



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Mary Stadick Smith
Secretary of Education
South Dakota Department of Education
800 Governors Drive
Pierre, SD 57501

August 30, 2018

Dear Secretary Smith:

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

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

External peer reviewers and Department staff carefully evaluated SD DOE's submission and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that the general assessments for reading/language arts and mathematics in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced) meet all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of section 1111(b)(1) and (3) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB and ESSA.

Congratulations on meeting these important ESEA requirements; an assessment system that produces valid and reliable results is fundamental to a State's accountability system. Assessments that produce valid and reliable results are fundamental to a State's accountability system.

In regard to the other assessments that SD DOE submitted for the February 2018 peer review, peer reviewers and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that the components of SD DOE's assessment system meet most, but not all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of section

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.

1111(b)(1) and (3) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and the Department's analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

- Reading/ language arts and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (Smarter Balanced): **Meets requirements of ESEA, as amended by NCLB and ESSA.**
- Reading/ language arts and mathematics general assessments in high school (Smarter Balanced): **Meets requirements of ESEA, as amended by NCLB and ESSA.**
- Reading/ language arts and mathematics alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards (National Center and State Collaborative/Multi-State Alternate Assessment (NCSC/MSAA)) in grades 3-8 and high school: **Substantially meets requirements of ESEA, as amended by NCLB and ESSA.**

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 SD DOE should be able to provide this additional information within one year.

Please note that the assessment requirements for ESEA, as amended by the NCLB, were in effect through the end of the 2016-2017 school year. The SD DOE peer review was conducted under the requirements of this statute. Beginning in the 2017-2018 school year, the assessment requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, will apply to State assessments. Department staff carefully reviewed the evidence and peer review recommendations in light of the updated requirements for State assessments under the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. As a result of this additional review, I have determined that the SD DOE administration of the MSAA assessments needs to meet one additional requirement related to alternate academic achievement standards. This requirement is listed under critical element 6.3. Under the orderly transition authority in section 4(b) of the ESSA, I am granting SD DOE until December 15, 2020, to submit evidence of an alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards that meets this ESSA requirement.

The specific list of items required for SD DOE to submit is enclosed with this letter. Because the State has not fully satisfied the condition placed on the State's Title I, Part A grant award related to its State assessment system, the Department is continuing to place a condition on the State's Title I grant award related to those components of the assessment system. To satisfy this condition, SD DOE must submit satisfactory evidence to address the items identified in the enclosed list. SD DOE must provide to the Department a plan and timeline by which it will submit the additional documentation within 30 days of the receipt of this letter. If adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action. 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 our determination. Please note that the peers' recommendations may differ from the Department's feedback; we encourage you to read the full peer notes for additional suggestions and recommendations for improving your assessment system beyond what is noted in the Department's feedback.

Please be aware that approval of SD DOE's administration of Smarter Balanced is not a determination that the system complies with Federal civil rights requirements, including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of

1964, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act and requirements under the IDEA. Also, please remember that, if SD DOE makes significant changes in its assessments, the State must submit information about those changes to the Department for review and approval.

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

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank T. Brogan
Assistant Secretary for
Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Ann Larsen, 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
2.3 – Test Administration	<p>For the Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that State established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the MSAA assessments that include evidence of a policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration in writing (including the assessment delivery devices, accessibility tools and features available for students, and item formats) prior to testing.
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	<p>For the MSAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide evidence that item response theory assumptions of test unidimensionality are met.
4.1 – Reliability	<p>For the MSAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> When MSAA implements constructed response operational writing items, appropriate studies must be conducted to determine reliability.
4.4 – Scoring	<p>For the MSAA:</p> <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 reading/language arts and mathematics and also operational writing items. Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate procedures and criteria for ensuring and documenting inter-rater reliability; and Clear scoring rubrics, comprehensive instructions for raters, adequate training of raters, and evaluation of inter-rater reliability.
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards (additional requirement under section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA)	<p>For the MSAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards (AAAS) ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. The State educational agency should provide this evidence by December 15, 2020.
6.4 – Reporting	<p>For the MSAA:</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

