



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Melody Schopp
Secretary of Education
South Dakota Department of Education
800 Governors Drive
Pierre, SD 57501

January 13, 2017

Dear Secretary Schopp:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) assessment peer review process under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) 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. Therefore, as you know, the Department reinstated peer review of State assessment systems so that each State receives feedback from external experts on the assessments it is currently administering. We appreciate the efforts required to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in April and June 2016. 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 child's advancement against and achievement of grade-level standards. The Department's peer review of State assessment systems is designed to provide feedback to States to support the development and administration of high-quality assessments.

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

- Reading/ language arts (R/LA) and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (Smarter Balanced). **Substantially meets requirements.**
- R/LA and mathematics general assessments in high school (Smarter Balanced). **Substantially meets requirements.**
- R/LA and mathematics alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards (NCSC/MSAA) in grades 3-8 and high school. **Partially meets requirements.**

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

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

The components that **substantially meet** requirements meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. The Department expects that SDDOE should be able to provide this additional information within one year.

The component that **partially meets requirements** does not meet a number of the requirements of the statute and regulations and SDDOE will need to provide substantial additional information to demonstrate it meets the requirements. The Department expects that SDDOE may not be able to submit all of the required information within one year.

The specific list of items required for SDDOE to submit is enclosed with this letter. Because one of the State's components partially meets the requirements, the Department is placing a condition on the State's Title I grant award related to those components of the assessment system. To satisfy this condition, SDDOE must submit satisfactory evidence to address the items identified in the enclosed list. SDDOE must submit a plan and timeline within 30 days for when it will submit all required additional documentation for peer review. The Department will also host regular (e.g., quarterly) progress calls with the State to discuss the State's progress on its timeline. If, following the peer review of the additional evidence, adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action. Additionally, the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) will monitor progress on matters pertaining to requirements in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) related to the participation of students with disabilities in Title I assessments. Insufficient progress to address such matters may lead OSERS to place a condition on SDDOE's Federal fiscal year 2017 IDEA Part B grant award.

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

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

Sincerely,

/s/

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

Enclosures

cc: Abby Javurek-Humig, Director of the Division of Assessment and Accountability

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

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments	Note: see evidence requested for NCSC/MSAA in element 5.2 below.
2.1 – Test Design and Development	<p>For the NCSC/MSAA, SDDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence to support the NCSC/MSAA test design criteria for the writing portion of the R/LA arts AA-AAAS. This will also impact evidence for related critical elements in sections 3 and 4 <p>For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), SDDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the Smarter Balanced test design aligns the assessments to the full depth and breadth for all of the academic content standards in R/LA (including speaking) and mathematics at each grade level. • Evidence that the item selection procedures for the computer adaptive test online assessment adequately deliver tests that meet test design requirements for the intended depth of knowledge (DOK) of the assessments (also applies to evidence requested for element 2.2). • Evidence that, for cases where an assessment includes off-grade-level content, assessments produce grade level student achievement scores that are based only on grade-level items. • Evidence that the item pools for all versions of the assessments (i.e., general, American Sign Language, Braille and Spanish) are sufficient to support the test design requirements.
2.2 – Item Development	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), SDDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See evidence regarding DOK and item pools in element 2.1 above.
2.3 – Test Administration	<p>Evidence that SDDOE established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the NCSC/MSAA assessments that include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a troubleshooting guide to address technology-related contingency plans. • Evidence of policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration (including the assessment delivery devices, accessibility tools and features available for students, and item formats) prior to testing. • Evidence of training to ensure consistency of administration across districts and schools. <p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), SDDOE must provide:</p>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a comprehensive contingency plan to address possible technology challenges during test administration.
2.5 – Test Security	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced) AND for R/LA and mathematics alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards (NCSC/MSAA) in grades 3-8 and high school, SDDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ prevention of any assessment irregularities, ○ detection of test irregularities, and ○ remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the assessments, • Evidence of consequences in the State for confirmed violations of test security. • Evidence of annual training requirements for test security policies and procedures for educators.
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	<p>For the NCSC/MSAA, SDDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As noted in element 2.1, evidence that demonstrates its assessments measure the full breadth and depth of the State’s content standards (writing). Following that, the State will need to document adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, including evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards. This will also affect other critical elements in sections 3 and 4. <p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), SDDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence as noted for all item pools in element 2.1 above. • Evidence that Smarter Balanced assessments that include off-grade-level content conform to the on-grade level blueprint for the assessment. • Evidence of alignment of sample test forms for grades 3, 4, 6 and 7 in R/LA and mathematics. • Evidence of improved alignment of the tests, based on the findings of the independent alignment study.
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes	<p>For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	For the NCSC/MSAA, SDDOE must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional evidence that supports the internal structure of the tests, specifically how the test meets item response theory (IRT) assumptions of test unidimensionality.
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.
4.1 – Reliability	For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility	For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), SDDOE must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of estimated reliability for students receiving accommodations using operational data.
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum	For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1. For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), SDDOE must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See evidence regarding DOK and item pools in element 2.1 above.
4.4 – Scoring	For the NCSC/MSAA, SDDOE must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols designed to produce reliable results and facilitate score interpretations for constructed-response items in R/LA and mathematics and operational writing items. Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Adequate procedures and criteria for ensuring and documenting inter-rater reliability; ○ Clear scoring rubrics, comprehensive instructions for raters, adequate training of raters, evaluation of inter-rater reliability; and ○ Documentation that the IRT model-data fit issue described in critical element 3.3 has been resolved. For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), SDDOE must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Smarter Balanced has clear, unambiguous criteria, including minimum thresholds, to ensure and document inter-rater reliability for States that are conducting hand-scoring of Smarter Balanced performance items.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	<p>For NCSC/MSAA, SDDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence either that paper versions of the assessments are provided as an accommodation or an analysis of the comparability of the meaning and interpretation of the assessment results across the technology-based and paper-based versions of the assessments. <p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), SDDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the design and development of the item pools used to support multiple versions of the assessments, specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Computer-adaptive in ASL (R/LA listening only, Math) ○ Computer-adaptive in braille (R/LA, math) ○ Computer-based fixed form in Braille (math) ○ Paper in Braille (R/LA, Math) ○ Computer-adaptive in Spanish (math) ○ Paper in Spanish (math) ○ Evidence that item pools for these additional computer adaptive versions can support the adaptive test design.
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	<p>For NCSC/MSAA, SDDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of the assessments for future years.
5.1 – Procedures for including Students with Disabilities	<p>SDDOE must submit evidence of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation indicating 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.
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs	<p>For the R/LA and mathematics alternate assessments based on AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (NCSC/MSAA), SDDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the NCSC/MSAA provides test-taking accommodations for those students taking the NCSC that are English learners (ELs). <p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), SDDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of guidance regarding selection of the Spanish version of the Smarter Balanced assessments for ELs, and evidence of procedures for communication of this guidance to districts, schools, teachers and parents.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
5.3 – Accommodations	<p>For the NCSC/MSAA, SDDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the accommodations provided: (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. • Evidence that appropriate accommodations for ELs are available. • Evidence that the State has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.
5.4 – Monitoring Testing of Special Populations	<p>SDDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of procedures for implementation of monitoring test administration for special populations that address responsibility, monitoring frequency, site selection, and results of determinations and findings.
6.4 – Reporting	<p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), and for AA-AAAS (NCSC/MSAA) SDDOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. • Evidence that individual student reports are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent with limited English proficiency, be orally translated for such parent.

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

June, 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

Note: Peer review notes provide the combined recommendations of the individual peers to the U.S. Department of Education (Department), based on the statute and regulations and the Department's peer review guidance and the peer's professional judgement of the evidence submitted by the State. These assessment peer review notes, however, do not necessarily identify 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 DAKOTA

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)..... 7

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS 8
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 8
2.2 – Item Development..... 9
2.3 – Test Administration 10
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)11
2.5 – Test Security 12
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 14

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 15
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 15
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 16
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure 17
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables 18

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER 19
4.1 – Reliability..... 19
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 21
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... 22
4.4 – Scoring 23
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 24
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment 25
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance..... 26

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS 28
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 28
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 30
5.3 – Accommodations..... 31
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations 34

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 35
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students 35
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 36
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 37
6.4 – Reporting..... 38

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

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>Evaluate for all subjects</p> <p>South Dakota provided the following information in response to Critical Element 1.1:</p> <p>SD Evidence 1: ESEA Flexibility Waiver (Current), Principle 1:1.A- 1.B pp. 30 – 50</p> <p>SD Evidence 2: ESEA flexibility approval letter, June 29, 2012</p> <p>SD Evidence 3: ESEA flexibility renewal approval letter, August 21, 2015</p> <p>SD Evidence 4: Standards for English Language Arts, Adopted 2010</p> <p>SD Evidence 5: Standards for Mathematics, Adopted 2010</p> <p>SD Evidence 6: 11-29-2010 BOE Minutes, Agenda Item 10</p>	<p>Evidence of a waiver state - requirements previously met.</p> <p>State has just adopted new Science standards and is in the process of development of a new Science assessment, so Science is not part of this peer review submission, but will be submitted after the first operational year of assessments.</p>
<p>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

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>Evaluate for all three subjects</p> <p>South Dakota provided the following information in response to Critical Element 1.2:</p> <p>SD Evidence 1: ESEA Flexibility Waiver (Current), Principle 1:1.A- 1.B pp. 30 – 50</p> <p>SD Evidence 2: ESEA flexibility approval letter, June 29, 2012</p> <p>SD Evidence 3: ESEA flexibility renewal approval letter, August 21, 2015</p> <p>SD Evidence 7: Original Approved ESEA Flexibility Request (June 29, 2012), Principle 1:1.A- 1.B pp. 18 – 28</p>	<p>Evidence of a waiver state - requirements previously met.</p> <p>State has just adopted new Science standards and is in the process of development of a new Science assessment, so Science is not part of this peer review submission, but will be submitted after the first operational year of assessments.</p>
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

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>SD Evidence 1: ESEA Flexibility Waiver (Current), Principle 1:1.C pp. 50-54</p> <p>SD Evidence 2: ESEA flexibility approval letter, June 29, 2012</p> <p>SD Evidence 3: ESEA flexibility renewal approval letter, August 21, 2015</p> <p>SD Evidence 8: Table of all relevant state assessments</p> <p>SD Evidence 9: Smarter Balanced 2014-15 Online Summative Test Administration Manual</p> <p>SD Evidence 10a: NCSC 2014-15 Directions for Test Administration Manual</p> <p>SD Evidence 10b: NCSC Assessment System User Guide for Test Administrators</p> <p>SD Evidence 11: ESEA Flexibility Part B Monitoring Report, Page 3, Principle 1, Assurance 3</p>	<p>All requirements meet.</p>
<p>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X_ No additional evidence is required .</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

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>Requirements met.</p>
<p>Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u> </u>X_ No additional evidence is required for this element, but peers noted related concern in element 5.2.</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

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>SD Evidence 1: ESEA Flexibility Waiver (Current), Principle 1:1.C pp. 50-54</p> <p>SD Evidence 23: 2014-15 SD State Report Card, p.4 ; p. 6; pp. 11-30</p> <p>SD Evidence 24: South Dakota Smarter Balanced Technical Manual</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.1: Student Population; p.38 	<p>Requirements met.</p>
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>South Dakota provided the following information in response to Critical Element 2.1:</p>	<p>From the SBAC submission:</p> <p>The decision of proficiency vs. non-proficiency is based on only on grade level testing. The determination of other measures (levels I and IV, or student growth) may be impacted by the use of off grade level items and states must take this into account when using the assessments for accountability purposes.</p> <p>States using SBAC will need a waiver to use SBAC due to the exclusion of speaking in the assessment.</p>
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>X<u> </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the <u>full range</u> of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results. States using SBAC will need a waiver to use SBAC due to the exclusion of speaking in the assessment.</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>South Dakota provided the following information in response to Critical Element 2.2:</p> <p>SD.2.2: General assessments in language arts and mathematics: See Smarter Balanced Coordinated Submission for all states (SB.2.2).</p> <p>SD.2.2: Alternate assessments in language arts and mathematics: See NCSC Coordinated Submission (AZ 2.2) for all states.</p>	
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required from SD</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>South Dakota provided the following information in response to Critical Element 2.3:</p> <p>SD.2.3 & SD.2.3.a: General assessments in language arts and mathematics: See Smarter Balanced Coordinated Submission for all states (SB.2.3.1).</p>	<p>Does state have a policy regarding who is responsible for getting administrators trained and prepared for testing, for example, do schools or districts have this responsibility? How does the state enforce/monitor t</p> <p>SD has a K-12 data center that supports most of the internet services across the state, and a central student-information system shared by districts across the state. The state Bureau of Information and Telecommunications (BIT) supports this system, and provided consistent guidance and technical support to schools throughout the test window as technology problems were encountered.</p> <p>Did not find evidence of contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. In its current form, the only contingency plan is to directly call the help desk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that all students are familiar with the item format and online functionality including sample items before test administration. • A troubleshooting guide would provide valuable support to users for addressing technology- related issues (e.g, loss of connectivity, power failure) before calling the contractor. <p>It is not clear whether there is redundancy in the system that saves and restores student responses in the event of tech problems.</p>
<p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence outlining the policy detailing who is responsible to make sure all test administrators have been trained. Evidence of contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

