has a policy to provide annual assessments in tested grades and subjects to students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</th>
<th>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 1.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>x</em>. The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please state whether Puerto Rico has a policy to provide annual assessments in tested grades and subjects to students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</td>
<td>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</td>
<td>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 – Participation Data</td>
<td>PRDE 22</td>
<td>PR provides assessment participation data broken down by subgroup, for both the general and alternate assessments, for all tested grades and subjects (reading/language arts, mathematics, and science). The assessment participation data indicates that ~94% or more of each subgroup of students in tested grades and subjects were assessed during the 2015-2016 school year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 1.5 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY

_x_ No additional evidence is required

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.
SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.1 – Test Design and Development | General assessment:  
- Purposes and intended interpretations and uses of the results are documented in PRDE 7, 23, and 33.  
- PRDE 24 and 27 describe the test blueprint and development process, including item writing.  
- Although PRDE did an alignment study showing DOK for an iteration of the PPAA, peers could not locate evidence of a process built into the test development to ensure complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (e.g., by having DOK targets for item writers).  
- N/A: PR does not have computer-adaptive assessments. | General assessment:  
Sufficient evidence was provided to address this critical element, except that peers could not locate evidence of a process built into the test development to ensure complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (e.g., by having DOK targets for item writers). |
| Alternate assessment:  
- Purposes and intended interpretations and uses of the results are documented in PRDE 7, 31, and 32 (results interpretation guide).  
- PRDE 31 describes the test blueprint and development process.  
- PRDE 18, p. 14 describes how teachers should assemble a portfolio, including ensuring that it is at an appropriate level of cognitive complexity.  
- N/A: PR does not have computer-adaptive assessments. | |

Section 2.1 Summary Statement

- The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:  
- Documentation of a process built into test development for the general assessments to ensure appropriate inclusion of challenging content and complex demonstration or application of knowledge and 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.
Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
---|---|---
2.2 – Item Development | General assessment: PRDE 29 | General assessment:
Alternate assessment: PRDE 31
Peers believe that PRDE 31 documents reasonable and technically-sound item development procedures.

Section 2.2 Summary Statement

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
• See requested additional evidence in 2.1 summary above.
## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Puerto Rico

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.3 – Test Administration</strong></td>
<td><strong>General assessment:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• PRDE 1 and 19 (State Assessment Instructions) and PRDE 20 and 21 (accommodations for SWD and limited Spanish proficient students). PRDE also provided training materials (PRDE 37-41) from workshops regarding test administration.&lt;br&gt;• PRDE has provided documentation of training for test administration (PRDE 43-45).&lt;br&gt;• PRDE 43, p. 4</td>
<td><strong>General assessment:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• PRDE 43, p. 4 indicates very minimal hardware and software requirements for online test administration. The document does not specify bandwidth/connectivity requirements of specific operating system, hardware versions, etc. Such information should be provided, with minimum requirements and recommended/optimal ones as well. Peers could not locate contingency plans for issues such as loss of connectivity during online test administration. There is a phone number referenced (PRDE 42, p. 66) for test administrators to call, but no documented contingency plan for a standardized response to technology issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Alternate assessment:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• PRDE 18 (Teacher’s Guide) explains in detail how teachers should assemble the portfolio. This is essentially a test</td>
<td><strong>Alternate assessment:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Sufficient evidence was provided to address this critical element.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Administration manual given the fully individualized nature of the alternate assessment. | • PRDE 39-41 documents training for teachers/test administrators.  
• N/A: The alternate assessment is not computer-administered. |                                                                                  |

**Section 2.3 Summary Statement**

_**X**_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- For the online administration of the general assessment, please provide more detailed information about minimum and optimal hardware, software, and bandwidth requirements.
- Please provide contingency plans (i.e., what action to take based on the issue or event) beyond just a phone number for technology issues during the online administration of the general assessment.
## 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</th>
<th>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRDE 17 – pg. 17-19</td>
<td>PRDE 37 – pg. 64-65</td>
<td>PR has a series of processes that are monitored before, during, and after the administration of an assessment. PR describes the procedures that must be followed during assessment administration (e.g., test materials must be kept in a safe place, teachers must not open assessment packets until the administration begins, etc.). PRDE visits districts to ensure that the proper procedures are carried out before, during, and after assessment administration. PRDE also outlines a process schools must use if the integrity of assessment administration is compromised. PR also provides monitoring protocols that are used before, during, and after assessment administration for both the general and alternate assessments. PR does not provide evidence of implementation (e.g., monitoring calendar, monitoring report with corrective actions, evidence that corrective actions have been implemented) for islandwide monitoring of assessment administration for both the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRDE 45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY