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

February-March 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA-Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (e.g., relevant document(s), page number(s) and location)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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, 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: <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>Beyond information provided for June 2016 submission, the additional evidence will be provided in Element 5.2 for NCSC/MSAA (see below)</p> <p>SD Evidence 10: <u>Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation on the Alternate Assessment</u> SD Evidence 11: <u>Alt Assessment Worksheet</u> SD Evidence 12.: <u>Documentation of Evidence Worksheet</u></p> <p>SD Evidence 17: <u>Smarter Balanced Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines</u> pp. 30- 38</p> <p>SD Evidence 6: <u>Smarter Balanced Administration Overview</u> power point slides 13-54</p> <p>SD Evidence 3: <u>Office of Assessment Winter Assessment Workshops</u> Slide 12</p> <p>SD Evidence 23: <u>Language Acquisition Plan</u></p>	<p>evidence submitted supports the requirements for this critical elements, as pertains to English Learners. Analysis relied upon evidence also submitted in critical element 5.2.</p>
<p>Section 1.4 Summary Statement (2016 Review)</p>		
<p><u>_x_</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Note: see evidence requested for NCSC/MSAA in element 5.2 below.</p>		
<p>Section 1.4 Summary Statement (2018 Review)</p>		
<p><u>_x_</u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA-Resubmission

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA-Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (e.g., relevant document(s), page number(s) and location)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>evidence from 2016-17 Consolidated State Performance Report indicate:</p> <p>All students Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment 70,859/71,140 99.6% Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment 70,867/71,142 99.6% Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment 28,609/28,933 98.9% Children with disabilities (IDEA) Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment 10,285/10,347 99.4% Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment 10,287/10,347 99.4% Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment 3,581/3,653 98.0% all subgroups provided For AA AAAS Participation of Students with Disabilities(IDEA)in Mathematics Assessment 949 1.34% Participation of Students with Disabilities(IDEA)in Reading/Language Arts Assessment 949 1.34% Participation of Students with Disabilities(IDEA)in Science Assessment 381 1.33%</p>	<p>evidence meets requirements for critical element</p>
Section 1.5 Summary Statement (2016 Review)		
<p><u> </u>_x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence of the participation rate for the assessments in science, both general and AA-AAAS at the appropriate grades.</p>		
Section 1.5 Summary Statement (2018 Review)		
<p><u> </u>_x_ No additional evidence is required</p>		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or 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 SOUTH DAKOTA-Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">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>SEE SBAC and MSAA peer notes.</p> <p>As part of South Dakota’s plan and process to regularly update and revise state content standards, the R/LA standards have undergone revision with the 2017 Proposed ELA Standards undergoing public comment at the present time with a planned adoption timeline of Spring 2018.</p> <p>South Dakota does not plan to seek a waiver at the present time for speaking based on conversations with US DOE staff at TILSA and other meetings. South Dakota will continue assess reading and writing as detailed in the Smarter Balanced assessment blueprints.</p> <p>Math standards are undergoing a similar revision and review process with the Mathematics Standards. Again, the planned adoption timeline is Spring 2018.</p>	
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement (2016 Review)</p>		
<p><u> </u>_x_ 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 SOUTH DAKOTA-Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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 <p>test design requirements for the intended depth of knowledge (DOK) of the assessments (also applies to evidence requested for element 2.2).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 		
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement (2018 Review)</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • see 2017/18 MSAA review and 2018 Smarter balanced review 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA-Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or 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 SOUTH DAKOTA-Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">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>Alternate Assessment</p> <p>SD Evidence 1: <u>Alternate Assessment</u> powerpoint slides 2-17 review general requirements for test administration</p> <p>SD Evidence 2: <u>AIR Test Delivery System Description</u></p> <p>SD DOE can provide all the necessary resources for a standardized test administration through presentations, online resources, and webinars. The main repository of all information is the SD DOE website starting with this link http://doe.sd.gov/Assessment/. All relevant information is updated annually.</p> <p>In order to ensure that MSAA was administered in the same manner across all states, the test coordinators and test administrators must annually participate in a series of on-line modules designed to walk the educators through all aspects of the test administration. SD Evidence 1 details the process used for training during winter assessment workshops.</p> <p>Contingency Plans</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The State of South Dakota’s Bureau of Information and Telecommunications (BIT) provides the k-12 statewide network used by public school districts. BIT has the ultimate responsibility for ensuring all aspects of the networks are up and running. In the case of a security breach or a slow-down in the system, the impacted agencies or schools are notified. 	<p>evidence provided, along with evidence from MSAA and Smarter Balanced 2018 peer reviews, meets requirements for this critical element.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA-Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. During the test administration windows, SD DOE Office of Assessment staff contact with the BIT staff if they learn of any issues coming from the schools. 3. The DOE staff are part of the technology coordinators list serv which allows for constant and immediate contact when issues arise that could impact test administration or security. 4. During test windows, the Office of Assessment will always have one person in the office to support schools. 5. The Office of Assessment has daily contact with the MSAA and Smarter Balanced service providers during test windows. 6. In the case of a service disruptions reported by the service provider, emails are sent to all appropriate school personnel immediately. 7. If an issue is reported by a school, depending on the situation, the service provider program manager or BIT will be contacted to determine the root cause and again, emails sent as needed. 	
<p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement (2016 Review)</p>		
<p><u>_x_</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a comprehensive contingency plan to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA-Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 2.3 Summary Statement (2018 Review)		
__x_ No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA-Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (e.g., relevant document(s), page number(s) and location)	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>SD Evidence 3: <u>Office of Assessment Winter Assessment Workshops</u> power point Slides 19-25</p> <p>SD Evidence 1: <u>Alternate Assessment</u> power point Slides 23-25</p> <p>SD Evidence 4: <u>Interview Protocol for school visits</u></p> <p>SD Evidence 5: <u>Summary of security reports for Smarter Balanced</u></p> <p>SD DOE takes test security serious and has the following procedures in place to educate as well as monitor test administration. Districts are expected to adhere to best practices and provide annual assessment trainings prior to test administration. The Office of Assessment offers trainings on a yearly basis. 83% of school districts sent staff to the trainings. Districts choosing not to attend were contacted by email and phone to ensure that the district coordinators had access to the need materials for training staff.</p> <p>During the 2016-17 assessment window, 23 districts were visited to review their assessment practices. Districts were identified based on prior problems, overuse of accommodations or alternate assessments, or lack of participation in trainings. Data were collected and reported, see Evidence 4 for procedure. The analysis of all school visits provided the Office of Assessment with needed details to continue to monitor some districts during the 2017-18 test window. The districts will be contacted with a summary of findings in January 2018.</p> <p>Security agreements are part of the online registration for both Smarter Balanced and MSAA. Without agreeing to the security policy, educators will not be</p>	<p>The evidence provided meets the requirements for this resubmission, when considered in context of MSAA and Smarter Balanced review notes.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA-Resubmission