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>SD Evidence 41: School Site Visits 2014-15 administration</p>	<p>Requirements met.</p>
<p>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.5 – Test Security for confirmed violations of 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 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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS</p> <p>South Dakota provided the following information in response to Critical Element 2.5:</p> <p>SD.2.5.a: General assessments in language arts and mathematics:</p>	<p>Help Desk log Evidence 41 is from January 2015 – guessing this does not capture all test administrations.</p> <p>South Dakota followed the policies and test security guidelines set forth in the State Procedures Manual and Online Test Administration Manual as detailed in the Smarter Balanced Submission SB.2.5, SB.2.5.1.</p> <p>All test administrators and individuals coming into contact with the assessments sign security agreements, and state law governs the procedures and reporting requirements levied on districts if cheating/ security breach is suspected.</p> <p>SEA reported random site visits provided oversight to ensure classroom level procedures were being used as required by the consortia documents.</p> <p>Districts reported test irregularities or test concerns to the state and these were used to help determine where follow up and site visits were needed.</p> <p>Test security incidents, such as improprieties, irregularities, and breaches, are defined and staff appropriate responses are provided (p.16).</p> <p>Unable to locate 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. Clear that training was implemented.</p> <p>Unable to locate evidence regarding remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments within the State’s additional response.</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 2.5 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Consequences for confirmed violations and remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State's assessments.		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS</p> <p>South Dakota provided the following information in response to Critical Element 2.6:</p> <p>SD.2.6 & SD.2.6.a: Evidence for all assessments (General and Alternate)</p>	<p>Moving forward, South Dakota will use a secure nightly upload process from the state student information system into the testing system so that no student data needs to be manually entered by test administrators when corrections are needed. Correcting the school’s regular student database automatically updates the records in the test system and minimizes the opportunity for student data to be exposed.</p> <p>Access to state systems where student assessment data can be disaggregated to numbers below the state’s n size is password protected and follows all FERPA guidelines. A <u>minimum n size of 10</u> is used in all public reporting as evidenced in rule, the ESEA Flexibility addendum and the report card itself.</p> <p>The State’s narrative adds some support for protecting data and privacy although not otherwise documented: “South Dakota embeds data security agreements into all contract processes, and uses secure FTP sites for all transfer of data that occurs outside of vendor secure sites. This transfer is overseen by the State’s Bureau of Information and Telecommunication to ensure that best practices are used and all pertinent security concerns are addressed”.</p>
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>South Dakota provided the following information in response to Critical Element 3.1:</p> <p>SD.3.1: General assessments in language arts and mathematics: See Smarter Balanced Coordinated Submission for all states (SB.3.1).</p> <p><u>SD 3.1 Additional Response</u> SD Evidence 24: South Dakota Smarter Balanced Technical Manual</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4: Validity; pp.45-55 <p>SD.3.1: Alternate assessments in language arts and mathematics: See NCSC Coordinated Submission for all states (AZ 3.1a; AZ 3.1b)</p>	
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required from SD</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>South Dakota provided the following information in response to Critical Element 3.2:</p> <p>SD.3.2: General assessments in language arts and mathematics: See Smarter Balanced Coordinated Submission for all states (SB.3.2).</p> <p>SD.3.2: Alternate assessments in language arts and mathematics: See NCSC Coordinated Submission for all states (AZ 3.2)</p>	
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required from SD</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>South Dakota provided the following information in response to Critical Element 3.3:</p> <p>SD.3.3: General assessments in language arts and mathematics: See Smarter Balanced Coordinated Submission for all states (SB.3.3).</p> <p>SD.3.3: Alternate assessments in language arts and mathematics: See NCSC Coordinated Submission for all states (AZ 3.3)</p>	
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required from SD</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>South Dakota provided the following information in response to Critical Element 3.4:</p> <p>SD.3.4: General assessments in language arts and mathematics: See Smarter Balanced Coordinated Submission for all states (SB.3.4).</p> <p><u>SD 3.4 Additional Response</u> SD Evidence 24: South Dakota Smarter Balanced Technical Manual</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.3: Evidence on Relation to Other Variables; pp.53-55 <p>SD Evidence 61: Descriptive Details for SD Algebra 1</p> <p>SD.3.4: Alternate assessments in language arts and mathematics: See NCSC Coordinated Submission for all states (AZ 3.4)</p>	<p>Beyond the studies conducted by the Consortia, AIR conducted an analysis of convergent and discriminant validity between state SBAC and ACT scores and found that the observed pattern of correlations within each multitrait-multimethod matrix generated conforms to the criteria expected for this type of validity. Need to review the study report.</p> <p>At grade 8, a subset of South Dakota students taking Algebra for high school credit took a state created End of Course (EOC) Assessment, aligned to the state content standards for Algebra I. There was a demonstrated correlation between student EOC scores and SBAC scores. Evidence appears to be incomplete, minimal information and correlation is not included Descriptive Details for SD Algebra I (document #61) appears to be a useful study, but the current documentation appears to be incomplete.</p>
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required from SD</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>South Dakota provided the following information in response to Critical Element 4.1:</p> <p>SD.4.1 & 4.1.a: General assessments in language arts and mathematics:</p>	<p>Questionable if reliability is sufficient at low end of score distribution. Reliability; pp.56-70: the marginal reliability was computed for the scale scores, taking into account the varying measurement errors across the ability range. Marginal reliability is a measure of the overall reliability of an assessment based on the average conditional standard errors of measurement, estimated at different points on the ability scale, for all students. The reliability coefficients range from 0.89 to 0.91 (p.58). Helpful to make clarify that only SD’s student population was used in the computation.</p> <p>Overall, the standard error curves suggest that students are measured with a high degree of precision given that the standard errors are consistently low. However, larger standard errors are observed at the lower ends of the score distribution relative to the higher ends. This occurs because the item pools currently have a shortage of items that are better targeted toward these lower-achieving students, a shortage of very easy items. Content experts use this information to consider how to further target and populate item pools (p.58). CSEMs are graphically presented on pages 59—60 with tabled CSEMs at each cut score on page 62.</p> <p>Decision accuracy and consistency are provided with the percentage of classification accuracy and consistency and Cohen’s coefficient kappa (p.67). Across grade levels, content areas and achievement levels the percentages accuracy are all above 90% and the percentages consistency range from 87.1 to 94.1. Helpful to make clarify that only SD’s student population was used in the computation.</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: All statistics for this element should also be provided based on the state student population (currently unclear if information provided was South Dakota information or for all SBAC).		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>South Dakota provided the following information in response to Critical Element 4.2:</p> <p>SD.4.2: General assessments in language arts and mathematics:</p>	<p>Well-constructed and most likely very useful chart with supports and accommodations on the far left column and the State’s tests across the top. The intersections provide information about use and availability.</p> <p>Additional training and guidance documents help to ensure that all students are assigned the proper accommodations when taking the assessment, and evidence is included of guidance that helps districts to determine how the decisions for assigning assessments and accommodations are to be made.</p> <p>The criteria for participation in the (NCSC Alternate Assessment) reflect the pervasive nature of a significant cognitive disability. All content areas should be considered when determining who should participate in this assessment. Thus, a student who participates in the (NCSC Alternate Assessment) participates in this assessment for all content areas.</p>
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required from SD</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>South Dakota provided the following information in response to Critical Element 4.3:</p> <p>SD.4.3: General assessments in language arts and mathematics: See Smarter Balanced Coordinated Submission for all states (SB.4.3).</p> <p><u>SD 4.3 Additional Response</u> SD Evidence 24: South Dakota Smarter Balanced Technical Manual</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5.2: Standard Error Curves; pp.58-62 <p>SD.4.3: Alternate assessments in language arts and mathematics: See NCSC Coordinated Submission for all states (AZ 4.3)</p>	<p>Questionable if reliability is sufficient at low end of score distribution. Overall, the standard error curves suggest that students are measured with a high degree of precision given that the standard errors are consistently low. CSEMs are graphically presented on pages 59—60 with tabled CSEMs at each cut score on page 62.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required from SD</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>South Dakota provided the following information in response to Critical Element 4.4:</p> <p>SD.4.4: General assessments in language arts and mathematics: See Smarter Balanced Coordinated Submission for all states (SB.4.4).</p> <p><u>SD 4.4 Additional Response</u> SD Evidence 24: South Dakota Smarter Balanced Technical Manual</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6: Scores; pp.71-82 <p>SD Evidence 9: SBAC 2014-15 Test Administration Manual</p> <p>SD.4.4: Alternate assessments in language arts and mathematics: See NCSC Coordinated Submission for all states (AZ 4.4)</p>	<p>The SBAC provided the item parameters that are vertically scaled by linking across grades using common items in adjacent grades. All scores are estimated based on these item parameters. Each student received an overall scale score, an overall achievement level, and an achievement category for each claim. This section describes the rules used in generating scores and the hand scoring procedure. The explanations for the selecting and conducting the main steps (e.g., estimating student ability using maximum likelihood estimation, transforming theta to vertical scale scores) seem reasonable.</p> <p>Evidence provided in the Technical Manual is vague as to the scoring procedures. Please define what constitutes the problems that were encountered and what defines more frequent monitoring (p 76).</p>
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Remediation for insufficient reliability of hand scoring.</p> <p>Documentation of standardized procedures, guidelines, and monitoring of hand scoring. See above.</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>South Dakota provided the following information in response to Critical Element 4.5:</p> <p>SD.4.5: General assessments in language arts and mathematics: See Smarter Balanced Coordinated Submission for all states (SB.4.5).</p> <p>SD.4.5: Alternate assessments in language arts and mathematics: See NCSC Coordinated Submission for all states (AZ 4.5)</p>	
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for SD.</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>South Dakota provided the following information in response to Critical Element 4.6:</p> <p>SD.4.6.a: General assessments in language arts and mathematics: See Smarter Balanced Coordinated Submission for all states (SB.4.6.1).</p> <p>SD.4.6.a: Alternate assessments in language arts and mathematics: See NCSC Coordinated Submission for all states (AZ 4.6.a)</p> <p>SD.4.6.b: General assessments in language arts and mathematics: See Smarter Balanced Coordinated Submission for all states (SB.4.6.2).</p> <p>SD.4.6.b: Alternate assessments in language arts and mathematics: See NCSC Coordinated Submission for all states (AZ 4.6.b)</p>	
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required from SD</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>South Dakota provided the following information in response to Critical Element 4.7:</p> <p>SD.4.7: General assessments in language arts and mathematics: See Smarter Balanced Coordinated Submission for all states (SB.4.7).</p> <p><u>SD 4.7 Additional Response</u> SD Evidence 24: South Dakota Smarter Balanced Technical Manual</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8.5.1 & 8.5.2: Score Report Quality Checks; pp.106-107 <p>SD Evidence 62: SD TAC Agendas</p> <p>SD Evidence 63: Standards Revision Cycle</p> <p>SD Evidence 64: MAAC agendas</p> <p>SD Evidence 65: Sample SBAC vendor agendas</p> <p>SD.4.7: Alternate assessments in language arts and mathematics: See NCSC Coordinated Submission for all states (AZ 4.7)</p> <p><u>SD 4.7 Additional Response</u> SD Evidence 62: SD TAC Agendas</p> <p>SD Evidence 63: Standards Revision Cycle</p> <p>SD Evidence 66: NCSC agendas</p>	<p>The State is commended for utilizing its Technical Advisory Committee to help review and plan for improvements of the assessment system.</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 4.7 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required from SD		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

