



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Molly Spearman
State Superintendent
South Carolina Department of Education
1429 Senate Street
Columbia, SC 29201

April 13, 2018

Dear Superintendent Spearman:

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, mathematics, and science that meet nationally recognized professional and technical standards with a few additional requirements. I appreciate the efforts of the South Carolina Department of Education (SCDE) 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 SCDE's submission and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that the components of your assessment system meet most, but not all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of section 1111(b)(1) and (3) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB. In addition, Department staff also reviewed SCDE's assessment evidence regarding whether they met the new requirements for State assessments under the ESEA, as amended by ESSA. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and our own analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

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

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

Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (SC Ready):
Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA

Substantially meets requirements means that these components meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. The specific list of items required for South Carolina to submit is enclosed with this letter. The Department expects that SCDE should be able to provide this additional information within one year. SCDE must provide to the Department a plan and timeline by which it will submit the additional documentation within 30 days of the receipt of this letter. If adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action. Resubmission should occur once all necessary evidence is complete (rather than in multiple submissions). The Department expects to conduct two peer review sessions yearly for new assessments and resubmissions; these will generally be held in February and August each year, with resubmissions due around December and June. SCDE's plan and timeline should propose resubmission according to this schedule (e.g., SCDE will resubmit evidence in summer 2018).

Please note that the assessment requirements for ESEA, as amended by the NCLB, were in effect through the end of the 2016-2017 school year. The SCDE peer review was conducted under the requirements of this statute. Beginning in the 2017-2018 school year, the assessment requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA will apply to State assessments. Given that this review began under the requirements of the ESEA as amended by the NCLB, it is important to indicate that while the SC Ready assessments meet most of the peer review guidance criteria under the NCLB, the State is still responsible to ensure that these assessments also comply with the requirements of the ESSA. Department staff have carefully reviewed SCDE evidence and peer review recommendations in light of the updated requirements for State assessments under the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. As a result of this additional review, I have determined that the SCDE administration of the SC Ready assessments has met the new requirements of ESEA, as amended by the ESSA.

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.

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.

Page 3 – The Honorable Molly Spearman

If you have any questions, please contact Erin Shackel of my staff at:
OSS.SouthCarolina@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

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

Enclosures

cc: Elizabeth Jones, Director Office of Assessment

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

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
2.1 – Test Design and Development	<p>For the SC Ready assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that range of item difficulty and cognitive complexity of the test design is aligned and sufficient to address the academic content standards. • Evidence that test items measure the full range of the grade-level academic content standards, including challenging content (i.e., higher-order thinking skills). • Evidence of the specifications and procedures to develop test forms. • Evidence to support the usability of the technology for delivering assessments.
2.2 – Item Development	<p>For the SC Ready assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills (e.g., by implementing specific recommendations from the independent evaluation of the SC Ready assessments).
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy	<p>For the SC Ready assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence the State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools.
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	<p>For the SC Ready assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that supports the overall validity for its assessments, specifically the claim that State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards. This evidence includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity.
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes	<p>For the SC Ready assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of validity; that the assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	<p>For the SC Ready assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence to support the claim that 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, specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The criteria used in interpreting data related to the internal structure of the assessments; and ○ Evidence of actions the State has taken to address issues arising from low reliabilities found for ELs on the mathematics assessments.
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	<p>For the SC Ready assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables, specifically evidence that documents the relationships between the SC Ready assessments and other tests measuring the same content (e.g., NAEP, district-administered assessments) as well correlations with student grades, teacher judgments and other related variables.
4.1 – Reliability	<p>For the SC Ready assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of criterion are used to interpret and evaluate test reliability. • Evidence of steps taken to improve the reliability of the tests for subgroups (see critical element 3.3).
4.2 – Fairness and accessibility	<p>For the SC Ready assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the results of bias, fairness and sensitivity item reviews.
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students	<p>For the SC Ready assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of official adoption of academic achievement standards.
6.4 – Reporting	<p>For the SC Ready assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors); ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; and

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="565 233 1321 338">○ 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.<li data-bbox="516 338 1321 483">• Evidence that the State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.

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

August 2017 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS	3
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students	3
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards	4
1.3 – Required Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only).....	5
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only).....	6
1.5 – Participation Data (reviewed by Department staff only).....	8
SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS	9
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	9
2.2 – Item Development.....	11
2.3 – Test Administration	13
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)	14
2.5 – Test Security	15
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....	16
SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY	17
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	17
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	19
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	20
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	22
SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER	23
4.1 – Reliability.....	23
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	24
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	25
4.4 – Scoring	26
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	27
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	28
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance.....	29
SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS	30
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	30
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	32
5.3 – Accommodations.....	33
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	35
SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .	37
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students	37
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....	38
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	39
6.4 – Reporting.....	40