	<p>able to login to the systems.</p> <p>For all assessments, the expectations for test security start and end with district personnel. The procedures and expectations for maintaining security are outlined at all workshops as presented in SD Evidence 1 and 3.</p> <p>State laws SDCL 13-3-56.1 and 13-3-56.2 require districts to investigate in the case of suspected cheating. The documents were provided in the June 2016 submission, Evidence 51 and 52. During the 2016-17 test administration window, two incidents were reported to the Office of Assessment by district administrators. Both situations were resolved at the local level but the districts will be on the list for site visits during the 2017-18 test windows.</p> <p>All districts report irregularities, improprieties, and breaches as needed. SD Evidence 5 is a summary of all reported issues during the 2016-17 test administration.</p>	
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement (2016 Review)</p>		
<p><u> </u>x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: 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. 		
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement (2018 Review)</p>		
<p><u> </u>x_ No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA-Resubmission

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>SD Evidence 6 [16-TechReport]: <u>South Dakota Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments 2015-2-16 Technical Report – Addendum to the Smarter Balanced Technical Report</u> pp. 23-27 details of what supports and accommodations were provided according to school input in TIDE.</p> <p>p. 60 Marginal reliability Coefficients p.p. 106 – 119 Percentage of Students in Achievement Levels for Overall and by Subgroups</p> <p>SD Evidence 7: <u>Smarter Balanced Administration Overview</u> power point slides 13-54</p> <p>SD Evidence 8: <u>Accommodations Manual</u></p> <p>Students are afforded a number of accommodations that are based on the student’s IEP . The data in SD Evidence 6 indicates the assessments are providing students with access to the test in a fair and accessible manner.</p> <p>Documentation procedures for the use of accommodations are provided through the assessment workshops as highlighted in Evidence 7.</p> <p>Accommodations versus modifications are addressed in the state’s Accommodation manual, Evidence 8, pages 14 – 15, 38 in particular.</p>	<p>evidence submitted supports critical element for evaluation of fairness across student groups.</p>
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement (2016 Review)</p>		
<p><u>_x_</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: 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 estimated reliability for students receiving accommodations using operational data. 		
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement (2018 Review)</p>		
<p><u>_x_</u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA-Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (e.g., relevant document(s), page number(s) and location)	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 assessed based on alternate academic 	<p>SD Evidence 9: <u>IEP Technical Assistance Guide</u> p. 9 Parent/guardian rights p. 16-17 Communication Needs p. 21 Accommodations and alternate assessment decisions p. 23- 26 Graduation and post-secondary goals p. 34 State/District-Wide Assessment Accommodations SD Evidence 10 [<u>Alt-Guidelines</u>]: <u>Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation on the Alternate Assessment</u> SD Evidence 11 [<u>AltAsmtWks</u>]: <u>Alt Assessment Worksheet</u> SD Evidence 12 [<u>DocEviden</u>]: <u>Documentation of Evidence Worksheet</u> SD Evidence 13 [<u>HSGradReq2</u>]: <u>Graduation Requirements Handbook</u> p. 9 Students on IEP</p> <p>SD Evidence 14: <u>Accountability Workbook</u> SD Evidence 15 [Evidence 1517-MSAA-Guide]: <u>MSAA 2017 Guide for Score Report</u> SD Evidence 16: <u>Sample Parent letter/student report</u></p> <p>The Office of Special Education provides documents for IEP teams including the IEP Assistance Guide which provides school personnel with the detailed information that is required for involving parents in all aspects of the IEP process. The specific details from the guide are called out in the evidence.</p> <p>Additional support is provided to the IEP team through the use of the Guide for IEP Teams on Participation on the Alternate Assessment, the Alt Assessment Worksheet, and Documents of Evidence Worksheet.</p> <p>There are no consequences for students taking the alternate assessment in terms of meeting graduation</p>	<p>evidence submitted meets the requirements for this critical element based upon the 2016 and 2018 reviews.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA-Resubmission