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 disabilities; • Includes instructions that students eligible to be 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS</p> <p>South Dakota provided the following information in response to Critical Element 5.1:</p> <p>SD.5.1 & SD.5.1.a: Evidence for all assessments (General and Alternate): See Smarter Balanced Coordinated Submission for all states (SB.5.1; SB.5.1.1).</p> <p>See NCSC Coordinated Submission for all states (AZ 5.1.a)</p>	<p>Ensure 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).</p> <p>As appropriate, the department or local educational agency shall provide IEP teams with a clear explanation of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and those based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of state or local policies on the student's education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards, such as whether only satisfactory performance on a regular assessment would qualify a student for a regular high school diploma.</p> <p>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. Discussion of “common core connectors” is conceptually helpful. The document provided is a training document, not procedures manual.</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence 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 <u>any possible consequences</u> 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).</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS</p> <p>South Dakota provided the following information in response to Critical Element 5.2:</p> <p>SD.5.2.a: Evidence for all assessments (General and Alternate): See Smarter Balanced Coordinated Submission for all states (SB.5.2.1).</p> <p>See NCSC Coordinated Submission for all states (AZ 5.2.a)</p>	<p>SD adhered to the procedures outlined in both the NCSC and SBAC submissions, allowing the consortia submissions to stand as evidence in this area.</p> <p>The ISAAP tool was used to help districts appropriately select and document accommodations. Regular training is provided as part of the state’s participation in the WIDA consortium to help educators separate difference from disability and uses the US Department of Education’s English Learner Toolkit as a framework for work with educators across the state.</p> <p>Students identified as English Language Learners have a Language Acquisition Plan to guide instruction and assessment. Accommodations and supports for learning and assessments are part of the plan.</p>
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required from SD</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS;</p> <p>South Dakota provided the following information in response to Critical Element 5.3:</p>	<p>SD adhered to the procedures outlined in both the NCSC and SBAC submissions, allowing the consortia submissions to stand as evidence in this area. South Dakota’s Usability, Accessibility, Accommodations Guidelines show evidence of the state adherence to the Smarter Balanced Submission.</p> <p>Tools, guidance, training and regular updates to assessment and special education directors served as key mechanisms to ensure that all districts had the ability to assign accommodations to students as was appropriate. ISAAP Tool helped teachers to assign appropriate accommodations to students.</p> <p>State Report Card demonstrates that students with disabilities exceeded the 95% participation rate required in law.</p> <p>Section 2.6 of the South Dakota Smarter Balanced Technical Manual describes the accommodations available and used by students and the Test Administration Manuals discuss how teachers respond to individual student needs.</p> <p>The Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium’s Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations (UAA) Guidelines are intended for school-level personnel and decision-making teams, including Individualized Education Program (IEP) and Section 504 teams, as they prepare for and implement the Smarter Balanced assessments.</p> <p>The UAA Guidelines provide information for classroom teachers, English language development educators, special education teachers, and instructional assistants to use in selecting and administering universal tools, designated supports, and accommodations for those students who need</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>them. The UAA Guidelines are also intended for assessment staff and administrators who oversee the decisions that are made in instruction and assessment.</p> <p>The Smarter Balanced UAA Guidelines apply to all students. They emphasize an individualized approach to the implementation of assessment practices for those students who have diverse needs and participate in large-scale content assessments.</p> <p>The Guidelines focus on universal tools, designated supports, and accommodations for the Smarter Balanced assessments of ELA/L and mathematics. At the same time, the Guidelines support important instructional decisions about and the connection between accessibility and accommodations for students who participate in the Smarter Balanced assessments.</p> <p>The summative assessments contain embedded universal tools, designated supports, and accommodations. Embedded resources are part of the computer administration system, whereas non-embedded resources are provided outside of that system.</p> <p>State-level users, TCs, and TEs have the ability to set embedded and non-embedded designated supports and accommodations based on their specific user role. Designated supports and accommodations must be set in TIDE before starting a test session.</p> <p>Similar information was located in the SD Evidence 9: SBAC 2014-15 Test Administration Manual (p.31).</p> <p>The state noted that accommodations and protocols for non-standard accommodations were regularly communicated to districts. Communications with</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>accommodation staff demonstrate the process by which the SEA worked with schools to adjust and meet student needs. However, no evidence was found in the documents regarding a standardized process.</p> <p>NCSC notes that while there is a training module and user guide to identify accommodations, there is no discussion of whether 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.</p>
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence of a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS;</p> <p>South Dakota provided the following information in response to Critical Element 5.4:</p> <p>SD.5.4: Evidence for all assessments (General and Alternate): See Smarter Balanced Coordinated Submission for all states (SB.5.4; 5.4.1; 5.4.2; 5.4.3: 5.4.4).</p> <p><u>SD 5.3.d/ SD.5.3.4 Additional Response</u> SD Evidence 88: Sample SPED Monitoring Protocol including Assessment Review</p> <p>SD Evidence 30: Accommodations Communication 2014-15</p> <p>SD Evidence 45: Sample state emails to check on assessment practices</p> <p>SD Evidence 119: Field Test Accommodations Use Tables</p>	<p>Future plans include a deeper examination of how the text-to-speech and read-aloud accommodations are being used at high rates and additional training and monitoring in cases where these are common.</p> <p>Data provided by SBAC on accommodation use during the field test were used to target the focus of many of the accommodation trainings and discussions with teachers across the state. Suggest that accommodations be tracked on the operational assessment. Ideally, this could be followed over time.</p> <p>Accommodations monitoring protocol, includes summary forms. No information regarding how “spot-checks” were selected or aggregated results.</p>
<p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Additional evidence about the monitoring process such as who is responsible, how the spot check locations are chosen, frequency, implementation, and follow-up.</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>South Dakota provided the following information in response to Critical Element 6.1:</p> <p>SD.6.1.a: General Assessments in English language arts and mathematics:</p>	<p>Table 12 presents the 2014–2015 state summary results for the average scale scores, the percentage of students in each achievement level, and the percentage of proficient students. The student performance by subgroups is included in Appendix A. There are four academic achievement levels that clearly differentiate among achievement levels, however there are no descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level.</p>
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>South Dakota provided the following information in response to Critical Element 6.2:</p> <p>SD.6.2: General assessments in language arts and mathematics: See Smarter Balanced Coordinated Submission for all states (SB.6.2).</p> <p>SD.6.2: Alternate assessments in language arts and mathematics: See NCSC Coordinated Submission for all states (AZ 6.2)</p>	<p>SD adhered to the procedures outlined in both the SBAC and NCSC submissions, and used the consortia achievement levels and cut scores, allowing the consortia submissions to stand as evidence in this area.</p>
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required from SD</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>South Dakota provided the following information in response to Critical Element 6.3:</p> <p>SD.6.3: General assessments in language arts and mathematics: See Smarter Balanced Coordinated Submission for all states (SB.6.3).</p> <p>SD.6.3: Alternate assessments in language arts and mathematics: See NCSC Coordinated Submission for all states (AZ 6.3)</p> <p><u>SD 6.3 Additional Response</u></p> <p>SD Evidence136: Incentivizing NCSC Workshop Participation</p> <p>SD Evidence 137: NCSC Developing UDL Workshop Evaluation</p> <p>SD Evidence 138: NCSC Developing UDL Workshop Agenda</p> <p>SD Evidence 156: Alternate Connectors Math</p> <p>SD Evidence 139: Alternate Connectors ELA</p> <p>SD Evidence 140: Alternate Connectors Writing</p> <p>SD Evidence 141: UDL Guidelines</p>	<p>The additional evidence includes tables of alternate connectors in math, ELA and Writing. These seem to be links or extension from the CCSS to the alternate assessment.</p> <p>No additional response evidence addresses the first component: 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>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>X_ No additional evidence is required from SD</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.4 – Reporting</p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration; • The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results; • The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement; ○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors); ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; ○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language 	<p>SD.6.4 & SD.6.4.a: General assessments in language arts and mathematics:</p> <p>See Smarter Balanced Coordinated Submission for all states (SB.6.4 & SB.6.4.1).</p>	<p>General assessments in language arts and mathematics:</p> <p>South Dakota used the AIR reporting system, based on the SBAC reporting system as evidenced in the Technical Manual for providing information at the district and school level to school and district level users. Reports could either be printed from this site to send home or from the South Dakota Assessment Portal (eMetric).</p> <p>South Dakota used the NCSC reporting system, allowing the consortia submission to stand as evidence in this area. Reports could either be printed from this site to send home or from the South Dakota Assessment Portal (eMetric).</p> <p>Student Reports are made available to all districts and schools via the eMetric, South Dakota Assessment Portal as well as through the assessment vendor portals. Access to the Assessment Portal is given based on the role of the user and follows all state data-privacy and FERPA requirements. In this system, authorized users can drill down and look at results at the district, school, subgroup, and individual student levels. Teachers can create their own secure assessments in the system and look at results of classroom assessments in conjunction with historical state assessment scores.</p> <p>Interactive versions of the state, district, and school level report cards are made available in SD-STARS to appropriate district level users. Access is given based on the role of the user and follows all state data-privacy and FERPA requirements. In this system, authorized users can drill down and look at results at the district, school, subgroup, and individual student levels, and can link back to the student record in the state student data system, allowing users to see how</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. 		<p>course taking patterns and other factors may be impacting a student. These reports are built into data retreats and training across the state to help school and district leadership teams access and use their data.</p> <p>Report cards look pretty good; however they could be improved by greater interpretation of the results in terms of the performance level descriptors (as a surrogate for item analyses).</p> <p>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?</p> <p>Schools are able to begin printing and distributing student reports as soon as they are made available in the test delivery system, <u>generally within 2 weeks</u> of testing. Guidance is given to schools about sending parent reports home, and processes and procedures are checked during Title I reviews. Would like documentation of specific information about timeline for release.</p> <p>Clearly, there is a process and timeline for delivering reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. The most recent version of the timeline would be helpful.</p>
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Timeline for delivering reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</p> <p>Evidence that individual student reports 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. It was noted that SBAC provides Spanish and Vietnamese.</p>		

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

June, 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes Smarter Balanced Consortium Evidence



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Contents

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS	3
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	3
2.2 – Item Development.....	9
2.3 – Test Administration	11
2.5 – Test Security	14
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....	16
SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....	18
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	18
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	21
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	22
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	24
SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER	25
4.1 – Reliability.....	25
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	27
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	28
4.4 – Scoring	29
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	30
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	31
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance.....	33
SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS	34
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	34
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	37
5.3 – Accommodations.....	38
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	40
SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .	41
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students	41
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....	42
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	43
6.4 – Reporting.....	44

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

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; 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Index p. 2 7 pp. 24-25</p> <p>15a 15b 17 29</p>	<p>Statements of purpose exist and are stated.</p> <p>One purpose statement relates to growth. Is there or will there be evidence to support that the SBAC summative test measures growth?</p> <p>Of note: There is no statement pertaining to the use of the SBAC test for teacher evaluation.</p> <p>The 5th purpose statement of the summative test is to gauge “how instruction can be improved...” Assessment results do not clearly indicate actions to improve instruction. Recommend either restating or deleting this purpose statement.</p> <p>In several places of Evidence 15a and 15b, the range of total items by claim on the test blueprints does not match the range implied by the sums of minimum and maximum numbers of items, respectively, by assessment targets. It is not clear if the range by claim is intended to be a tally of items or an additional constraint.</p> <p>Speaking is not included in the assessments for ELA.</p> <p>Re “measure the full range”: In Evidence 17 p. 31, what makes for sufficiently good alignment is unclear. Evaluation of alignment study results is exacerbated</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>by the statement “low percentages of fully aligned and mostly aligned ratings do not necessarily reflect poor alignment.”</p> <p>The peers recommend including a clear discussion and supporting tables demonstrating the SBAC summative assessments cover the full range of the CCSS standards. The evidence should display the full range of the CCSS standards and indicate which are covered by the SBAC summative assessments. Those standards not assessed should be noted with the reason for their exclusion stated.</p> <p>Although off grade level tests may be administered via the CAT system, the conditions under which off grade level items may be given is not clear. It is not clear to what extent students receiving a test event with off grade level items are receiving and/or being scored on a grade-level test event that complies with the blueprints.</p> <p>It is claimed that off grade level items are realigned to the on grade blueprint, but how this alignment was done and evaluated are not included among the evidence documents.</p> <p>The peers’ understanding is that the decision of proficiency vs. non-proficiency is based only on on-grade level testing. The determination of other measures (levels I and IV, or student growth) may be impacted by the use of off grade level items and states must take this into account when using the assessments for accountability purposes.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