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

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State.</p>	<p>The State has adopted academic content standards for ELA and Mathematics, as announced by SC State Superintendent of Education on March 11, 2015 (CE1.1A) and approved by the State Board of Education (CE1.1B p. 8).</p> <p>Evidence is found in the Education Accountability Act (EAA) that the State applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools. (CE1.2J, Section 59-18-320(B) p. 8).</p>	<p>Sufficient evidence was provided to address this critical element.</p>
<p>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required .</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science specify what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school to succeed in college and the workforce; contain content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.</p>	<p>The State’s Education Accountability Act, Section 59-18-325(C) (1) (p. 11), and references to this Act on the Test Administration Manual (CE1.A, p. 8) and the Draft Technical Report Peer Review (CE3.1A p. 8) provide evidence that the assessments must focus on student preparedness for postsecondary success in a college or career.</p> <p>SC has referenced the endorsement of several SC colleges and universities (CE1.2C to CE1.2F) as well as reviews and feedback from qualified committees of educators, including special education and English language teachers (CE1.2-H, pp. 1-3), content area experts, and a task force of parents, business and community leaders as evidence of stakeholder involvement in determining the coherence and rigor of these academic content standards (CE1.2I, 59-18-350, p. 15).</p>	<p>Sufficient evidence was provided to address this critical element.</p> <p>Future submissions might consider also proving endorsements from the business community to support direct entry into the workforce, given successful student performance on standards adopted.</p>
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>x<u> </u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>1.3 – Required Assessments</p> <p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments (based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate academic achievement standards-AAAS) in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). 	<p>South Carolina’s Education Accountability Act SECTION 59 18 320 (B) addresses requirements for the standards based assessment of mathematics, English/language arts (ELA) and science administered to all public school students in grades three through eight including students required by the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA).</p>	
<p>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p>_x_ No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</p> <p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system; • For English learners (EL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment; ○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years. 	<p>SECTION 59-18-320 of the Education Accountability Act requires annual assessments in math, ELA, and science to be administered to all public school students including students required by the IDEA.</p> <p>Page 22 of CE1.4A, which is the SC READY and SCPASS Spring 2017—Test Administration Manual, discusses the State’s requirements for certain groups of students to be included in the Statewide assessments. One of the groups referenced is “Students with Disabilities Who Have Been Placed by Districts and Public Agencies in Private or Nonpublic Schools.” The guidance instructs that that these students should be tested by their home district.</p> <p>Appendix D of the Test Administration Manual (TAM) explains that SC READY, SCPASS, and science assessment are not available in alternate language formats and that all ESOL/EL students must take these tests in English. Instructions in the TAM state that students enrolled in U.S. schools for less than one year and who score less than “Initially Proficient”) based upon their scores on an English language proficiency (ELP) assessment are allowed a one-time exemption from the SC READY ELA test.</p>	<p>Though the SC READY and SCPASS Spring 2017—Test Administration Manual provides guidance on the test administration requirements for “Students with Disabilities Who Have Been Placed by Districts and Public Agencies in Private or Nonpublic Schools,” another section included in the same manual states that students attending a private school do not need to be tested. Please consider placing a qualifier in the private school section to remind a reader who simply turns to that section that a student with disabilities publicly placed in a private school must be included in the assessment system.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>1.5 – Participation Data</p> <p>The State’s participation data show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system. In addition, if the State administers end-of-course assessments for high school students, the State has procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates on each required assessment and provides the corresponding data.</p>	<p>Sufficient evidence of participation data for all students and disaggregated by students group for ELA and Math in grades 3-8. This evidence is provided in document CE1.5 titled: 2015-16 Participation Rates.</p>	
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u> </u>x<u> </u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.1 – Test Design and Development</p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; • Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design. 	<p>CE1.4A (p. 1) provides evidence that the State’s College-and Career-Ready Assessments (SC READY) are statewide assessments in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics. All students in grades three through eight are required to take the SC READY assessments except those students with significant cognitive disabilities who qualify for the South Carolina National Center and State Collaborative (SC-NCSC) alternate assessment.</p> <p>The purpose of these assessments is to infer how well students are mastering specific cognitive processes and the content knowledge and skills to meet the grade-level standards for college and career readiness, and to provide the basis for federal, state, district and accountability and teacher evaluation (CE1.4A, p. 2; CE3.1A, p. 7).</p> <p>Test blueprints for each subject specifies the total number of points on each grade-level test, as well as the approximate number of points per reporting category or domain (CE2.1E).</p>	<p>Insufficient evidence was provided to address this critical element.</p> <p>Peers did not see the range of item difficulty and cognitive complexity in the evidence. Documents CE2.1A and CE2.1B provide partial information, but inadequate evidence that they measure the full range of the grade-level academic content standards, including challenging content, i.e., higher-order thinking skills. Peers are unable to infer the test specifications from the test maps.</p> <p>What is the State’s response to the recommendations presented in CE2.2A regarding test construction?</p> <p>While documents CE2.1D and CE2.1E do provide partial specifications for test design (including number of items, score point ranges, content strands-identified up to Standard 2 for mathematics, as an example, and time limits), they do not support alignment to content standards beyond the basic reporting category (that is, how are Standard 3 and 4, for mathematics, for example, accounted for within the test blueprints-based on documents CE2.1F-Q). These documents do not indicate the balance of cognitive complexity.</p> <p>It could be inferred that documents CE2.1F-Q provide evidence that items assess higher-order thinking skills, but this is not explicit in the test maps provided (for instance, cognitive level as a column in the spreadsheets). Also, no rationale for the design of the assessment is provided.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		No evidence to support the usability of the technology for delivering assessments is provided.