<p>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>requirements as South Dakota has one set of graduation requirements with options to waive some requirements. The critical decision that an IEP team must make is if a student will get a diploma or not. All students on an IEP are provided with significant transition supports in order for the student to prepare for life after high school.</p> <p>All students taking state assessments are included in the accountability calculations. Pages MSAA provides schools detailed resources for understanding the student score reports in the MSAA Guide for Score Report which is updated annually. The parent letter provides describes how the student performed based on the test including specific strengths.</p>	
<p>Section 5.1 Summary Statement (2016 Review)</p>		
<p><u> </u>_x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: 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. 		
<p>Section 5.1 Summary Statement (2018 Review)</p>		
<p><u> </u>_x_ No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA-Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (e.g., relevant document(s), page number(s) and location)	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>SD Evidence 10: <u>Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation on the Alternate Assessment</u> SD Evidence 11: <u>Alt Assessment Worksheet</u> SD Evidence 12.: <u>Documentation of Evidence Worksheet</u></p> <p>SD Evidence 17 [Guidelines]: <u>Smarter Balanced Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines</u> pp. 30- 38</p> <p>SD Evidence 6: <u>Smarter Balanced Administration Overview</u> power point slides 13-54</p> <p>SD Evidence 3: <u>Office of Assessment Winter Assessment Workshops</u> Slide 12</p> <p>SD Evidence 23: <u>Language Acquisition Plan</u></p> <p>EL students taking MSAA: 2015-16 51/1111 5% of alternate assessment test takers with 66% proficient Math and 60% proficient ELA</p> <p>2016-17 62/665 9.3% of alternate assessment test takers were EL student with 57% proficient Math and 49% proficient ELA which is in line with the percent proficient for all students participating MSAA.</p> <p>Review of MSAA data files revealed that EL students took MSAA with the same frequency of accommodations as non EL students according to the teacher reporting within the testing system.</p> <p>Participation in MSAA is based on the student’s IEP and meeting the criteria outlined in the Alt Assessment materials, SD Evidence 10, 11, and 12 in</p>	<p>State’s evidence supports use of accommodations by English Learners in the MSAA alternate 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 SOUTH DAKOTA-Resubmission

	<p>the same manner as any other student who is being considered for participation in the alternate assessments.</p> <p>All districts have access to the Smarter Balanced Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines (Evidence 17) and the student’s LAP (Evidence 23) for determining what supports and accommodations are appropriate for a student. Most situations for EL students are handled on a case-by-case basis with support provided to the district through the state assessment director, the Title III program staff, and Office of Special Education accommodations specialist. The focus of all communication is to provide the best access to the assessment based on the student’s needs, not what is easier for test administrators.</p> <p>Smarter Balanced has a Spanish version of the mathematics assessment available and starting with the 2016-17 school year, SD DOE provided guidance on when the Spanish version of the test would be appropriate during the winter assessment workshops, see slide 12 of Office of Assessment Winter Workshops power point.</p> <p>The presentation on Smarter Balanced test administration presented at the 2017 winter assessment workshops provided general information on supports and accommodations applicable to EL students as well as all other students</p>	
--	--	--

Section 5.2 Summary Statement (2016 Review)

x The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
 For the R/LA and mathematics alternate assessments based on AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (NCSC/MSAA), SDDOE must provide:

- Evidence that the NCSC/MSAA provides test-taking accommodations for those students taking the NCSC that are English learners (ELs).