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"> 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>Guidance p. 14 15a 15b 28 § 2.1-2.2</p> <p>Guidance Index 8 15a 15b 27 28 29 p. 8 30</p>	<p>The relative scarcity of DOK 3+ items in the assessments makes it difficult to conclude that they reflect “appropriate inclusion of challenging content” and requires “complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills)”</p> <p>There are notes specifying a minimum number of DOK 3+ items in the blueprints. However, from Evidence 28, it is unclear how DOK requirements are being implemented.</p> <p>The discussion of custom item pools in sections Evidence 28, § 2.1 and 2.2 suggests that some students will receive a test with a different blueprint from other students. The current documentation lends itself to the interpretation that this might occur even for students not receiving accommodations.</p> <p>Evidence 29 page 8 identifies the inadequacy of the item pools in providing assessments to the full range of students. This issue needs to be addressed.</p> <p>In Evidence 27, the number of ELA items developed are short of the order, although the Index claims that deliveries exceeded orders. The rationale for the</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>orders listed in Evidence 27 is not explained. Specifically, how was the pool size and item demand determined?</p> <p>The ELA shortfalls in Evidence 27 are not explained in terms of impact on standards coverage. There needs to be an identification of the DOK of these orders and the shortfalls.</p> <p>Evidence 29 states that not all assessments follow blueprint constraints. Please provide the remediation and the assurance that this is not happening in operation with actual students.</p> <p>Appendix B of Evidence 29 demonstrates that many students taking the Spanish language and Braille versions of the SBAC assessments may be receiving assessments not aligned to the blueprints.</p> <p>It is unclear from Evidence 29 if the algorithm used in the simulation would accurately reflect (or accurately reflected) that used in operational testing.</p> <p>Evidence 30 demonstrates issues meeting constraints for the performance tasks. This needs to be addressed – specifically, how the misalignment was resolved.</p> <p>Evidence 8, p. 6 states that states may use their own delivery engines. The peers agree that states will need to provide evidence either that they are using the SBAC engine or that their chosen delivery engine functions the same as the SBAC engine and conforms to the SBAC blueprints for tests being delivered. If a non-SBAC engine does not conform, then it is incumbent upon the state using it to provide all evidence beyond item development for their program. That is, the program will need to be treated as an assessment other than SBAC (although using the</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		SBAC pool).
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Further justification for Purpose 4. Purpose 4 is related to measuring student growth. Where appropriate (e.g., in § 3), evidence should be provided supporting (1) growth interpretations of assessment results, and (2) specific uses of growth estimates. b. Further justification for Purpose 5. Purpose 5 indicates that the assessment results will provide information about how instruction can be improved. This may be beyond the scope of a summative assessment system, since assessment results do not clearly indicate actions to improve instruction. Peers believe that this purpose should be restated or deleted. Alternatively, evidence can be provided where appropriate to support this interpretation / use of assessment results. <p>2.1.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Clarification concerning whether the range of total items by claim identified in the test blueprints is intended to be a tally across assessment targets, or an additional constraint. b. Documentation concerning the basis for exclusion of speaking in the ELA assessments. c. Documentation concerning the Consortium’s criterion for “sufficient alignment” (see Evidence 17 p. 31) and an explanation of how the results of the alignment study cited meets this definition. If sufficient alignment cannot be demonstrated, a remediation plan to achieve sufficient alignment. d. A clear discussion and supporting tables demonstrating the SBAC summative assessments cover the full range of the CCSS standards. The evidence should display the full range of the CCSS standards and indicate which are covered by the SBAC summative assessments. Those standards not assessed should be noted with the reason for their exclusion stated. e. Documentation supporting adherence to the grade level blueprint of assessments administered to students that include off grade level items. f. Documentation that a suitable methodology was implemented for realigning off grade level items to on grade level content for use in administration of off grade level content. <p>2.1.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Documentation supporting the claim that the DOK range of each assessment reflect “appropriate inclusion of challenging content” and requires “complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills)” b. Clarification regarding how DOK requirements are being implemented, for both CAT and fixed forms. <p>2.1.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Explanation of how the implementation of custom item pools described in § 2.1 and 2.2 of Evidence 28 cannot result in test events that are inconsistent with the test blueprints. If they can result in such test events, then a plan for how this will be remedied. b. Documentation with plan addressing the inadequacy of the item pools in providing assessments to the full range of students, identified on p. 8 of Evidence 29. c. An explanation of how DOK requirements are being implemented in the test delivery algorithm. d. An explanation of the basis for the item counts in the orders listed in Evidence 27. e. An explanation of the impact, if any, that the ELA shortfalls in Evidence 27 had / have on standards coverage. f. Documentation that all assessments in operation now conform to blueprints. g. Documentation regarding remediation of the issue that many students taking the Spanish language and Braille versions of the SBAC assessments may be 		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>receiving forms or test events that do not conform to the blueprints.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> h. Documentation regarding remediation of the issue in meeting constraints for the performance tasks. i. Documentation that SBAC is appropriately guiding and supporting states in using the appropriate algorithm. Clarification that a state using a different algorithm cannot rely on evidence gathered through the SBAC algorithm. 	
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>2.1.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A waiver to use SBAC due to the exclusion of speaking in the assessment. <p>States should note: Educator evaluation is not a listed purpose of this assessment.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>7 15a 15b 53</p>	<p>The documentation states revision based on the results of the cognitive labs, but does not specify what revisions were done or what changes were made to address issues identified (i.e. use of equation editor).</p> <p>There does not appear to be a specific statement about the mode of delivery for review of items. Since this is an electronic assessment, the items should have been reviewed on screen. The Consortium needs to specify the review mode in addition to the thorough documentation already provided.</p> <p>Page 3 of evidence 53 states that the ethnic make-up of the reviews reflects the diversity of the governing states, however the make-up of those states is not listed and the make-up of the math review panel is different from the ELA. While the peers are sensitive to the issues of recruitment, increased transparency would be helpful and support the positive outcome of the review. For example, listing the targets for ethnic make-up of panels and the efforts to recruit. If there were no targets for diversity, instead of claiming the panels matched the diversity of the governing states, simply state that this is the make-up based on the recruitment.</p> <p>The blueprints have a scarcity of items at DOK 3+. This leads the reviewers to question the level of inclusion of higher order skills.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

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> <p>2.2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Documentation regarding how usability issues discovered during the cognitive labs (e.g., student difficulties using the equation editor) have been addressed. b. Documentation showing that the mode of delivery during item review was the same as that for test administration – in other words, that reviewers reviewed items exactly as they would have been seen by students. c. Documentation regarding the targets for ethnic make-up of panels and the efforts to recruit panels consistent with those targets or, if there were no targets for diversity, a statement to the effect. d. Documentation as per Summary Statement 2.1.3.a. 		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>None.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

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; 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>11a p. 4 11b 65a 66 67 p. 24 68 pp. 36-41 69b 69c 69d 69e 77a 77b 76</p>	<p>The graphic on p. 4 of Evidence 11a is extremely helpful.</p> <p>Evidence 65a contains links that are important, however many are dead (the link to the collaboration site is not available to the reviewers).</p> <p>Since many documents are supplied as templates, the state will need to provide evidence that they are communicating clearly, effectively and accurately to its educators. These should include state-specific communications on the following issues: usability and accessibility guidelines, on-line test administration procedures, assessment technology requirements, test administrator manuals, and state specific procedures. These should include the content from the SBAC manuals as listed: on-line test administrator manual 67, usability accessibility and accommodations guide 68, UAA guidelines 11a 11b, state procedures manual 65a, test administrator users guide 66, paper pencil TAM 77a 77b, iPad guidelines 76, technology requirements training 69b, student interface training 69c, TA interface training modules 69d, ART training module 69e</p> <p>Evidence 67 p. 24: the thirty-minute timer mentioned in the first paragraph discussing the timeout, disagrees with the twenty-minute timer in the second paragraph. Please clarify.</p> <p>The definition of activity for the inactivity timer may be problematic since students can be clicking on the</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

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"> 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>66</p> <p>65a 66 69 70 p. 4</p>	<p>screen every minute and still time out due to the definition. Typical computer activity conventions just require mouse movement, not specific activity.</p> <p>Evidence 68: The guidance provided for the read-aloud accommodation (table on pp. 36-41) appears to be challenging to implement or to adhere to during a live administration.</p> <p>If modifications are made to the SBAC systems, what process is in place to inform states of the changes?</p> <p>States need to provide evidence of their state training requirements.</p> <p>Contingency plans need to give more details and clearer guidance on issues such as how to resume test administration in case of lost internet connectivity. SBAC needs to develop contingency guidelines and procedures to address a broad range of possible technology challenges during test administration, and submit these as evidence.</p> <p>The implementation readiness package was not ready based on the evidence provided. The package modules should have been ready beginning in spring 2015. Please provide evidence that the package is ready and the date when it was ready (Evidence 70 p. 4).</p> <p>Since states may use different administration vendors, each state should provide the customized contingency plans detailed for their state, and in alignment with SBAC’s guidelines.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>States need to provide evidence that test administrators have procedures and access to helpdesk/troubleshooting support.</p> <p>States need to provide evidence that they have determined that schools meet the readiness guidelines prior to operational utilization.</p>
Section 2.3 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>2.3.1</p> <p>a. A clarification to reconcile the disagreement, in Evidence 67 p. 24, between (1) the thirty-minute timer mentioned in the first paragraph discussing the timeout, and (2) the twenty-minute timer referenced in the second paragraph. Provision of the clarification to states.</p> <p>2.3.2</p> <p>a. Documentation of the communication plan (to states) when modifications are made to the SBAC systems.</p> <p>2.3.3</p> <p>a. Contingency plans addressing a broad range of technology challenges, providing more details and clearer guidance on issues such as how to resume test administration in case of lost internet connectivity.</p> <p>b. Documentation that the Implementation Readiness Package has been fully developed and released, together with the release date.</p> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>2.3.3</p> <p>a. A contingency plan detailed for their state, and in alignment with SBAC’s guidelines.</p> <p>b. Documentation that test administrators have technology failure contingency procedures in place and access to helpdesk/troubleshooting support.</p> <p>c. Documentation of school readiness for operational administration of technology-based assessments.</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.

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS</p> <p>65a 65b 66 78</p>	<p>The documents appear to defer much of the test security and irregularity detection to the states. However, peers felt that this critical element implied that SBAC should have its own programs of post hoc assessment for irregularities (data forensics) and ongoing test security monitoring including social media monitoring.</p> <p>Information in 65b should be communicated to states</p> <p>SBAC should maintain a security log overall to ensure security of the summative assessment system itself.</p> <p>States need to provide evidence of their security policies and procedures in accordance with the investigation and remediation procedures for SBAC.</p>
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>2.5.1</p> <p>a. Documentation that SBAC has in place security protocols and procedures to protect SBAC items and assessments.</p> <p>2.5.2</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>a. Documentation that information in 65b is communicated to states.</p> <p>2.5.4</p>	<p>Documentation of the implementation of the security logging and the remediation plan for incidents that may impact the validity of the assessment (including communications).</p>	<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p>
<p>2.5</p>	<p>Documentation of state’s security policies and procedures and the relationship of the state’s policies and procedures to those of SBAC. In other words, a state’s security policies and procedures should reference SBAC’s policies and procedures and demonstrate coherence with these. It should be clear from all available documentation (regardless of source – SBAC or state) that all aspects of critical element 2.5 are addressed.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS</p> <p>65a 66 134</p> <p>133</p>	<p>SBAC needs to provide evidence that they are monitoring test item exposure and drift to ensure integrity on an ongoing basis. States must provide evidence of this item with respect to administration and use.</p> <p>Please detail what is the low risk item stated in Evidence 133 and explain what is being done about this issue or why the issue is not being addressed.</p> <p>States must provide evidence of this item.</p> <p>For reporting outside the SBAC system, states need to provide evidence of compliance with this item.</p>
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		
<p>2.6.1</p>		
<p>a. Documentation of monitoring of test item exposure and drift done by SBAC to ensure integrity of the assessment system.</p>		
<p>2.6.2</p>		
<p>a. Further explanation of the low risk item in Evidence 133, including any actions being taken to address it or a reason why it is not being addressed.</p>		
<hr/>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p>		
<p>2.6.1</p>		
<p>a. Documentation of compliance with this item with respect to “administration” and “use of test 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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.6.2 a. All. 2.6.3		
For states reporting outside of the SBAC system, documentation of compliance with this item.		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