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please provide the range of item difficulty and cognitive complexity in the evidence. Documents CE2.1A and CE2.1B provide partial information, but inadequate evidence that they measure the full range of the grade-level academic content standards, including challenging content, i.e., higher-order thinking skills. • Please provide the test specifications to develop test forms. • Please provide evidence to support the usability of the technology for delivering assessments. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.2 – Item Development</p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p>SC Ready is based on items purchased from a contractor. Items undergo a multi-step process that includes reviews by expert judges regarding content and cognitive complexity alignment, sensitivity and fairness, and field testing (CE2.2A p. 5; CE3.1A, pp. 19-20).</p> <p>Results of an independent evaluation of the assessments recommended the incorporation of readability and grade-level appropriateness reviews for mathematics items and associated stimuli during item development to further support the validity of test scores (CE2.2R, p. 6).</p>	<p>Insufficient evidence was provided to address this critical element.</p> <p>Peers did not find evidence of how the State is responding to the recommendations presented in CE2.2R, the independent evaluation of the assessments.</p> <p>How is the State responding to the recommendations provided in CE2.2A (pp. 5-7)?</p> <p>Evidence is not provided of instructions given to item writers regarding how to write the items.</p> <p>How were the items developed to include accessibility tools available to all test takers, i.e., principles of universal design? State documents submitted to the contractor listed in CE2.2R might provide information to support the critical element.</p> <p>The State did not provide evidence describing the criteria used to select items from the contractor to ensure alignment to the State’s grade-level academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity. The evidence cited refers to scoring guidelines and PLDs (CE2.2B through CE2.2P) and directions for standard setting (CE2.2Q). CE2.1F through CE2.1K are test maps that are not useful to evaluate associated processes for item selection and test form construction. CE2.1L through CE2.1Q describe outcomes of what was delivered to the State.</p> <p>There is no evidence submitted regarding the use of cognitive labs as a tool to establish that the assessments measure the intended construct.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 2.2 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please provide appropriate evidence that the State has taken steps to strengthen procedures to develop and select items based on recommendations from the independent evaluation of the assessment process. • Please provide evidence describing the criteria used to select items from the contractor to ensure alignment to the State’s grade-level academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity. 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>CE1.4A, CE2.3A, CE2.3B and CE3.1A provide evidence for the dissemination and implementation of policies and procedures for standardized test administrations before, during and after the administration of the tests. Appendices C and D of CE1.4A describe administration procedures for testing students with documented disabilities and English learners. CE2.3F describes administration and training procedures for paper-and-pencil and online delivery of tests, along with system requirements, browser support and other technical requirements for online testing.</p> <p>Evidence of specific procedures for administration of technology-based assessments is outlined on pp. 43-47 and 62-66 of CE1.4A. Procedures for disruptions of online testing, including power outages, fire, storms, death, etc. are found on pp. 29-30, while Appendix B (pp. B1-B3) describes procedures related to what to do in the case of online pauses, loss of Internet connectivity, and other disruptions.</p>	<p>Sufficient evidence was provided to address this critical element.</p>
<p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>x<u> </u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p>Sufficient evidence provided. CE2.4 is a spreadsheet tracking the onsite monitoring of assessment administration over the last five years.</p> <p>CE2.5B lays out monitoring procedures for Accommodations and Modifications of Statewide assessments. Document CE2.5A provides SCDE’s process to collect and evaluate data to determine if there are any test irregularities and risks and which schools to visit during assessment administration. The document includes information on the selection and training of Statewide assessment monitors, and provides information on what monitors will do during and after an onsite review of the administration of a Statewide assessment.</p>	
<p>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/>_x_ No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.5 – Test Security</p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. 	<p>CE 2.5A and CE3.1A describe the State’s comprehensive test security system based on the State’s test security regulations. It defines violations and consequences for violations, including possible fines and incarceration (pp. 3-4), detection of test irregularities (pp. 10-12), investigating and providing corrective action (pp. 12-13) and the feedback loop to convey policy and improve procedures (p. 15).</p> <p>The Test Administration Manual (CE1.4A, pp. 10-20) provides detailed discussion of test security, including legal requirements, State Board regulations, reporting test security violations, violations and student with disabilities, online test security and other relevant topics. Similar information is included in CE2.5E, CE2.5F and CE2.5G, along with policies and procedures for monitoring the use of testing accommodations (CE2.5B) and the training monitors receive to document the monitoring visits (CE2.5C).</p> <p>Page 61 of the TAM (CE1.4A) provides evidence of training that the State provides to train test administrators to be eligible to administer the SC READY. After training, the TA must sign the appropriate Agreement to Maintain Test Security and Confidentiality form (Appendix E, p. E-25). CE2.5D provides a series of vignettes to train test administrators on avoiding test security violations.</p>	<p>Sufficient evidence was provided to address this critical element.</p> <p>Peers thought that the vignettes were helpful as a tool to train test administrators on preventing test security violations (CE2.5D).</p> <p>Peers did not find evidence of security procedures during item writer workshops and item development. Peers suggest the State ensures test security at all stages of the development process (i.e., confidentiality forms filled out by item writers, panelists, etc.) to strengthen test security.</p> <p>Although monitors are encouraged to monitor other schools if it was feasible, the State may want to consider a process for selecting schools for monitoring beyond those that were selected because of previous test security violation incidents (CE2.5A, p. 11).</p>
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 	<p>The Test Administration Manual (CE1.4A-TAM) includes specific procedures for schools/district to implement to ensure the integrity and confidentiality of test materials.</p>	<p>Insufficient evidence was provided to address this critical element.</p> <p>There is sufficient evidence regarding policies and procedures to protect the integrity and confidentiality of State materials.</p> <p>However, there was no evidence regarding policies and procedures to secure student-level assessment data and to protect personally identifiable information. For example, there is no evidence submitted regarding rules and procedures for secure transfer of student-level data in and out of the State’s data management and reporting systems (i.e., authorized personnel, data encryption), as well as rules and procedures to ensure that aggregate or de-identified data intended for public release do not inadvertently disclose any personally identifiable information (i.e., minimum number of students required to produce a group report).</p> <p>For examples of qualifying evidence, refer to the Peer Review Guidance, “Examples of Evidence” for Critical Element 2.6.</p>
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please provide evidence the State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools. • Please provide evidence regarding policies and procedures 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. 		