_x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

Please provide evidence of implementation (e.g., monitoring calendar, monitoring report with corrective actions, evidence that corrective actions have been implemented) for island-wide monitoring of assessment administration for both the general and alternate assessments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.5 – Test Security</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 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;</td>
<td>General assessment:</td>
<td>General assessment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Detection of test irregularities;</td>
<td>• PRDE 17 (p. 17-19) and PRDE 19 (p. 14) document test security procedures, including steps to follow in incident reporting (PRDE 19, p.14).</td>
<td>Although PRDE 17 and 19 both mention that there are consequences to violations of test security, these are not specified (e.g., “consequences … will include up to and including dismissal and/or loss of license”).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</td>
<td>• PRDE 43 includes security procedures for the online administration of the test. PRDE 46 is a summary of test security procedures with a certification that principals must sign indicating that they have trained the test administration staff.</td>
<td>Peers could not locate evidence of the frequency with which test security training is required, so we cannot assess whether PRDE meets the annual training requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</td>
<td>• PRDE 17 (p. 18) indicates that site visits are performed before, during, and after the tests to ensure test security. PRDE 45 includes monitoring checklists and PRDE 29 (p. 85-86) indicates that schools were randomly audited daily during the testing period.</td>
<td>Peers also looked at PRDE 19 (technical manual) to see whether Pearson conducts typical data forensics to detect test irregularities and could not locate such analyses, which could provide additional evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• PRDE 19 (p. 14) lists the steps that test administrators should follow to report irregularities or test security breaches. PRDE 17 (Appendix C) is the test security form, which lists various possible categories of incidents to be reported.</td>
<td>Peers could not locate state’s policies and procedures for responding to and investigating alleged or actual security lapses and test irregularities. See non-regulatory guidance p. 32 for a description of what such policies and procedures could include.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternate assessment:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PRDE 18 is a through guide for teachers on how to prepare the portfolio and what considerations to keep in mind. On p. 17, the last two bullet points indicate that teachers should not provide any false information in the portfolio or add or delete evidence after the deadline. PRDE 17, p. 18 (fourth check mark) also indicates that teachers should not copy or keep any part of the portfolio, alter responses, and should comply with materials return instructions.</td>
<td>What procedures are in place to ensure that these violations do not happen? PRDE 31, chapter 6 details the centralized scoring that Pearson does at its San Juan site. However, there is no information about the security of the assembled portfolio at the school level, before it reaches the scoring site. At the scoring site, is there any attempt to look for duplicated tasks across portfolios (within or across years). for instance?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 2.5 Summary Statement

_**x**_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

#### General assessment:
- Specify the consequences for test security violations.
- Specify the frequency of test security training.
- Provide policies and procedures to remediate test security breaches and irregularities.
- Provide policies and procedures for responding to and investigating alleged or actual security lapses and test irregularities (see p. 32 of non-regulatory guidance).

#### Alternate assessment:
- Provide policies and procedures for ensuring portfolio security at the school and for detecting any portfolio assembly violations at the scoring site.

---

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

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:

- 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.

### General assessment:

- PRDE 29 (p. 64) mentions that Pearson discusses security during item writer workshops. Peers expected to find further information on test security at all stages of the development process (e.g., confidentiality forms to be filled out by panelists).

Pearson outlines various procedures for maintaining the security of scannable and non-scannable test documents (PRDE 29, p.86-91) and for the online tests (e.g., secure browser, being the only party to restart completed tests).

PRDE 17 (p. 18), 19 (p. 13), 36 (p.64) indicate that personal student data is confidential and accessible by only authorized personnel.