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; 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Guidance 7 17 104 105 124 pp. 86-89 131</p>	<p>Evidence 104 and 105 are the most direct evidence.</p> <p>How have the low ratings from 104 and 105 been addressed if at all?</p> <p>Evidence 124 achievement level feedback on pp. 86-89 suggests panels not understanding the standard setting process. How has this been addressed?</p> <p>The ELA shortfalls in evidence 27 are not explained in terms of impact on standards coverage. There needs to be an identification of the DOK of these orders and the shortfalls.</p> <p>Evidences 104 and 105 are the only alignment between standards and test items, however these studies do not encompass each grade level. Please provide evidence of alignment between operational tests at each grade level and the CCSS.</p> <p>Since the system allows student tests to include off grade level items, SBAC needs to report the rate at which it occurs and the impact on student scores as well as describe the implications for match to blueprints since presumably the blueprints were developed for on grade level test forms / events.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

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"> 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>SBAC needs to demonstrate adherence to the guidance regarding off grade level testing condition #2 on page 14. (Some reviewers felt the guidance means off grade level items cannot be used for any score purpose while others felt the guidance means off grade level items can be used in determining scores but not proficiency) Only on grade level items are used for score production and the on grade level items used cover the full range of the standards at that grade level.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence demonstrating the CAT forms students are scored upon match the blueprints submitted as evidence. Please submit this evidence for operational tests instead of simulations with the plan for monitoring this process.</p> <p>To maintain a valid item bank, SBAC needs to monitor item exposure and run post hoc analyses to ensure the system has the same characteristics as designed and approved.</p> <p>N/A: State responsibility.</p>
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>3.1.1</p> <p>a. Documentation regarding how issues of low ratings in Evidence 104 have been addressed. Examples: Evidence 104, p. 18 shows SBAC has a low rating on</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>“high quality items and variety of item types.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Documentation regarding how the low ratings on panelist comprehension of the standard setting process (Evidence 124, pp. 86-89), was addressed. c. Documentation regarding the ELA item shortfalls in Evidence 27 affected the item pool and how those shortfalls were addressed. d. Evidence of alignment between operational tests and the CCSS for those grade levels not covered in Evidence 104 and Evidence 105. (There must be evidence of alignment for every grade level.) e. Documentation regarding the rate at which off grade level testing occurs, the impact of off grade level testing on student scores, and the implications of off grade level testing for blueprint satisfaction of test events. f. Documentation demonstrating adherence to the Guidance regarding off grade level testing condition #2 on p. 14. (Some reviewers felt the Guidance means off grade level items cannot be used for any score purpose while others felt the Guidance means off grade level items can be used in determining scores but not proficiency.) g. Documentation that the operational CAT test event that students are scored on match the blueprints submitted as evidence. A plan for monitoring the process of evaluating match to blueprint for all test events administered. h. Documentation of plan for monitoring item exposure and conducting post hoc analyses to ensure the system has the same characteristics as designed and approved. 	
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>3.1.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. All. 		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>7 25 130b</p>	<p>Cognitive labs are compelling and good evidence for this critical element.</p> <p>Documentation states that revisions were made based on the results of the cognitive labs, but does not specify what revisions were done or what changes were made to address issues identified (i.e. use of equation editor).</p>
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>x The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: 3.2 a. Documentation as per 2.2.a</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states: None.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>7 61 130b 130c</p>	<p>The summary of evidence in Evidence 130b p. 8 is not compelling for meeting this critical element.</p> <p>DIF and biserial correlations calculated and used...good.</p> <p>Evidence 61 does not discriminate between interim and summative items. Please provide confirmation that this applies only to the summative items.</p> <p>Evidence 7 p. 166: Good evidence for unidimensionality but again not specific to summative vs other tests - please specify.</p> <p>Evidence 130c p. 5: Bias estimates are unacceptable for 3rd grade in ELA and some other grades. Also for Math claims 2 and 4. Please provide evidence the claim level classifications that are reported are not negatively impacted by the bias.</p> <p>Please provide model fit information based on operational assessment data instead of just pilot data.</p> <p>Please provide clarification that items removed from the dimensionality analysis were removed from the bank as well and not merely removed from the analysis.</p> <p>The item vector dimensionality study could have bene stronger if it included the possibility of more than two dimensions.</p> <p>Not clear if scaling at the claim level was considered.</p>
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Confirmation that Evidence 61 and Evidence 7 p. 166 apply to the summative items. b. Documentation that claim level classifications are not negatively impacted by large bias estimates in 3rd grade ELA, and for Math Claims 2 and 4. c. Model fit information based on operational assessment data. d. Confirmation that items removed from the dimensionality analysis were retired from further operational use. 	
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>3.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen. 		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>7 p. 443 137 139 156</p>	<p>In Evidence 7 there is no clear explanation of how SBAC lines up with PISA or NAEP even though they used embedded items. The purpose appeared to be to ground the standard setting but how they actually helped to inform the process isn’t clear. It isn’t clear how inclusion of these items helped to show that “assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.”</p> <p>Evidence 7 p. 443: Not clear how the ACT benchmarks were projected on to the SBAC scale. Please clarify how this occurred and how this was used to provide the validity evidence relevant to this critical element.</p> <p>Evidence 139: The high pass rate for students who are failing the course does support this critical element.</p> <p>Evidence 137: Peers are not sure this is relevant to this critical element. The importance of the results was not presented.</p>
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>3.4</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Clarification of how inclusion of PISA and NAEP items in the standard setting, and how projection of ACT benchmarks onto the SBAC scale, helped to show that “assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.” b. Discussion of the high pass rates on the Smarter Balanced assessments for students failing the course in the Washington: Linking Course Grades to Smarter Balanced Cut Scores report, with respect to meeting this critical element. <hr/> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>3.4</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen. 		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

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; 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>7 p. 472 130c pp. 14, 17, 22-34, 36-41</p>	<p>There needs to be additional information concerning which states were included in the calculations of reliability and categorical classification decisions. The calculations should include data from all states included in that round. Per follow-up communication, CT, MI, and NH were not included in these calculations.</p> <p>Per ED, this critical element implies a requirement for state-specific reliabilities. These state-specific reliabilities should be either in the submissions of the Consortium or the State.</p> <p>130c: Total score reliabilities are acceptable. Claim reliabilities are low, but impact is likely marginal. Total score reliabilities are low in Decile 1 for grades 7 and 11 in mathematics (p. 14) and 11th grade LEP and IDEA (p. 17).</p> <p>130c: CSEMs high for the low end (pp. 36-41), especially in relation to typical ranges for achievement levels (007: p. 472). Frequently the CSEM is about a 1/3rd of a typical range. This could impact achievement level accuracy for students and may limit the utility of the assessments for measuring student growth.</p> <p>130c: Classification accuracy for distinguishing between level 2 and 3 is low for ELA grades 3-5 (pp. 22-34). Since level 3 is proficient, this has an impact on proficiency designations.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

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"> For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement. 		<p>Consistency estimates are not provided or addressed. The submission should include a statement or rationale for claiming that test procedure produces test forms meeting this requirement, especially in light of potential differences in results for different algorithms.</p> <p>There needs to be evidence that all of the data included in computing the reliability-related estimates are based on the same implementation of the same algorithm.</p>
<p>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>4.1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A statement responding to areas of low reliability and low accuracy (Either SBAC or the relevant state) Test reliability of the assessments estimated for each state separately and each subgroup within state (these estimates will also need to meet adequacy criteria) Estimates of consistency of classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results (these estimates will also need to meet adequacy criteria) 		
<hr/> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>4.1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (Either SBAC or the relevant state) Test reliability of the assessments estimated for each state separately and each subgroup within state (these estimates will also need to meet adequacy criteria) If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen. 		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>11a 30 126</p>	<p>The evidence supports attention in design and development to ensure fairness and accessibility.</p> <p>Only simulation or field test data, showing no DIF or low DIF on the assessment.</p> <p>Peers agreed there should be ongoing tracking of DIF items that have been left in the pool.</p> <p>Accommodations are not tested; there are only lit reviews in Evidence 126.</p> <p>See notes on low IEP and LEP reliabilities.</p> <p>Evidence 11a is not prescriptive and does not provide data validating the use of the accommodations for certain students.</p> <p>Would like to see reliability estimates for students using accommodations, based on operational data.</p>
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>4.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Documentation supporting ongoing tracking of DIF items left in the operational pool, to ensure that any negative impact they have on fairness and accessibility remains minimal. b. Estimated reliability for students using accommodations, based on operational data. <hr/> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>4.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen. 		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Index pp. 76-77 104 130c pp. 33-35</p>	<p>It is not clear how Evidence 104 addresses this critical element.</p> <p>Evidence 130c: The reported SEMs are large and CSEMs are especially high for certain deciles and grades.</p> <p>The bin analysis in Evidence #130c pp. 33-35 demonstrates a need for more representation at the low end of the scales. The need is very pronounced for mathematics.</p> <p>Comments on earlier critical elements addressing representation across the scale are relevant here as well.</p> <p>Index pp. 76-78 calls attention to lack of items at the low end, impacting the test’s ability to test those students. SBAC should follow through on stated plans to enrich the item bank at the low end.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>4.3 Documentation that Smarter Balanced has enriched the item bank such that the assessments can provide a more precise estimate of student performance for low-achieving students.</p> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>4.3</p> <p> a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>70</p>	<p>Evidence 70: The scoring module was not ready, per this document. We would like evidence that the implementation readiness package was made available and the dates on which each module was released, especially the scoring module.</p> <p>We would like additional evidence of standardized scoring procedures and protocols, specifically with respect to the use of the same CAT algorithm across states. (Scoring and item selection for test forms are interdependent for CATs.)</p>
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>4.4 Evidence of established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols, specifically:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Documentation that the implementation readiness package was made available and the dates on which each module was released, especially the scoring module. A plan to ensure timely future delivery of materials and modules necessary for third party administration vendors. b. Documentation of reliable and accurate scoring for alternate test forms (i.e. paper and pencil, paper braille). 		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>4.4</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen. 		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>Simulation studies provided evidence regarding adherence to blueprint (and those simulations did not always produce conforming forms).</p> <p>Need evidence that operational forms always produce conforming forms for all students.</p>
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>a. Documentation that the assessment system always produces blueprint conforming forms for all students who took an operational form or test event, regardless of format or accommodation.</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>42 49a 49b 50 51 70 130d 143 145 169</p>	<p>This critical element is largely redundant with the prior one, because of CAT. However, it is relevant to the paper-pencil version, Spanish version, ASL, and Braille versions.</p> <p>Noted systematic reviews for Spanish translations. Expected evidence of analogous reviews for ASL and Braille.</p> <p>We found no empirical evidence of this. For example, there was no analysis comparing descriptive statistics on students taking different versions, and discussion of results to address comparability. Some comparisons, for example adaptive Braille versus paper Braille versus CAT, are especially relevant.</p> <p>(We would expect to see this for operational data, now that it is available.)</p> <p>Has SBAC attended to comparability across devices empirically? Can it? (Is device information collected for test events?)</p>
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>4.6</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation that the Consortium followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments (i.e. evidence of systemic checking the ASL and Braille versions of items.) Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results (i.e. evidence of comparability between standard Smarter Balanced assessments, ASL, Braille, Spanish, and other versions of the assessment using operational data). Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results (i.e. evidence of comparability across the different devices allowed for standard Smarter Balanced assessments.) <hr/> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>4.6</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Index 155</p>	<p>Useful to have advisory groups for different student populations.</p> <p>Evidence 155: Many of the proposed analyses seem standard for a tech report.</p> <p>Index (pp. 97-98): Outline of the review cycle.</p> <p>Unclear to the Peers whether a complete 2014-2015 Technical Report exists. We would like a complete technical report for 2014-2015 or an explanation for why it is still in process.</p> <p>For States using SBAC: 4.7 is covered by the SBAC submission.</p>
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: 4.7</p> <p>a. To support that the Consortium has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, a complete technical report for the operational administration of the Smarter Balanced assessments in 2014-15.</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states: None.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

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 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS</p> <p>11a 11b 97 98 128</p>	<p>11a: SBAC should provide guidance when use of the SBAC test is not appropriate. This is not provided. (States also need to provide their specific guidance on this critical element for alternate assessment.)</p> <p>This critical element should be provided in the state-specific submission.</p> <p>126: This is met with respect to accommodations. See first bullet above.</p> <p>97 and 98: Evidence of this is provided. (States need to provide evidence that they have given appropriate guidance to their IEP teams.)</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>students with disabilities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities; • 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>128: Evidence of this is provided. (States need to provide evidence that they have given appropriate guidance to their IEP teams.) This is provided.</p> <p>Evidence of these last three critical elements should come from the state-specific or alternative assessment submissions.</p>
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u> </u>X_ No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>5.1.1</p> <p> a. States need to provide specific guidance associated with their AA-AAS.</p> <p>5.1.2</p> <p> a. All.</p> <p>5.1.3</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.1.4	a. States need to provide specific guidance associated with their AA-AAS.	
	a. States need to provide evidence of specific guidance provided to IEP teams.	
5.1.5	a. Documentation that the state adheres to the SBAC Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines, or state-specific evidence to address this part of the critical element.	
5.1.6	a. All.	
5.1.7	a. All.	
5.1.8	a. All.	