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

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. 	<p>Basic test blueprints are provided by the State as document CE3.1B, but only include the range of the number of items presented on a test by reporting category and do not include the DOK or level of cognitive complexity and item type requirements.</p> <p>Reliability analyses conducted (CE3.1A, Chapter 8 & CE3.1C) do serve to support the internal consistency of the Grade 3-8 mathematics and ELA assessments. However, the mere presentation of results is not sufficient to communicate how the reliability studies support validity evidence.</p> <p>CE2.2T shows evidence of a 2016 study to examine the validity of score inferences from oral administration on the grades 3-8 ELA tests to students with blindness or a visual impairment. The policy recommendation was for oral administration to be a standard accommodation on the ELA assessment for students in grades 4-8 only.</p> <p>All the SC READY assessments were subjected to a formal DIF analysis procedure to detect unfair advantage of one group over another on the test. More than 95% of all items showed little or no DIF. The data also indicated that the assessments showed very little DIF for gender, ethnicity, or mode (CE3.1A, pp. 77-79).</p>	<p>Insufficient evidence was provided to address this critical element.</p> <p>Peers did not find evidence of alignment. The information presented in CE3.1A is insufficient to make determinations that the items from the contractor are designed to measure the full range of the State’s academic content standards.</p> <p>There is a need for contextual information to frame and explain the data provided on tables, i.e., how are the data connected to the validity argument intended to support the uses of the assessment results.</p> <p>Although one of the stated uses of the assessment results is teacher accountability, peers did not find evidence to support this use.</p> <p>The alignment process presented as document CE3.1A, Section 2.4 is insufficient to communicate confidence to stakeholders that the items selected from DRC’s pre-prepared item bank are aligned with the State’s content standards. Documents CE3.1D (the RFP for test development services) and CE2.1F-Q (the test maps) are not sufficient to provide support for the alignment of the assessment to SC’s academic standards or that procedures for alignment are followed during test development. The RFP is just a request for services that outlines desired requirements, but does not provide evidence that requirements are implemented or met. The test maps provide information about the make-up of the assessments, but do not provide information that the desired alignment criteria were met.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>There was no coherent argument to support evidence of overall validity. One suggestion to make this argument is to examine the 1) crosswalk between the contractor’s college and career standards to the South Carolina college and career standards, and 2) alignment of the items in the contractor’s item bank to the State’s content standards.</p> <p>The blueprints (CE3.1B) and the test maps and test sessions (CE2.1F through CE2.1Q) do not provide support for overall validity based on content.</p> <p>Peers could not find evidence of the State’s plan to address the recommendation from an independent, comprehensive evaluation of the State assessments related to item development and test construction (CE2.2R, p. 6).</p> <p>There is no evidence submitted regarding the use of cognitive labs as a tool to establish that the assessments measure the intended construct.</p>
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please provide overall validity evidence for the State’s assessments that address the objectives of Critical Element 3.1 in terms of measuring the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards. • Please provide a rationale for how the validity evidence presented support all the uses of assessment results. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>		<p>Insufficient evidence was provided to address this critical element.</p> <p>A contractor was contracted by South Carolina to conduct an audit of the SC READY testing program. They will complete the audit by December 31, 2017. This report will include construct validity evidence and can be provided for Peer Review.</p> <p>The State should consider critically reviewing with the contractor the evidence suggested in the U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment System, Non-Regulatory Guidance for States dated September 25, 2015 document to ensure that the commissioned study will adequately address this critical element.</p>