- PRDE 47, p. 37 indicates that it will not report any subgroup smaller than 20 to protect confidentiality.

### Alternate assessment:

- PRDE 18 provides information about how teachers assembling the portfolio should maintain the integrity of test materials. PRDE 31, chapter 6 details the process Pearson uses at its scoring facility to protect data integrity. PRDE 17, p. 18 (third check mark) mentions confidentiality of the answer sheets with demographic data. PRDE 32, p. 2, “Integridad y confidencialidad de las pruebas” discusses

Peers could not locate information about how the portfolios are securely transmitted from the schools to the districts. PRDE does document how return materials are picked up from districts and sent to Pearson (PRDE 31, p. 55).

---

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the portfolio as a secure test material that is to be handled in accordance with PRDE security protocols and indicates that it is to be shared only with a restricted set of individuals.</td>
<td>Peers believe that this document, PRDE 47, p. 37 which indicates that it will not report any subgroup smaller than 20 to protect confidentiality, also applies to the alternate. Please confirm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• PRDE’s submission did not reference documentation specific to the alternate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 2.6 Summary Statement**

- The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
  - Please provide additional documentation regarding security during test development beyond the assertion in PRDE 29.
  - Peers could not locate documentation of a) how the schools transmit test data to PRDE or b) how the data are stored.
  - Please confirm that n sizes of less than 20 are not reported for the alternate assessment.
### SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</td>
<td>• PRDE 13 is the report of a Webb alignment study conducted in October 2016 for math, science, and Spanish. • PRDE 33 is a report of a crosswalk between the 2014 PRCS standards and the 2007 PPEA (former name of the alt) standards. It provides evidence that in cases where no alignment was present, replacement indicators were written.</td>
<td>Overall results indicated adequate alignment between standards and the assessment but there are some areas that peers believe need attention (e.g., Spanish grade 11 has 50% domain representation, math grade 6 did not have 80% or more of items aligned with expectations, p. 53). What is PRDE’s plan to address this in future development cycles?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 3.1 Summary Statement**

- x - No additional evidence is required

---

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes | **General assessment:**  
Validity study reported in PRDE 13 shows on p. 53 that 50% or more of all items across all grades and content areas are at the expected DOK level or higher.  
**Alternate assessment:**  
PRDE 31, section 8.1.5 states that intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level are tapped. | Alternate assessment:  
There is also some evidence in section 8.1.2.1 under ‘Development of Aligned Test Specifications’ but further detail about this process is needed to address its connection to this critical element. |

**Section 3.2 Summary Statement**

- The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
  - Please provide further detail to document that the alternate is tapping intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade 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.
### 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure

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.

**General assessment:**

PRDE 29 (p.123-125) and PRDE 29y, p. 374-391 report correlations among subtests and between subtests and total test scores. This evidence also shows DIF analyses showing that scores did not differ by gender.

**Alternate assessment:**

Peers could not locate evidence documenting that the scoring and reporting structures are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the alternate academic content standards.

**Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence**

- **Alternate assessment:** Please provide such evidence.

### Section 3.3 Summary Statement

- **x** The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
  - Please provide evidence documenting that the scoring and reporting structures are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the alternate academic content 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.
## Critical Element

### 3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables

The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **General assessment:**
PRDE provided evidence 29 (Table 6.8, p. 126), which shows correlations across the general assessments. | To address this critical element, it is necessary to show correlations between the assessments and other tests (e.g., NAEP, district-administered assessments of the same content areas, student grades, teacher judgments of readiness). |
| **Alternate assessment:**
Same as for general assessment. | |

### Section 3.4 Summary Statement

- The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
  - Please provide correlations between state assessments (general and alternate) and other measures.