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 SMARTER BALANCED

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS</p> <p>11a 11b 97 98 126 128</p>	<p>Evidence 97: Guidance unclear and not helpful. Steps 3 and 4 do not help schools determine whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodations, and if so, which accommodations are appropriate.</p> <p>Evidence 128: Provided as evidence, but does not pertain to ELs</p> <p>Evidence 126: Provides a framework, but needs operationalization to meet this critical element</p>
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>5.2</p> <p>a. Documentation regarding how schools determine whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodations, and if so, which accommodations are appropriate.</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>5.2</p> <p>a. Documentation that the state adheres to the SBAC Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines, or state-specific evidence to address this part of the critical element.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS;</p> <p>11a 11b 65a 97 98 100a 100b 126 129</p>	<p>If a state excludes some accommodation tools, then the State needs to provide a rationale that it is still meeting this critical element.</p> <p>Points (i) and (ii) are not shown. Claim (iii) is not made or stated. There is no comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations. (And a discussion relevant to comparability in light of findings.)</p> <p>Suggestion: Meeting with the appropriate advisory group with information relevant to this critical element and soliciting their advice re need for follow-up investigation.</p> <p>65a: Consortium has a process, p. 15, which depends on the State having a process. The State needs to provide their process for requesting and reviewing.</p>
<p>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: 5.3.3</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SMARTER BALANCED

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"> a. Documentation that the Consortium 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. b. Documentation that the Consortium has determined that the accommodations it provides 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 (e.g., a comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations, and a discussion relevant to comparability in light of findings). 	
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p>		
5.3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If the State does not adhere to the SBAC Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines, state-specific evidence to address this critical element. If a state excludes some accommodation tools, then the State needs to provide a rationale that it is still meeting this critical element. 	
5.3.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If the State does not adhere to the SBAC Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines, state-specific evidence to address this critical element. If a state excludes some accommodation tools, then the State needs to provide a rationale that it is still meeting this critical element. 	
5.3.4		
All.		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS;</p> <p>96 97 98 99 126</p>	<p>Monitoring compliance with accommodation policies and procedures: State responsibility</p> <p>Monitoring appropriateness of accommodation (that they are continuing to function as intended): Consortium responsibility</p>
<p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>5.4</p> <p>a. Documentation of all aspects of this critical element as it relates to monitoring compliance with accommodation policies and procedures</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 SMARTER BALANCED

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>49 86 95</p>	<p>States are responsible for first two critical elements.</p> <p>Evidence 86: This critical element is met for SBAC.</p>
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>6.1.1 a. All.</p> <p>6.1.2</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 SMARTER BALANCED

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

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>	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet	<p>Evidence of a technically sound procedure has been provided.</p> <p>Please provide information re what the Consortium was targeting w/r/t panelist ethnicity distribution.</p>

Section 6.2 Summary Statement		
<p><u> x </u> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>6.2.</p> <p>a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

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>(1) 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>(2) 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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>86 106 107</p>	<p>The Consortium provided the evidence that could reasonably be expected of them at this early stage in the program. This critical element should be addressed more fully as the program develops – for example, through additional validity studies.</p> <p>This critical element is not relevant at the SBAC Consortium level. However, this needs to be addressed by states in their state-specific submission or through the submission of the alternate assessment consortium.</p>
<p>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p>		
<p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>6.3.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen. 		

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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.4 – Reporting</p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration; • The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results; • The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement; ○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors); ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; ○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p>	<p>Responsibility for meeting this critical element lies principally with the State.</p> <p>There is evidence that SBAC had a plan to develop a tool (with Amplify) for reporting. States need to produce evidence to meet this critical element.</p> <p>The SBAC reporting system appears to meet sub-bullets 1 and 2. However, the states not using the SBAC reporting tools need to provide evidence to meet sub-bullets 1 and 2.</p> <p>All states need to provide evidence showing that sub-bullets 3 and 4 are being met.</p> <p>In regards to sub-bullet 4, the SBAC system provides Spanish and Vietnamese reports upon request.</p> <p>All states need to provide evidence of report delivery.</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 SMARTER BALANCED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="padding-left: 40px;">that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. 		States must provide evidence for this critical element.
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
<p><u> </u>X_ No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p> <hr/> <p>The following evidence is needed from individual member states:</p> <p>6.4.1</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a. All.</p> <p>6.4.2</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">b. All.</p> <p>6.4.3</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a. All documentation under this bullet and sub-bullets as it pertains to delivery of reports.</p> <p>6.4.3.1</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a. All, if the state is not using the Smarter Balanced-hosted reporting system and the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium reporting system user guide.</p> <p>6.4.3.2</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a. All, if the state is not using the Smarter Balanced-hosted reporting system and the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium reporting system user guide.</p> <p>6.4.3.3</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a. All.</p> <p>6.4.3.4</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a. All.</p> <p>6.4.4</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a. All.</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.

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

April 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes for the NCSC Assessment Consortium



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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT
CONSORTIUM**

Contents

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS	3
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	3
2.2 – Item Development.....	5
2.5 – Test Security	9
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....	10
SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....	11
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	11
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	12
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	13
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	14
SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER	15
4.1 – Reliability.....	15
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	16
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	17
4.4 – Scoring	18
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	19
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	20
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance.....	21
SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS	22
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	22
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	25
5.3 – Accommodations.....	26
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations.....	28
SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .	29
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students 	29
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....	30
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	31
6.4 – Reporting.....	32

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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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; 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS</p> <p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 2.1</p> <p><u>Purpose</u> NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015); p. 8.</p> <p>NCSC 10: NCSC AA-AAS 2015 Guide for Score Report Interpretation; p. 1.</p> <p>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual, Chapter 1 Introduction to the NCSC System; p. 8.</p> <p><u>Intended Interpretation and uses of results</u> NCSC 10: NCSC AA-AAS 2015 Guide for Score Report Interpretation; pp. 9-12.</p> <p>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual, Chapter 9 Reporting Interpretation and Use; pp. 184-189.</p> <p><u>Description of the structure of the assessment</u> NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015); pp. 8-13.</p> <p>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual, Chapter 2 Test Development; see especially pp. 9-24.</p> <p><u>Test blueprints</u> NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual, Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 62-65, and Appendices 2K and 2L.</p>	<p>On page 8 of the test administration manual and page 1 of the Score Guide, the purpose listed as to participation in an assessment that is a measure of what they know and can do in relation to the CCSS.</p> <p>NCSC 15: Matrix by Users by Report displays the overall reporting structure. NCSC15, pg. 184. It is not clear to what extent the interdisciplinary team that developed the report design template included teachers and other school personnel working directly with students.</p> <p>NCSC10 pg.12. When reviewing scores by another person, it may be helpful to communicate with the TA that gave the test to gain information that is useful in interpreting the scores.</p> <p>NCSC 15 (Appendix 2-M): item selection methods - referred to tiers: Items were presented as a series of items tapping progressively higher levels of a construct based on increasing tier and difficulty information from Pilot Phase 1. It would be helpful to explain the tier development process and what this means -is it related to DOK?</p> <p>NCSC15. NCSC partners approved 10 math targets per grade level, 7-9 reading targets per grade level, and 3 writing targets per grade level. (pp.21) How did the development partner go about selecting passages for grade level and complexity of the tests. More specificity of the process and how this was reviewed by teachers is needed.</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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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); 	<p>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual, Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 9-59.</p> <p>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual, Appendix 2-M</p> <p>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual, Chapter 3 Alignment and System Coherence; pp. 80-82. Appendix 3B.</p> <p>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual, Chapter 7 Standard Setting; pp. 136-137.</p> <p>NCSC 8: NCSC Assessment System User Guide for Test Administrators, Description of interface and assessment features; pp. 58</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design. 	<p>The consortium does not administer computer adaptive assessments. Not applicable to NCSC AA-AAS</p>	
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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-AAorder thinking skills.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS</p> <p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 2.2</p> <p>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual, <u>Approach to test design and defining the construct</u> Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 10-22</p> <p><u>Developing the item model</u> Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 22-28</p> <p><u>Item Review</u> Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 31-24</p> <p><u>Item data reviews</u> Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 52-57</p> <p><u>Technical platform and assessment features</u> Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 35-36</p> <p><u>Form assembly procedures and specifications</u> Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 65-59</p> <p><u>Operational blueprints</u> Chapter 2 Test Development; Appendices 2K, 2L, and 2M.</p> <p><u>Item specifications reflected in exemplar design pattern and task template</u> Chapter 2 Test Development; Appendix 2-z</p>	<p>NCSC 15: Test blueprints reflect the development and emphasis of content in the college and career ready standards. Perhaps the blueprints should also include level(s) of cognition which are operationally defined.</p> <p>In the document referenced, it is not clear how the tiers relate to DOK.</p>
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

<p>2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State: 2.3.a</p> <p>Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</p>	<p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 2.2</p> <p>Standardized procedures for assessment administration; accessibility tools, features, and accommodations</p> <p>NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015)</p> <p>Standardized procedures for assessment administration pp. 9, 10, 12-28</p> <p>Accessibility tools and features, including use of reader pp. 9, 15, 21-23</p> <p>Instructions for accommodations, including use of scribe pp. 9, 15-16, 21-24, 36-37</p> <p>Expectations for training and test security regarding test administration with readers and scribes NCSC 5: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Administrators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Module 2: Overview of NCSC AA-AAS (Test) and Testing Integrity • Module 3: Optimal Testing Conditions and Assessment Features • Module 4: Test Accommodations and Procedures for Assessing Students Who Are Blind, Deaf, or Deaf-Blind: Additional Directions for Test Administration <p>Standardized procedures for assessment administration, (continued) NCSC 3: Directions for Test Administration: Tables of Contents and Front Matter for Mathematics and English Language Arts - Reading Grades 3 – 8 and 11</p>	<p>In the training modules for test administration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quizzes would be stronger if they have at least four questions; some modules had only 2 questions. • Quizzes would provide more useful information if the test taker needed to complete the training to answer all the questions. <p>Invalidation is not defined. As a part of training, it would help users to have</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examples of situations that warrant invalidation. • Clarification of the invalidation decision-making process. <p>Training would be stronger if it reflected a policy requirement that all students take sample items to learn functionality and format for both online and paper versions of the test.</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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

<p>2.3.b 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;</p>	<p>NCSC coordinated evidence for all States</p> <p>Expectations for NCSC Online Test Administration Training Requirements for Test Administrators and Test Coordinators NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015); pp. 17, 19</p> <p>NCSC 7: Directions for Test Administration of Mathematics Sample Items Grades 3, 6, 11 and Directions for Test Administration of English Language Arts - Reading Sample Items Grades 4, 8, 11</p> <p>NCSC 5: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Administrators Module 1: Training Requirements and Responsibilities of Test Administrators Module 2: Overview of NCSC AA-AAS (Test) and Testing Integrity Module 3: Optimal Testing Conditions and Assessment Features Module 4: Test Accommodations and Procedures for Assessing Students Who Are Blind, Deaf, or Deaf-Blind: Additional Directions for Test Administration Module 5: Navigate the Assessment System Module 6: Before Test: Complete Demographics, LCI, and Accommodations Module 7: Student Response Check Module 8: Student Experience in the NCSC Assessment System Module 9: Mathematics DTA – Administer the Test Module 10: ELA DTA – Administer the Test Module 13: Submitting or Closing a Test, Accommodations- After Test, and End of Test Survey NCSC 6: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Coordinators Module 1: Responsibilities of Test Coordinators Module 2: Overview of NCSC AA-AAS (Test) and Testing Integrity Module 3: Navigate the NCSC Assessment System</p>	<p>NCSC 5. The submission for peer review does not include the field test constructed response items in the ELA Writing assessment. Therefore, Modules 11 and 12, which pertain to the field test constructed response ELA Writing items are expected to be included with the training modules in NCSC 5.</p> <p>It is not clear in situations in which a TC is also a TA, whether he/she is required to also complete the required training for TAs as well as pass the required quiz prior to having access to the test.</p>
<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.</p>		
	<p>Documentation of procedures to ensure that test administrators and coordinators access and complete</p>	