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please submit the evidence of validity that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s 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.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p>The State does present results of analyses to support the internal consistency of the Grade 3-8 mathematics and ELA assessments. However, the interpretation of results is very minimal and the State does not provide any rationale for how the results support the intended interpretations and uses of test scores for the SC Ready assessments.</p> <p>CE3.1A, Tables 9.5, 9.6, & 9.7 do seem to provide support that there are interrelationships among subscores. However, it is unclear whether the resulting correlations between reporting categories meet hypothesized expectations.</p> <p>CE3.1C provides a table of test reliability coefficients for various subgroups which provides some evidence that the internal structure of the assessments is variable depending on the subgroup (e.g., Grade 3-5 Mathematics exam has lower than expected reliability for students with IEPs). Reliability less than 0.85 is considered lower than expected as stated on page 38 of the technical report (CE3.1A).</p> <p>CE3.1A, Section 9.2 does provide support that minimal DIF is present across the mathematics (Table 9.4) and ELA (Table 9.3) assessments.</p>	<p>Insufficient evidence was provided to address this critical element.</p> <p>The State needs to provide a rationale for how the internal consistency results support the intended interpretations and uses of SC Ready test scores as part of a larger narrative that provides a comprehensive argument for the validity of test score interpretation and use, including the use of assessment scores for teacher evaluation purposes.</p> <p>The implications of the analyses were unclear. The State needs to provide a hypothesis for expectations, a description of the method associated with the analysis, an interpretation of the results, and a discussion on how the results support the hypothesis or how the assessments can be improved in the future based on the findings.</p> <p>It would be helpful to conduct some dimensionality analyses to uncover whether the assessment supports the reporting of scores into the intended reporting categories.</p> <p>It is unclear how the State intends for the referenced documents to support the dimensionality of the assessment. CE3.1A, section 7.8 does not support any analyses conducted and the fit statistics in CE3.3A and CE3.3B are from a unidimensional Rasch model without hypotheses stated with respect to how the fit statistics from this model support the intended interpretations of results.</p> <p>CE3.3C does not seem sufficient to provide evidence that ancillary constructs are not barriers for success</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>on the assessments as indicated by the State. In fact, it does seem that there may be instances where ancillary constructs may be presenting a barrier (e.g., Grade 5-8 reliability coefficients for the ELL subgroups are lower than 0.85 for mathematics which may suggest that reading ability is a contributing factor to the lower reliability of the mathematics assessments for students with less English Language ability).</p> <p>There is no evidence submitted regarding what procedures are in place to use results of analyses of traditional item indices to improve the strength of the item pool (i.e., are items with p-values and/or point-biserial correlations outside of the acceptable ranges removed from the item bank?)</p>
Section 3.3 Summary Statement		
<p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please provide an explanation for how the internal consistency results support the intended interpretations and uses of SC Ready test scores. • Please provide the criteria used for evaluating the results. • Please provide evidence of actions the State has taken to address issues arising from the results (e.g., there is evidence that language ability for English learners represent in math is a barrier for success on the assessments; what procedures are in place to use results of analyses of traditional item indices to improve the strength of the item pool). 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>CE3.4A provides evidence of a study on the two most widely used formative assessments drawn from the Adoption List of Formative Assessments and given to second grade (school year 2014–15) students in South Carolina: Measures of Academic Progress (MAP 2–5 Reading; NWEA) and STAR Reading (Renaissance Learning). The goal of this study was to provide bands of probabilities of each student on track to surpass Not Met 1 on SC READY reading in third grade (school year 2015–16) based on scale scores from these tests in second grade. Results were inconclusive due to a variety of study limitations.</p>	<p>It is unclear what these study findings indicate for the validity of the SC Ready exams. The study write-up should provide a hypothesis and an interpretation of whether the hypothesis was supported.</p> <p>CE3.4B-C seem to be supporting documentation for CE3.4A; however, it is unclear how these sources should be used by peer reviewers.</p> <p>Needs correlations between the SC READY assessments and other tests measuring the same content (e.g. NAEP, district-administered assessments) as well correlations with student grades, teacher judgments and other related variables.</p>
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>x<u> </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence of adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables. 		