For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), SDDOE must provide:

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA-Resubmission

- 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.

Section 5.2 Summary Statement (2018 Review)

No additional evidence is required

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA-Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (e.g., relevant document(s), page number(s) and location)	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 under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners; • 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>See NCSC/MsAA peer notes.</p>	
<p>Section 5.3 Summary Statement (2016 Review)</p>		
<p>_x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: 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. 		
<p>Section 5.3 Summary Statement (2018 Review)</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA-Resubmission

___ No additional evidence is required or

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

- [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA-Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or 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 SOUTH DAKOTA-Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">5.4 – Monitoring Testing of 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>SD Evidence 4: <u>Interview Protocol for school visits</u></p> <p>SD Evidence 18: <u>Reading Passages Documentation</u></p> <p>SD Evidence 19: <u>Memo to districts regarding reading accommodations</u></p> <p>SD Evidence 20: <u>Read Aloud Protocol</u></p> <p>During the 2016-17 assessment window, 23 districts were visited to review their assessment practices. Districts were identified based on prior problems, overuse of accommodations or alternate assessments, or lack of participation in trainings. Data were collected and reported, see <u>Evidence 4</u> for procedure. The analysis of all school visits provided the Office of Assessment with needed details to continue to monitor some districts during the 2017-18 test window. The districts will be contacted with a summary of findings in January 2018.</p> <p>Specific accommodations are monitored to ensure there is not an overuse of an accommodation that doesn’t support the goal of a student learning to be an independent reader. Smarter Balanced allows for the use text-to-speech or read aloud for the reading passages as an accommodation for grades 3-5. The Office of Assessment and the Office of Special Education collect justifications for the use of the accommodation and enable the text-to-speech or read-aloud passages. See Evidence 18 and 19 for further details. The schools are encouraged to use text-to-speech whenever possible so that there aren’t so many security risks. If read-aloud is desired based on the student’s need, the Smarter Balanced read aloud protocol is expected to be applied (Evidence 20).</p>	<p>evidence supports appropriate monitoring of testing of special populations, especially when combined with count data provided in the supplemental tech report for Smarter Balanced administration.</p>
<p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement (2016 Review)</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA-Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><input type="checkbox"/>_x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</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. 		
<p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement (2018 Review)</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>_x_ No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA-Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (e.g., relevant document(s), page number(s) and location)	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 that parents can understand; 	<p>SD Evidence 21: <u>Memo regarding district obligations to distribute student test results.</u></p> <p>SD Evidence 22: <u>Sample of weekly communication regarding student reports</u></p> <p>SD Evidence 3 [WW-17General]: <u>Office of Assessment Winter Assessment Workshops Slide 27-29</u></p> <p>Annually, the Office of Assessment provides all district assessment contacts with the necessary information for accessing, printing and distributing individual student results to parents. Timelines when scores will be available are included in all communications. Reminders are included in the weekly communication to district assessment coordinators.</p> <p>Schools have access to Smarter Balanced results starting in mid-April and all student results are available prior to the end of May with the possible exception of paper tests if a district delayed returning materials for scoring.</p> <p>MCAA student results are available through the MCAA system starting in mid-August. Districts receive communications regarding the availability of the data as soon as the data are made available.</p> <p>SD DOE will work with the Braille team at the State Library to develop a plan to produce student reports in Braille. To date, no school has asked for assistance in providing reports in Braille or any other language but SD DOE will continue to follow up with districts.</p> <p>Starting with the 2017-2018 test administration,</p>	<p>evidence provided supports the information requested from the 2016 peer review. no further evidence 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 SOUTH DAKOTA-Resubmission

<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>Smarter Balanced student reports and parent information regarding results will be made available in Spanish for districts to print as needed. Parent information will also be provided in the Karen language. Student reports could not be created in Karen as it is a scripted language using Burmese script.</p> <p>There are no plans to provide MSAA reports in languages other than English through the service provider.</p>	
<p>Section 6.4 Summary Statement (2016 Review)</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: 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. 		
<p>Section 6.4 Summary Statement (2018 Review)</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA-Resubmission

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

February 201 State Assessment Peer Review Notes

(resubmission of evidence based on 2016 Peer Review)