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

<p>2.3.c If the State administers technology-based assessments,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the State has defined technology and other related requirements, (ii) included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and (iii) established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>NCSC coordinated evidence for all States</p> <p>Defined technology and related requirements NCSC 8: NCSC Assessment System User Guide for Test Administrators; pp. 66-67</p> <p>NCSC 9: NCSC Assessment System User Guide for Test Coordinators; pp. 72-73</p> <p>Technology-based standardized test administration procedures NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015); pp. 9- 18, and 21-34</p> <p>Contingency plans that outline strategies for managing possible challenges or disruptions during test administration NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015); pp. 16, 19, 35</p> <p>NCSC 8: NCSC Assessment System User Guide for Test Administrator; p. 2</p> <p>NCSC 9: NCSC Assessment System User Guide for Test Coordinator; p. 6</p>	<p>In its current form, the only contingency plan is to directly call the help desk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A troubleshooting guide would provide valuable support to users for addressing technology-related issues (e.g., loss of connectivity, power failure) before calling the contractor. • It is not clear whether there is redundancy in the system that saves and restores student responses in the event of tech problems.
<p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>Evidence of consistent standardized procedures that address (unless determined to be State-specific evidence)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test administration instructions and training that address rules for invalidating test results when necessary • Ensuring that all students are familiar with the item format and online functionality including sample items before test administration <p>Evidence of contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS</p> <p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 2.5</p> <p><u>Test security procedures before, during and after test administration</u> NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015); pp. 15-16,18-19, 25-28, and 36-37</p> <p><u>Incident-reporting procedures and consequences</u> NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015); p. 28</p> <p><u>Requirements for annual test security training for Test Administrators and Test Coordinators</u></p> <p>NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015); pp. 17, 19, 25</p> <p>NCSC 5: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Administrators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Module 2: Overview of NCSC AA-AAS (Test) and Testing Integrity <p>NCSC 6: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Coordinators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Module 2: Overview of NCSC AA-AAS (Test) and Testing Integrity 	<p>The process for refreshing items and test forms is not clear which has implications for test security, especially when parts of the test are printed.</p> <p>NCSC should have processes and procedures for preventing, detecting, reporting, investigating, and remediating assessment irregularities or clarification of which aspects should be addressed by state-specific evidence.</p>
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence that NCSC has processes and procedures for preventing, detecting, reporting, investigating, and remediating assessment irregularities or clarification of which aspects should be addressed by state-specific evidence (unless determined to be State-specific evidence).</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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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 Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 2.6</p> <p><u>Integrity and confidentiality of test materials, test-related data, and PII</u></p> <p>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual, Appendix 2-C: Design for Technical Platform for NCSC Assessment System, p. 15 of 25 (in page navigation) “System Security Layers”</p>	<p>The consortium indicated that the Vendor contracts with States had security requirements for data handling and redress options were not provided to verify. Appropriately redacted test contracts may be needed.</p> <p>The Amazon Web Services (AWS) secure global infrastructure and services are subject to regular third-party compliance audits (NCSC 15 p.13). Most of the cited evidence is a NCSC Glossary.</p> <p>It is unclear how “System Security Layers” protect the integrity of test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results.</p>
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence that the NSCS has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information or clarification of which aspects should be addressed by state-specific evidence (unless determined to be State-specific evidence).</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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS</p> <p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 3.1</p> <p>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual, Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 9-69.</p> <p>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual, <u>Relationship of the Core Content Connectors (CCCs) to grade level academic content standards</u> Chapter 3 Alignment and System Coherence; pp. 72-75 and Appendix 3-B, Study 1.</p> <p>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual, <u>Alignment of the tasks and items to grade-level CCSS</u> Chapter 3 Alignment and System Coherence; pp. 77-80 and Appendix 3-B, Study 3.</p> <p><u>Alignment of NCSC items to the performance level descriptors (PLDs)</u> Chapter 3 Alignment and System Coherence; pp. 80-82 and Appendix 3-B, Study 4.</p>	<p>The consortium provided a range of studies that was clear and well documented of the iterative process used to address this area. As part of this process, the consortium demonstrated the breadth of content and cognitive complexity as appropriate.</p>
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p> <p><u> </u>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence for 3.1-3.4 is required once writing items are part of the operational test.</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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS</p> <p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 3.2</p> <p>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual, Chapter 2 Test Development</p> <p><u>Interaction Studies</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Student and teacher interaction with task templates pp. 57-58 - Student interaction with and teacher perception of mathematics and reading items pp. 58-59 <p>End of test survey: data collection and analyses; pp. 59-60, and 62</p> <p>Writing evaluation study; p. 61</p> <p><u>Item specifications reflected in exemplar design pattern and task template</u> Chapter 2 Test Development; Appendix 2-A</p>	<p>It is unclear how the end of test survey questions informed test administration.</p>
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence for 3.1-3.4 is required once writing items are part of the operational test.</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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS</p> <p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 3.3 NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual</p> <p><u>DIF analyses</u> Chapter 8 Studies of Reliability and construct-Related Validity; summarized pp. 177-179 and detailed in appendix 8-C</p> <p><u>Analyses of item statistics by tier</u> Chapter 6 Psychometric Analyses Classical statistics; pp. 120-121, and IRT parameters; pp. 136-127</p> <p><u>Classical Statics and Reliability</u> Chapter 8 Studies of Reliability and construct-Related Validity; Appendix 8-A</p> <p><u>Dimensionality analyses</u> Chapter 8 Studies of Reliability and construct-Related Validity; pp. 179-183</p>	<p>DIMTEST and DETECT analyses were applied to all grades and content areas.</p> <p>All the DETECT values for 2014-15 indicated moderate to strong and very strong multidimensionality (p.182). It appears that a major IRT assumption is violated.</p> <p>NCSC has identified multidimensionality as a critical issue to be addressed with their TAC and member states.</p>
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence that documents how apparent violations of the IRT assumption of test unidimensionality have been sufficiently addressed and remediated for future test administrations. Evidence for 3.1-3.4 is required once writing items are part of the operational test.</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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 3.4 NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual</p> <p><u>Alignment between knowledge, skills, and abilities in assessment to student learning expectations for instruction</u> Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 75-76 and Appendix 3-B, Study 2.</p> <p><u>Vertical coherence study</u> Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 82-84 and Appendix 3-B, Study 5.</p>	
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence for 3.1-3.4 is required once writing items are part of the operational test.</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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.1 – 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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS</p> <p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 4.1</p> <p>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual</p> <p><u>Test form reliability coefficients and standard error of measurement for all grades and content areas</u> Chapter 8 Studies of Reliability and Construct-Related Validity; pp. 171-174.</p> <p><u>Reliability coefficients and standard error of measurement for subgroups and disability categories</u> Chapter 8 Studies of Reliability and Construct-Related Validity; Appendix 8-A.</p> <p>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual</p> <p><u>Overall SEM by grade, content, and form</u> Chapter 8 Studies of Reliability and Construct-Related Validity; pp. 171-174.</p> <p><u>Test Characteristic Curves (TCCs), Test Information Function (TIFs) and Conditional Standard Error Measurement (CSEM) by grade, content, and form</u> Chapter 6 Psychometric Analyses; Appendix 6-F.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCSC is not computer-adaptive. 	<p>Writing is missing because it was field tested; however, the coefficient reliability results will be required at a later date as well as the ELA results that include writing.</p>
<p>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence for 4.1,4.3, and 4.4 for the ELA test is required once writing items are part of the operational test.</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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 4.2</p> <p>Technical Manual</p> <p><u>Principled approach to assessment development and developing the item model</u> Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 12-16 and pp. 22-24.</p> <p><u>Item Specifications Reflected in Example Annotated Design Pattern and Task Template</u> Chapter 2 Test Development; Appendix 2-A.</p> <p><u>Appendix 2-B- Accessibility by Design – Accommodations Committee Work</u> Chapter 2 Test Development; Appendix 2-B.</p> <p><u>Item review procedures</u> Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 31-34</p> <p><u>Item data reviews</u> Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 54-57</p> <p><u>Technical platform and assessment features</u> Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 36-38</p> <p><u>DIF analyses</u> Chapter 8 Studies of Reliability and Construct-Related Validity; summarized pp. 177-179 and detailed in appendix 8-C</p>	
<p>Section 4.2 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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 4.3 CSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual</p> <p><u>Alignment of the tasks and items to grade-level CCSS</u> Chapter 3 Alignment and System Coherence; pp. 77-80 and Appendix 3-B.</p> <p><u>Alignment of NCSC items to the performance level descriptors (PLDs)</u> Chapter 3 Alignment and System Coherence; pp. 80-82 and Appendix 3-B, Study 4.</p> <p><u>Test Map for Core Items</u> Chapter 6 Psychometric Analysis; Appendix 6-B (p.35).</p> <p><u>Performance level and scale score distributions</u> Chapter 6 Psychometric Analysis; pp. 130-131 and Appendix 6-I.</p> <p><u>Test Characteristic Curves and Test Information Functions for all grade/ content tests</u> Chapter 6 Psychometric Analysis; Appendix 6-F.</p>	<p>Evidence for 4.3 is required once writing items are part of the operational test.</p> <p>Math panelists reported focus KSAs provided full support for some but not all four math claims, writing panelists indicated some but fell short of providing full evidence in support of the claim (pg. 82)</p> <p>TCC, TIF and CSEM curves generally appear as expected.</p> <p>Model-data fit for the “combined” items were problematic. Especially for the grade 11 Tier 1 WP item, the estimated a-parameter equaled 11.34, an extremely abnormal value, with a huge standard error of .61, indicating that the model does not adequately fit the data (p.7). What was done to remedy the fit issue?</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence for 4.1, 4.3, and 4.4 for the ELA test is required once writing items are part of the operational test.</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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS</p> <p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 4.4</p> <p>NCSC 1: Test Administration Manual pp. 12-13, pp. 29-33, and pp. 36-42.</p> <p>NCSC 5: Training Modules for Test Administrators See modules 9-12 and pp. 193-336.</p> <p>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual</p> <p>Chapter 4 Test Administration; pp. 86-99.</p> <p><u>Detailed Description of Scoring Procedures</u> Chapter 5 Scoring; pp. 100-114.</p> <p><u>Procedures, rationale, and results for IRT-based scaling</u> Chapter 6 Psychometric Analyses; pp. 121-129 and Appendix 6-C.</p> <p><u>NCSC Scoring Decisions</u> Chapter 6 Psychometric Analyses; Appendix 6-D.</p>	<p>Evidence for 4.4 for the ELA test is required once writing items are part of the operational test, including standardized scoring procedures designed to produce reliable results and facilitate score interpretations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Interrater reliability ○ Scoring Math CR items ○ Instructions for ELA ○ Scoring of Reading Words CR ○ Fit issue resolution <p>2014-15 was the first year of test administration. How will between year equating be conducted for 2014-15 and 2015-16?</p> <p>Appendix 6 D, page 7. Model fit for combined items problematic, 11.34 is high value; high 0.61 indicating the model does not fit the data. How has this fit issue been resolved?</p>
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p> <p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence for 4.1, 4.3, and 4.4 for the ELA test is required once writing items are part of the operational test to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of standardized scoring procedures designed to produce reliable results and facilitate score interpretations for ELA, including writing after it is added, and math, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Interrater reliability ○ Procedures for scoring math and reading word constructed-response items and writing items ○ Instructions for scorers of ELA constructed-response items, including writing ○ Documentation that Fit issue has been resolved • Evidence of impact on scoring based on rules for invalidating test results 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS</p> <p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 4.5 NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual</p> <p><u>IRT Calibration, Scaling, and Equating Process</u> Chapter 6 Psychometric Analyses; pp. 121-130.</p> <p><u>Stability of form variance and difficulty</u> Chapter 6 Psychometric Analyses; pp. 124-125 (Tables 6-10 and 6-11).</p> <p><u>Test Characteristic Curves (TCC) and Test Information Functions (TIF) for all forms for all grades and content areas</u> Chapter 6 Psychometric Analyses; Appendix 6-F</p>	<p>Equating across years is not pertinent because 2014-15 is the first administration. How will between-year equating be conducted for 2014-15 and 2015-16?</p> <p>It would be helpful if there was a reference back to whether the forms match the blueprint to address this section.</p>
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The consortium must provide evidence to address comparability across years, including addressing the inclusion of writing in 2015-16 years. 		