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

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.1 – Reliability</p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement. 	<p>Chapter 8 of CE3.1A, Draft Technical Documentation for the 2016 South Carolina College- and Career-Ready Assessments – ELA and Mathematics, provides reliability indices and both classical standard errors of measurement and conditional standard errors of measurement for the general assessments. Decision consistency measures for the performance levels are also given. Table 8.1 (p. 38) provides student reliability indices (coefficient alpha) on all subjects for the total student population and for students in each gender group and the ethnic groups of African-American, Hispanic, and white students. Reliability indices do not differ greatly among the total student population and the students in each gender and ethnicity group. Table 8.2 (p. 39) reports classical standard errors of measurement based on scale scores, while Table 8.3 (p. 40) shows conditional standard errors of measurement at the two cut scores that define the three performance levels for all grades and subjects. Table 8.4 provides classification consistency results which are supported by subgroup consistency results presented in CE4.1A and CE4.1B.</p>	<p>Insufficient evidence was provided to address this critical element.</p> <p>While acceptable reliability analysis have been conducted, there is a lack of contextual information to help interpret the results of these studies along with a narrative describing how the results support the reliability of the assessments.</p>
<p>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</p> <p><u> </u>x<u> </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please provide information on what criteria are used to make determinations of reliability based on coefficients such as alpha and kappa. • Please provide action steps taken to improve the results of the subgroups that did not meet the acceptable reliability values. 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<p>Although CE3.1A, Section 2.2, provides some evidence that as part of the item construction process, content specialists and editors evaluate each item to make sure that it measured the intended College- and Career-Ready standards, are grade-level appropriate, and adhere to principles of universal design, the evidence is minimal. For example, 10 experienced reviewers evaluated each item for bias, fairness, and sensitivity issues. But the process for doing so or the results are not presented.</p> <p>CE3.1A, Section 9.2, provides evidence of DIF analyses for field tested items (p. 22). The data indicated that the assessments showed very little DIF for gender, ethnicity, or mode (pp. 80-86).</p>	<p>Insufficient evidence was provided to address this critical element.</p> <p>How were the items developed to include accessibility tools available to all test takers, i.e., principles of universal design? State documents submitted to the contractor listed in C2.2R might provide information to support the critical element.</p> <p>CE3.1A makes references to Bias, Fairness and Sensitivity reviewers. However, peers did not find any evidence of the processes they followed to evaluate item fairness and accessibility or a description of the evaluation outcomes.</p> <p>No evidence to support the usability of the technology for delivering assessments is provided.</p>
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please provide details about the processes that the Bias, Fairness and Sensitivity reviewers followed to evaluate item fairness and accessibility. • Please provide a summary of Bias, Fairness and Sensitivity item reviews. • Please provide evidence to support the usability of the technology for delivering assessments, i.e., how were the items developed to include accessibility tools available to all test takers. 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>CE4.3C and CE4.3D report conditional standard errors of measurement at various points along the score range for ELA and mathematics, respectively, but without any discussion as to how this information supports this critical element. Evidence of levels of score precision appear in the draft technical report (CE3.1A, Sections 8.2 and 8.3). These SEMs and CSEMs appear high, ranging from 5-6 score points.</p>	<p>Insufficient evidence was provided to address this critical element.</p> <p>CE3.1A, Chapter 5 does not support that there is an adequate distribution of cognitive complexity and item difficulty to cover the full performance continuum and the only statistic reported is central tendency. Providing a range of item difficulties by assessment and grade would serve to better support this critical element.</p> <p>Peers could not find the criteria the State used to evaluate the conditional standard errors of measurement to help define the three performance levels for all grades and subjects.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please provide the criteria the State used to evaluate the conditional standard errors of measurement to help define the three performance levels for all grades and subjects. 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>Chapter 4 of CE3.1A describes standardized scoring procedures and protocols to produce reliable results and valid interpretation of scores.</p> <p>CE3.1A (p. 49) provides evidence of quality controls for rater accuracy (a rater must maintain at least 70 percent exact agreement on validity checks), and internal reports containing daily and cumulative inter-rater reliability results, score point distribution data, and production volumes for each reader and item. Table 4.2 on page 52 reports the interrater agreement results for ELA text dependent analysis (TDA) item, Spring 2016.</p> <p>CE1.4A (p. 12) provides evidence that the State Board of Education may invalidate test scores that reflect improbable gains and that cannot be satisfactorily explained through changes in student populations or instruction.</p>	<p>Sufficient evidence was provided to address this critical element.</p> <p>Peers did not find a rationale to justify at least 70 percent exact agreement for rater accuracy.</p>
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> x </u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p>CE3.1A, Draft Technical Documentation for the 2016 South Carolina College- and Career-Ready Assessments – ELA and Mathematics, provides evidence of the application of the 1-parameter (Rasch) item response theory (IRT) model for item calibration and scaling (pp. 61-65) of the SC READY assessment forms. Under this model, ability measures known as theta are estimated for each raw score and converted into scale score to facilitate equating and linking of multiple forms for both subjects and all grades in order to establish form comparability within and across school years (CE3.1A, pp. 33-36).</p>	<p>Sufficient evidence was provided to address this critical element.</p> <p>The 2016 SC READY assessments were administered for the first time and included a single form. Linking and equating will be applied with subsequent administrations.</p>
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> x </u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<p>An independent evaluation of the SC Ready ELA and mathematics assessments provides evidence that the State followed a design and development process used to develop items (“ Items undergo a multi-step process that includes review by expert judges regarding content and cognitive complexity alignment, as well as sensitivity and fairness.”) to support comparable interpretations of results across different versions of the assessments (CE2.2A)</p> <p>CE3.1A, Table 9.3 shows evidence of consistency of reporting categories and key ideas for the mathematics paper-based and technology based as a way to elicit comparable response processes and alignment of both assessment platforms.</p> <p>CE4.6A reports results of a comparability study comparing item level performance across paper and pencil and online administrations of the SC READY Mathematics and English Language Arts, Grades 3 to 8 based on a DIF analysis. Results of the study showed that there is no difference in performance based on the mode of test administration.</p>	<p>Sufficient evidence was provided to address this critical element.</p>