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.
**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1 – Reliability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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: | General assessment:  
- 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. | General assessment:  
Sufficient evidence was provided to address this critical element for the general assessment. |
| | Alternate assessment: PRDE’s submission index did not list evidence for the alternate assessment related to this critical element. However, peers located the relevant documentation indicated below: | Alternate assessment:  
Peers recommend the PRDE provide some measure of generalizability. |
| | - PRDE 31 (p. 67-68) mentions that there are several conceptualizations of reliability in such an assessment. “One is the consistency of the observed outcomes associated with a given skill”.  
- PRDE 31 (p. 51, section 4.3. ‘Ensuring comparability/procedural quality and fidelity’) references the portfolio assembly process but does not provide any independent verification (e.g., second observer).  
- No evidence located. | Please provide generalizability evidence for fidelity of administration. |
| | | Please provide evidence of consistency and accuracy of estimates in classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels. |
| | N/A: No computer-adaptive assessments | |

**Section 4.1 Summary Statement**

- The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Alternate assessment:
- Peers recommend the PRDE provide some measure of generalizability.
- Please provide generalizability evidence for fidelity of administration.
- Please provide evidence of consistency and accuracy of estimates in classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</td>
<td>Sufficient evidence was provided to address this critical element for both the general and alternate assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Sufficient evidence was provided to address this critical element for both the general and alternate assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General assessment:**

Evidence cited 2.1 (test design and development) and 2.2 (item development) (PRDE 29, chapter 4) document the care taken in the test development process to maximize accessibility.

PRDE 29 (p.138-159) also details the DIF analyses showing the comparability of the online and paper versions of the assessment and to ensure no differences across subgroups (p. 184-187).

PRDE 20 and 21 list accommodations for both SWD and students with limited Spanish proficiency.

**Alternate assessment:**

PRDE did not cite evidence in its submission for this critical element. However, peers located the following evidence:

The alternate allows the students with the most significant impairments, even those who cannot be appropriately assessed with the regular assessment with accommodations, to participate fully in assessment. PRDE 18 documents the process to decide whether a student is eligible and to determine the necessary supports. PRDE 31 documents the test development process, including broad stakeholder involvement.

---

**Section 4.2 Summary Statement**

- _x_ No additional evidence is required

---

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

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</td>
<td>General assessment: PRDE 29.y lists TIFs and CSEMs (p. 114-138) showing score precision across the range of performance. Alternate assessment: PRDE did not cite evidence in its submission for this critical element. Peers could not locate any evidence for this critical element listed in the non-regulatory guidance (p. 41).</td>
<td>General assessment: Sufficient evidence is provided to address this critical element. Alternate assessment: Please provide documentation that the alternate provides adequately precise estimates of student performance across the full continuum (e.g., a cumulative frequency distribution or histogram of student scores for each grade and subject on the most recent test administration).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 4.3 Summary Statement

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Please provide documentation that the alternate provides adequately precise estimates of student performance across the full continuum.

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

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.4 – Scoring</td>
<td><strong>General assessment:</strong> PRDE 29 (chapter VI) details scoring procedures and protocols. PRDE 48: Constructed Response Scoring Plan</td>
<td>Sufficient evidence is provided to address this critical element.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Alternate assessment:</strong> PRDE 31 (chapter VI) details scoring procedures and protocols for the portfolio assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 4.4 Summary Statement**

- **x** No additional evidence is required

---

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</td>
<td>General assessment: PRDE 29 (p. 126-130 and 130-134) describes the scaling and equating across forms.</td>
<td>Sufficient evidence is provided to address this critical element.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternate assessment: N/A: portfolio assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 4.5 Summary Statement**

_x_ No additional evidence is required
## Critical Element

### 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment

If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:
- 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General assessment:</strong> Spanish and Science assessments have online and paper versions. PRDE 29 (p. 134-183) documents a comparability study of the two versions and PRDE 49 details the calibration study Pearson performed, which includes DIF analyses on the two versions (p. 8-29).</td>
<td>Peers noted that in PRDE 43 (p. 4) indicates that the online assessments are available on a number of devices (Windows and Mac laptops and desktops, Chromebooks, iPads, and Android devices). Per non-regulatory guidance (p. 43) PRDE should provide documentation either that the test administration hardware and software are standardized across unaccommodated administrations or demonstrate that delivery mode does not affect score comparability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alternate assessment:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General assessment:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternate assessment:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 4.6 Summary Statement

- The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
  - Please indicate whether the online administration used standardized hardware/software across unaccommodated administrations or demonstrate score comparability across devices.