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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</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>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 4.6</p> <p>NCSC 1: Test Administration Manual pp. 12-13, pp. 29-33, and pp. 36-42.</p> <p>NCSC 5: Training Modules for Test Administrators See modules 9-12 and pp. 193-336.</p> <p>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual Chapter 4 Test Administration; pp. 86-99.</p> <p>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual <u>Item Specifications Reflected in Example Annotated Design Pattern and Task Template</u> Chapter 2 Test Development; Appendix 2-A.</p> <p><u>Alignment and System Coherence</u> Chapter 3 Alignment and System Coherence; Appendix 3-B.</p>	<p>Clarify choice for paper version use. Is this based on technical support, availability of computers, teacher preference or is it only as an accommodation by the IEP team?</p> <p>If it is not an accommodation only, evidence must be provided to support comparability.</p>
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale Evidence either that paper versions of the assessments are an accommodation or documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results across the technology and paper-based version of the assessments.</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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS</p> <p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 4.7</p> <p>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual</p> <p><u>Chapter 2, Test development</u></p> <p><u>Chapter 3, Alignment and System Coherence</u></p> <p>NCSC 16: TAC membership and agendas</p> <p>NCSC 17: Post-Administration Research Studies</p>	<p>Post administration studies are listed in NCSC 17 but there is no plan, timeline, or evidence that any will be completed.</p> <p>NCSC 16 does not provide information on TAC recommendations; there are agendas but no decision points or meeting summaries.</p> <p>Evidence of an ongoing system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving the quality of its assessment system for future years.</p>
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence of an ongoing system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving the quality of its assessment system for future years.</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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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; 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS</p> <p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 5.1</p> <p>NCSC 2: Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions for the NCSC Alternate Assessment of English Language Arts and Mathematics and Training</p> <p><u>Guidance for IEP Team decisions</u> NCSC 2: Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions for the NCSC Alternate Assessment of English Language Arts and Mathematics and Training; pp. 3-18.</p> <p>NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015) Student Participation Criteria; p. 20.</p> <p>NCSC 5: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Administrators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Module 2: Overview of NCSC AA-AAS (Test) and Testing Integrity <p><u>Guidelines to determine assessment using an alternate assessment</u> NCSC 2: Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions for the NCSC Alternate Assessment of English Language Arts and Mathematics and Training; pp. 3-18. <u>Accessibility tools, features, and accommodations</u></p> <p>NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration</p>	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities; • 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 	<p>Manual (2015); pp. 9, 23-25, and 36-37.</p> <p>NCSC 4: Procedures for Assessing Students Who Are Blind, Deaf, or Deaf-Blind: Additional Directions for Test Administration</p> <p>NCSC 8: User Guide for Test Administrators; pp. 18, 26-28, and 55-65.</p> <p>NCSC 5: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Administrators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Module 3: Optimal Testing Conditions and Assessment Features • Module 4: Test Accommodations and Procedures for Assessing Students Who Are Blind, Deaf, or Deaf-Blind: Additional Directions for Test Administration • Module 6: Before Test: Complete Demographics, LCI, and Accommodations <p>NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015); pp. 9, 23-25.</p> <p>NCSC 5: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Administrators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Module 4: Test Accommodations and Procedures for Assessing Students Who Are Blind, Deaf, or Deaf-Blind: Additional Directions for Test Administration <p><u>IDEA disability categories and assessment decisions</u></p> <p>NCSC 2: Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions for the NCSC Alternate Assessment of English Language Arts and</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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>Mathematics and Training; pp. 5, 6-7 (#2).</p> <p><u>Promote access to general curriculum</u> NCSC 2: Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions for the NCSC Alternate Assessment of English Language Arts and Mathematics and Training; p. 7 (#4).</p> <p>NCSC 11: Parent Overview of the NCSC Assessment System: Grades 3 – 8 and 11</p> <p>NCSC 12: NCSC Brief 1: AA-AAS: Standards That Are the “Same but Different”</p> <p>NCSC 13: NCSC Brief 5: Standards-based Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) for Students Who Participate in AA-AAS</p> <p>NCSC 14: NCSC Brief 7: NCSC’s Content Model for Grade-Aligned Instruction and Assessment: “The Same Curriculum for All Students”</p>	
Section 5.1 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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</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>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 5.2 <u>English learners and accommodations</u></p> <p>NCSC 2: Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions for the NCSC Alternate Assessment of English Language Arts and Mathematics and Training; p. 7 (#3).</p> <p><u>Accessibility tools, features, and accommodations for English learners</u></p> <p>NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015); pp. 9, 23-25.</p> <p>NCSC 5: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Administrators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Module 4: Test Accommodations and Procedures for Assessing Students Who Are Blind, Deaf, or Deaf-Blind: Additional Directions for Test Administration <p>NCSC 8: User Guide for Test Administrators; pp. 55-65</p> <p><u>Guidance for selection of accommodations for English learners</u></p> <p>NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015); pp. 9, 24, and 36-37.</p> <p>NCSC 5: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Administrators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Module 4: Test Accommodations and Procedures for Assessing Students Who Are Blind, Deaf, or Deaf-Blind: Additional Directions for Test 	<p>The evidence does not address 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.</p>
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide procedures to ensure the inclusion of English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the assessments and clearly communicates this information or clarification that these components should be addressed by state-specific evidence (unless determined to be State-specific evidence). 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS</p> <p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 5.3 <u>Availability of accommodations for students with disabilities</u></p> <p>NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015); pp. 9, 24, 36-37.</p> <p>NCSC 5: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Administrators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Module 4: Test Accommodations and Procedures for Assessing Students Who Are Blind, Deaf, or Deaf-Blind: Additional Directions for Test Administration <p>NCSC 8: User Guide for Test Administrator; pp. 18, 26-28.</p> <p><u>Accommodations for English learners</u></p> <p>NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015); pp. 9, 24, 36-37.</p> <p>NCSC 5: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Administrators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Module 4: Test Accommodations and Procedures for Assessing Students Who Are Blind, Deaf, or Deaf-Blind: Additional Directions for Test Administration <p>NCSC 8: User Guide for Test Administrator; pp. 18, 26-28. Technical Manual</p>	<p>While there is a training module and user guide to identify accommodations, there is no discussion of whether 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.</p> <p>Are there additional accommodations that NCSC suggests as part of procedures for EL and if so, what direction is given to the state?</p> <p>NCSC evidence does not address EL procedures for inclusion of all EL students in the state assessment. NCSC is silent on providing any direction to the states around</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 learner.

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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><u>Principled approach to assessment development and developing the item model</u> Chapter 2 Test Development.</p> <p><u>Item Specifications Reflected in Example Annotated Design Pattern and Task Template</u> Chapter 2 Test Development; Appendix 2-A.</p> <p><u>Accessibility by Design – Accommodations Committee Work</u> Chapter 2 Test Development; Appendix 2-B.</p> <p>Chapter 4 Test Administration; pp. 88-90.</p> <p><u>Documentation of accommodations, Student response check, Accessibility Features</u> Chapter 4 Test Administration; p. 96.</p> <p><u>Accommodations Frequencies</u> Chapter 6 Psychometric Analyses; Appendix 6-L.</p> <p>NCSC 5: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Administrators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Module 4: Test Accommodations and Procedures for Assessing Students Who Are Blind, Deaf, or Deaf-Blind: Additional Directions for Test Administration; pp. 62-84. 	
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence that the accommodations provided (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. ○ Evidence that appropriate accommodations for English learners (EL) are available. ○ Evidence of a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all 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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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>The Consortium did not provide a response to Critical Element 5.4. It was indicated that this will be state specific evidence.</p>
<p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p>		
<p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS</p> <p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 6.1</p> <p>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual</p> <p><u>Development of Grade Level Performance Level Descriptors</u> Chapter 7 Standard Setting; Appendix 7-A.</p> <p>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual</p> <p><u>Performance Level Descriptor Front Matter and Performance Level Descriptors</u> Chapter 7 Standard Setting; Appendix 7-B.</p> <p>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual</p> <p><u>Performance level and scale score distributions</u> Chapter 6 Psychometric Analyses; pp. 130-131 and Appendix 6-I.</p>	
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS</p> <p>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual</p> <p><u>Rationale for selection of method</u> Chapter 7 Standard Setting; p. 132.</p> <p><u>Selection and characteristics of panelists</u> Chapter 7 Standard Setting; pp.144-146.</p> <p><u>Detailed description of procedures</u> Chapter 7 Standard Setting; pp. 146-157.</p> <p><u>Results, evaluation, and policy adjustments</u> Chapter 7 Standard Setting; pp. 158-168.</p> <p><u>External evaluation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 7 Standard Setting; pp. 169-170. • Synopsis of Validity Evidence for the Cut scores Derived from the Grades 3 - 8 and 11 Standard Setting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chapter 7 Standard Setting; Appendix 7-O. • Review of the Standard Setting Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chapter 7 Standard Setting; Appendix 7-P. • Plake validity evidence memo <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chapter 7 Standard Setting; Appendix 7-Q. 	
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS</p> <p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 6.3</p> <p>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual</p> <p>Chapter 7 Standard Setting; Appendix 7-A.</p> <p><u>Alignment between knowledge, skills, and abilities in assessment to student learning expectations for instruction.</u></p> <p>Chapter 3 Alignment and System coherence; pp. 75-76, Appendix 3-B, Study 2.</p> <p><u>Vertical coherence study</u></p> <p>Chapter 3 Alignment and System coherence; pp. 82-84, Appendix 3-B, Study 5.</p>	<p>Evidence provided shows that the alternate academic achievement standards demonstrate adequate 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>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.4 – Reporting</p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration; • The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results; • The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement; ○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors); ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; ○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to 	<p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 6.4</p> <p><u>Interpretive guidance for use with State report</u> NCSC 10: NCSC AA-AAS 2015 Guide for Score Report Interpretation</p> <p><u>Examples of reports of assessment results</u> NCSC 10: NCSC AA-AAS 2015 Guide for Score Report Interpretation; pp. 17-23.</p> <p><u>Interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of assessment results</u> NCSC 10: NCSC AA-AAS 2015 Guide for Score Report Interpretation; pp. 1-8, 9 – 12, 27 – 41 (performance level descriptors).</p> <p><u>Individual student reports for each content area and grade level</u></p> <p>NCSC 10: NCSC AA-AAS 2015 Guide for Score Report Interpretation, Appendix A. Individual Student Report; pp. 23, 25-26.</p> <p><u>Interpretive guidance that accompanies individual student reports</u> NCSC 10: NCSC AA-AAS 2015 Guide for Score Report Interpretation; pp. 25-26.</p> <p>NCSC 11: Parent Overview of the NCSC Assessment System: Grades 3 – 8 and 11</p>	<p>There are no itemized score analyses at any reporting level. Scores are only presented at the test level, no domain or “subtest” scores. Efforts should be made to generate reports at finer content/process grain sizes (e.g., reporting reading and writing).</p> <p>The evidence does not indicate that reports 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.</p> <p>NCSC10, Page 14 test status: lists several different test statuses, but it is not clear how each status impacts scores and reporting. Specifically the “did not test, DNT” status is not defined as to what is included, such as parent refusal, ESR/ESM, and invalid.</p> <p>There is no information on timeliness of reporting results to parents, educators, and principals.</p> <p>There is no indication that descriptive assessment reports are available in alternate format (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand.</p> <p>No consortium report at the content level test provided detailed information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students.</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 THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. 		
<p>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</p> <p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic assessment reports 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 (unless determined to be State-specific evidence). • Evidence must be provided 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 (unless determined to be State-specific evidence). • data element definitions (e.g., do not test category include and how is it reflected in reports) in reports to clarify how each student is counted and reported. 		

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.