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>x<u> </u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p>CE4.7B and CE4.7C document evidence presented to the Technical Advisory Committee for the South Carolina Department of Education as part of the Department’s regular cycle for reviewing and updating the State’s academic content standards and assessments. CE4.7D describes the Standard Operating Procedure for the Cyclical Review of the South Carolina PreK-12 Academic Standards and for the Development of New Academic Standards as stipulated by the SC Education Accountability Act of 1998 to ensure that the standards and assessments are maintaining high expectations for learning and teaching. At a minimum, each academic area should be reviewed and updated every seven years (CE1.2J, Section 59-18-350).</p>	<p>Sufficient evidence was provided to address this critical element.</p>
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards; • States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs; • Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment; • Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities; • Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with 	<p>The Memorandum of April 15, 2015 from the SC State Superintendent of Education (CE5.1, p. 2) provides evidence of State policy to ensure the inclusion of all students with disabilities as outlined in the Individuals with Disabilities in Education Act (IDEA). CE3.1A (p. 3) documents that all students in grades three through eight are required to take the SC READY assessments except those students with significant cognitive disabilities who qualify for the South Carolina National Center and State Collaborative (SC-NCSC) alternate assessment.</p> <p>CE3.1A (p. 31) documents that students with disabilities are included in SC READY test administrations with appropriate accommodations based upon recommendations by each student’s individualized education program (IEP) committee. Students with 504 accommodation plans and English learners are also included in SC READY testing. The Memorandum of December 31, 2015 from the SC State Superintendent of Education (CE5.1E, p. 2) provides evidence of State policy on allowable accommodations. CE5.1B and CE5.1F describe guidance for oral administration of the ELA assessment, while CE1.4a (pp. 27-28) and CE5.1C outline the State policy on use of calculators for mathematics. Appendix C of the Test Administration Manual (CE1.4A) provides details on testing students with standard accommodations.</p> <p>CE5.1G provides a list of standard accommodations that may be used by students with disabilities on the online and paper and pencil modes of the SC READY assessments (pp. 1-2; pp. 3-4) in accordance with the</p>	<p>Sufficient evidence was provided to address this critical element.</p> <p>The bullet “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.” does not apply to this review.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>disabilities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA; • Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments); • The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum. 	<p>student’s IEP, and the paper and pencil testing tools and supports, such as highlighter, magnifier, calculator and others (p. 3).</p> <p>CE5.4A, the monitoring overview and rubric for IEP development used during onsite monitoring contains evidence that, if a student is taking the alternate assessments or is not taking a statewide test, the monitor must check if there is a statement of why the child cannot participate in the general assessment and why the particular alternate assessment is appropriate (p. 6).</p>	
<p>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>x<u> </u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. 	<p>Appendix D of the Test Administration Manual (CE1.4A) provides evidence of State procedures and guidance for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodations, such as the student’s English fluency levels, teacher judgments, and other evidence, including the accommodations used in the classroom for individual students. Additionally, accommodations should be recorded on the student’s accommodations plan, kept with the student’s ESOL folder and recorded on the student’s answer document. Appendix D also identifies the list of available accommodations for including ELs in the state assessments.</p> <p>CE5.1G provides a list of standard accommodations that may be used by English learners on the online and paper and pencil modes of the SC READY assessments (p. 2; p. 4) in accordance with the student’s Accommodations Plan, and the paper and pencil testing tools and supports, such as highlighter, magnifier, calculator and others (p. 3).</p>	<p>Sufficient evidence was provided to address this critical element.</p>
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> x </u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities (SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 	<p>CE3.1A (p. 31) documents that students with disabilities are included in SC READY test administrations with appropriate accommodations based upon recommendations by each student’s individualized education program (IEP) committee. Students with 504 accommodation plans and English learners are also included in SC READY testing. The Memorandum of December 31, 2015 from the SC State Superintendent of Education (CE5.1E, p. 2) provides evidence of State policy on allowable accommodations.</p> <p>Appendices C and D of the Test Administration Manual (CE1.4A), and the SC Accommodation Manual (CE5.3A) identify the list of available accommodations for including students with disabilities and English learners, respectively, in the state assessments. CE5.1G provides a list of standard accommodations that may be used by students with disabilities and English learners on the online and paper and pencil modes of the SC READY assessments, and the paper and pencil testing tools and supports, such as highlighter, magnifier, calculator and others. CE3.1A (pp. 33-34) presents a summary of the frequency of use of each accommodation on the State’s assessments by student characteristics by grade.</p> <p>CE5.3B provides extensive evidence of State clarifications on allowable accommodations, appropriate access to accommodations, and the legal basis for providing accommodations during test administrations.</p> <p>CE5.3C/CE2.2T provide evidence that the State has</p>	<p>Sufficient evidence was provided to address this critical element.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>evaluated that the oral administration accommodation for reading are appropriate and effective, do not alter the construct being assessed, and allow meaningful interpretations of results.</p> <p>CE5.3F (p. 1), CE.1A (Appendix C, p, C-3) provide evidence that the State has a procedure in place to allow school districts to seek approval to use special request (circumstances) accommodations on statewide assessments. CE.1A (Appendix C, p. C-29) shows a copy of the special circumstances request State form. CE5.3G provides a copy of the form the committee that reviews special requests must use to record the committee’s decision, while CE5.3H shows a copy of the committee’s response to the request.</p>	