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

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).

**General assessment:**
- PRDE 29 (chapter III)
- PRDE 13
- PRDE 50 (TAC minutes)

**Alternate assessment:**
PRDE did not cite evidence related to the alternate in their submission index but peers located the following:
- PRDE 31 (chapters 3, 4, and 5)
- PRDE 50 (TAC minutes)

Sufficient evidence is provided to address this critical element for both the general and alternate assessment.

### Section 4.7 Summary Statement

- x No additional evidence is required
## SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities | • Peers could not find documentation of the effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking the alternate assessment.  
• PRDE 18 (p.93), PRDE 56 (p. 8), and PRDE 20 (accommodations manual)  
• PRDE 19, 20, 21 provide information on accommodations for SWD and limited Spanish proficient students; PRDE 51 (‘Public policy for drafting an IEP in MiPE [Mi portal especial, platform for recording IEP] 2016-2017 for special education students’ [title translated by peers]) provides guidance for IEP teams  
• PRDE 20; PRDE 21 (p. 11) lists appropriate accommodations for limited Spanish proficient students on statewide assessments.  
• PRDE 20 (p. 21-40) lists the various categories of accommodations and their appropriateness for students with different kinds of disabilities.  
• PRDE 18 (p. 6)  
• Peers could not locate evidence that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their child’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of possible consequences thereof.  
• PRDE 18 (p. 7), which is the teacher guide for the alternate (designed for the most significantly cognitively impaired students) specifies that the general academic achievement standards are the basis of the curriculum for all students, including those with special needs.  
• Please provide such documentation. |
**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Puerto Rico**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>disabilities;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 5.1 Summary Statement**

- The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
  - Peers could not find documentation of the effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking the alternate assessment. Please provide.
  - Peers could not locate evidence that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their child’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of possible consequences thereof. Please provide.

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

### Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)

- PRDE 21 lists accommodations for limited Spanish proficient learners but does not indicate procedures for determining whether an LSP learner should receive linguistic accommodations.
- PRDE 21, PRDE 29 (p. 93)
- PRDE 21 (p. 11) lists appropriate accommodations for limited Spanish proficient students on statewide assessments but does not provide guidance about how test administrators should select from among the possibilities.

## Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

- For instance, peers wondered at what point or how it is decided that a second language learner of Spanish no longer needs accommodations?

- Additional guidance should be included.

### Section 5.2 Summary Statement

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Please specify procedures for determining whether a limited Spanish proficient learner should receive linguistic accommodations.
- Please provide additional guidance about how test administrators should select from among possible accommodations for limited Spanish proficient students.

---

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

#### 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:

- 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.

#### Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)

- PRDE 20 and 21
- PRDE 21
- PRDE 29 (p. 213) references an Appendix ‘Review of implementations of accommodations for students with disabilities and LSP students for the PPAA’ which could provide evidence, but peers were unable to locate it; PRDE 52 provides a frequency count of the number of regular test booklets, large print, Braille, students who receive a reader, and a DVD test presentation).
- Peers could not locate documentation of a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for the small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.

#### Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

- Peers request a summary of the frequency of use of each accommodation by student characteristics.
- Please provide.

### Section 5.3 Summary Statement

- The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
  - Please provide a summary of the frequency of use of each accommodation by student characteristics.
  - Please provide documentation of a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for the small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.
### Critical Element

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations

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:

- 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.

#### General and alternate assessments:

- PRDE 45 provides monitoring checklists, which include ensuring that SWD receive accommodations as required by their IEP and LSPs receive linguistic accommodations.
- The State monitors that SWDs receive test accommodations consistent with their IEP as determined by the IEP team (COMPU by its abbreviation in the Spanish documentation) and LSPs receive linguistic accommodations from the list (PRDE 45).
- See bullet above. IEP teams ensure that accommodations for assessment are consistent with those for instruction (PRDE 51).
- PRDE monitoring checklist (PRDE 45) documents consistency for SWDs. For limited Spanish proficient students, the process for determining appropriate accommodations could not be located (see request in critical element 5.2 above).
- Monitoring checklists (PRDE 45) ask whether accommodations were provided to SWD and LSP but not whether they were provided in accordance with correct test administration procedures. For instance, it is possible that a read-aloud accommodation was provided and contents that should not have been read aloud were read to the student (e.g., not just instructions but also reading passages).

#### Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

- See request in critical element 5.2.
- Please provide.

### Section 5.4 Summary Statement

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Please provide evidence to show that accommodations were administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.
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 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students          | • Peers understand that the certification of final PLDs by the PRDE program directors and the assessment director constitutes evidence that PR formally adopted academic achievement standards (PRDE 59) for the general and alternate assessment.  
  • PLDs for the required tested grades and content areas can be found in PRDE 16 for the general assessment and in PRDE 57 for the alternate.  
  • a) and b) PLDs in PRDE 16 and 57 have four levels, which include the descriptions of the competencies associated with each level.  
  c) Achievement scores differentiating among the levels can be found in the standard setting reports (PRDE 29.N for the general and 56 for the alternate). |                                                                                                                                                                                             |

**Section 6.1 Summary Statement**

- _x_ No additional evidence is required

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</td>
<td>General assessment: PRDE 29, 29.N, and 56 document the standard setting procedures for the general assessments. Alternate assessment: PRDE 56 documents the standard setting procedures for the alternate assessment. PRDE 55 (a report from a member of the PRDE TAC) provides observational evidence for the cut scores.</td>
<td>General assessment: Sufficient evidence was provided to address this critical element. The modified Angoff method is well-established and the backgrounds of the panelists included a wide range of teachers (content area specialists at the needed grade levels, from various places on the island, rural/urban, SWD/regular classroom teachers, etc.) Alternate assessment: Sufficient evidence was provided to address this critical element. A variety of special ed, resource, and regular classroom teachers at the tested content and grade levels served as panelists, with varied demographic backgrounds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 6.2 Summary Statement

- No additional evidence is required

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

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.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General assessment:</strong></td>
<td>PRDE 1 (p. 6-7) indicates that principles of college and career readiness were used in developing the content standards, and the state’s grade-level content standards were the basis for developing the PLDs.</td>
<td>Per non-regulatory guidance (p. 50-51), peers consider this evidence that PRDE has met the requirements of this critical element.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternate assessment:</strong></td>
<td>PRDE 59 (p. 12) states, “...met to review and validate the performance level descriptors for students participating in the META-PR and META-PR-ALTERNA based on the 2014 Puerto Rico Content Standards (PRCS).” However, peers could not locate “a description of the process used to develop the alternate academic achievement standards that shows...that the state’s extended academic content standards were used as a main reference in writing performance level descriptors for the alternate academic achievement standards.” (non-regulatory guidance, p. 51)</td>
<td>Please provide additional evidence to this effect.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Section 6.3 Summary Statement
- The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
  - Please provide evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the extended academic content 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.
Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.4 – Reporting</strong></td>
<td><strong>General and alternate assessments:</strong></td>
<td>• Sufficient evidence was provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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:</td>
<td>• PRDE 60 (general assessment) and PRDE 61 (alternate assessments) list student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested. Score reports with those features are publicly available on the PRDE website (<a href="http://www.de.gobierno.pr/files/2016_META_PR_DEPR_Exec_Summary_final.pdf">http://www.de.gobierno.pr/files/2016_META_PR_DEPR_Exec_Summary_final.pdf</a>) Itemized score reports appear in PRDE 60; PRDE 23 (interpretive guide) and PRDE 62 (results interpretation brochure) are intended to inform instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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;</td>
<td>• PRDE 60 (p. 78) provides an example of student-level reports that provide valid and reliable information regarding student achievement, report achievement in terms of academic achievement standards, and provide interpretive information to parents. Peers could not locate evidence that such reports are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request.</td>
<td>• Please provide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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;</td>
<td>• Peers could not locate evidence of a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</td>
<td>• Please provide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Provide information to help parents,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | | |
STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Puerto Rico

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 6.4 Summary Statement**

- x The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
  - Please provide evidence that such reports are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request.
  - Please provide evidence of a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.

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