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. 	<p>CE5.4A provides evidence of a document the state uses during onsite monitoring to ensure that accommodations selected for students with disabilities are appropriate (p. 6). CE5.4B (p. 6) documents the process to record online results of the online monitoring related to whether the IEP team appropriately identified testing participation and classroom and testing accommodations and modifications, while CE5.4C (p. 3) documents if there was evidence that the student's teachers received notice of, and have a system in place to implement, the accommodations listed on the IEP.</p> <p>CE1.4A, Appendix C (p. C-31) shows a form test administrators must sign to verify that the procedures for using one of the allowed response options were consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations, and that the student responses represented an authentic student assessment consistent with state test security laws and regulations. Appendix D (p. D-3), specifies that appropriate accommodations for English learners should be based on the English fluency levels of individual students, teacher judgments, and other evidence, including the accommodations used in the classroom for individual students.</p> <p>CE5.4E and CE5.4F provide evidence of schedules and procedures for onsite IEP monitoring, including accommodations (CE5.4E, slide 25 and 29; CE5.4F, pp. 6-8), and correcting findings of noncompliance (CE5.4E, slides 35-36). CE5.4G and CE5.4H present results of onsite monitoring by school.</p>	<p>Sufficient evidence was provided to address this critical element.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 5.4 Summary Statement		
__x_ No additional evidence is required.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; • The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels. 	<p>The State uses the results of the assessments to infer how well students are mastering specific cognitive processes and the content knowledge and skills to meet the grade-level standards for college and career readiness (CE2.1C, p. 18, CE3.1A, p. 5) using four performance levels: Does Not Meet Expectations, Approaches Expectations, Meets Expectations, and Exceeds Expectations (CE2.2D). The specific meaning of each of the four levels is provided for grade 8 in CE2.2P.</p> <p>CE2.2S contains the standard setting report.</p>	<p>Insufficient evidence was provided to address this critical element.</p> <p>The State seems to be confusing content and academic achievement standards. Content Standards appear in documents CE6.1A-C. Academic Achievement Standards appear in documents CE2.2D-P.</p>
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p> <p><u> </u> x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please provide evidence of official adoption of academic achievement standards. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p>CE2.2S provides details on the Bookmark process and how it was used for setting cut scores. CE2.2C provides evidence of the qualifications of the panelists in terms of content experience, expertise teaching students with disabilities and English learners, and number of years teaching.</p> <p>CE2.2D provides evidence of the process used for developing, setting and validating performance-level descriptors aligned to the State’s academic content standards.</p> <p>CE4.1A and CE4.1B provide evidence of the reliability of categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and four achievement levels based on results of the general mathematics and ELA assessments, respectively, by grade and federally reported race.</p>	<p>Sufficient evidence was provided to address this critical element.</p> <p>Peers suggest increasing the representation of educators of English learners on the standard-setting committees.</p>
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> x </u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p>CE2.2U presents the results of a vertical moderation judgmental and statistical procedure in which panelists reviewed the cut scores and made adjustment recommendations in order to articulate and even out the peaks and valleys in the achievement trajectory from grades 3 to 8.</p> <p>CE6.1B provides evidence of the vertical articulation of ELA academic content standards across grades, not academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>Insufficient evidence was provided to address this critical element.</p> <p>CE2.2Q provides documentation of training on standard setting, not a description of steps taken to vertically articulate performance levels across grades.</p> <p>CE2.2D and CE2.2Q do not provide an evaluation that State’s achievement standards are aligned to grade-level content standards or that PLDs meaningfully differentiate across PLs and are vertically articulated. Peers need to see the results of the validation study in addition to the method and results for articulating standards.</p> <p>CE3.4A-C do not provide benchmarking of achievement standards against other assessments that would show that they are challenging. That is, how does the ability of MAP to predict SC Ready Grade 3 scores have anything to do with whether the SC Ready achievement standards are rigorous enough to allow for high school students to be ready for college or the workforce?</p>
<p>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please provide a description of steps taken to vertically articulate PLDs across grades. • Please provide the results of the validation study in addition to the method and results for articulating standards. • Please provide benchmarking of achievement standards against other assessments that would show that they are challenging (i.e., students are ready for college or the workplace). 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.4 – Reporting</p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration; • The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results; • The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement; ○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors); ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; 	<p>The State’s Education Accountability Act, CE1.2, Section 59-18-360, Dissemination of Assessment Results mandates that, beginning with the 2010 assessment administration, the Department of Education is directed to provide assessment results annually on individual students and schools by August first, in a manner and format that is easily understood by parents and the public, and that schools and districts are responsible for disseminating this information to parents.</p> <p>CE6.4C and CE6.4D provide evidence of State reports to the public of student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested. CE6.4E and CD6.4F provide guides to interpret results at the aggregated level for math and ELA.</p> <p>CE6.4B provides evidence of State outreach to parents and guardians regarding the State assessments, including information on reporting of test results. No information is provided regarding availability of this resource in alternative formats.</p> <p>The State’s Individual Student Report provides information to schools and parents on a student’s achievement based on the State’s proficiency levels, along with an estimate of the student’s performance relative to his/her peers in the State and other States with comparable standards. The ISR also includes a student’s performance level by specific content categories, including cut-off scores, and academic progress across grades to help parents and educators interpret the results. The State stated that the ISR is not available in alternate formats.</p>	<p>Insufficient evidence was provided to address this critical element.</p> <p>Although peers find evidence of reporting the percentage of students not tested in CE6.4D. However, peers are concerned that this report is not readily accessible.</p> <p>How are students not tested defined (e.g., absent, exempt or refusal)?</p> <p>Peers suggest the creation of another interpretive guide specifically for the use of parents, including alternative formats for other languages upon request and to the extent practicable.</p> <p>The ISR does not include PLDs. How does the ISR help parents/guardians interpret the results specific to the academic needs of their students?</p> <p>What’s the date for delivery of results to parents? There’s information on when schools receive individual students results.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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; • The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. 		
<p>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please provide the rationale for not providing the ISR in alternative formats. • Please provide evidence that validate the usability of the Annual Score User’s Guide for parents. • Please include the PLDs in the ISR to help interpret academic strengths and instructional needs. • Please provide information about when parents receive their student’s assessment results. 		

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