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 Assessment Consortium

Contents

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS	3
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	4
2.2 – Item Development.....	6
2.3 – Test Administration	7
SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....	8
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	9
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	11
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables.....	12
SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER	13
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	13
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	14
4.4 – Scoring	15
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	16
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	17
5.3 – Accommodations.....	18

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 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 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
------------------	--	--

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 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 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;">2.1 – Test Design and Development (stemming from 2016 review)</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 and mathematics at each grade level. Evidence that the item selection procedures for the computer adaptive test (CAT) 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). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Evidence #S021</i> – Evaluating Alignment in Large-Scale Standards-Based Assessment Systems Evidence #S022 – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Common Core State Standards Analysis: Eligible Content for the Summative Assessment, Final Report <i>Evidence #S023</i> – Race to the Top Application for New Grants Comprehensive Assessment Systems (p. 41) Evidence #12b – Smarter Balanced Content Specifications for Mathematics <i>Evidence #S024</i> – PCG - Claim/Target and Common Core Standard Associations Data Input Specifications Evidence Packet #S010 – Blueprint Fidelity <i>Evidence #S029</i> – Summary of Smarter Balanced CAT Algorithm on Depth of Knowledge 	<p>Peers felt that S021 was not relevant for this request.</p> <p>S022 was previously provided and calls out 48 (R/LA) and 3 (Mathematics) standards as “not measurable.” However, they were judged “not measurable” using the item types proposed by SBAC: “A standard was considered measurable via on-demand summative assessment tasks if it can be assessed by any of the item types listed in the following subsection, as defined in the SBAC proposal (SBAC, 2010b, pp. 42, 52–53).” (p.9) Page 6 lists the item types. Peers feel that the standards should drive the item types / components of the assessment system. It seemed, however, that the item types were determining the assessable content, rather than the standards determining the item types / components. Regulation and Guidance clearly state “full depth and breadth for all of the academic standards.”</p> <p>S023 includes a statement of intent, not evidence for this CE.</p> <p>S024 described the new coding scheme for the items. Peers felt it was not relevant.</p> <p>Suggestion: SBAC might provide evidence of how the other components of the assessment system (formative, interim, benchmark) cover the standards deemed ineligible for the summative, AND that the states using the SBAC incorporate those other elements meaningfully into their assessment system. (That is, those other elements contribute to scores / performance levels.)</p> <p>Peers commend SBAC for conducting a thorough blueprint fidelity study, and for taking measures to correct the error identified for Grade 6 Math. We would like to see the blueprint fulfillment rates at the student level, in addition to the claim / content category level, as presented in S010a. In other words, we’d like data answering the question, “What percent of students received a test event conforming to the blueprint?,” rather than “What percent of test events fulfilled blueprint requirement X?”</p> <p>Peers feel that 100% blueprint fulfillment (at the student level) is implied by this CE. A reason for less than 100% blueprint fulfillment may reside in the way in the which algorithm treats blueprint fulfillment as described in S029 – that is, not as an absolute constraint.</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 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 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"> 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Evidence #S023 – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Race to the Top Grant Proposal (pp. 45-46)</i> <i>Evidence #S025 – Smarter Balanced Mathematics Expanded Item Pools</i> <i>Evidence #S026 – Pool Expansion Information Presentation</i> <i>Evidence #S027 – 2016-17 Expanded Pool Standards Alignment</i> <i>Evidence Packet #S010 – Blueprint Fidelity</i> <i>Evidence Packet #S012 – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses</i> <i>S013</i> 	<p>This requirement is met.</p> <p>Peers would have appreciated a clarification that when expanded pool items are used, that the relevant psychometric considerations are being addressed – e.g., that item parameters used are established for all grades spanned.</p> <p>Peers noted that several items span a relatively large grade range (roughly 20% in MA and 13% in R/LA span 3 or more grades). (Peer calculations based on S027). This seemed high.</p> <p>Peers commend SBAC for producing the gap analyses (S012). Peers believe that steps taken to bridge the gaps as described in S013 should resolve the issues.</p> <p>Peers ask that the program continue to monitor those grades/versions where blueprint fulfillment was less than 100%, as well as those where there had yet to be administrations.</p>
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Evidence that the Smarter Balanced test design aligns the assessments to the full depth and breadth for all the academic content standards in R/LA and mathematics at each grade level. B. Evidence that the item selection procedures for the computer adaptive test (CAT) 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). C. 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. Provide, upon completion of the item development plans, evidence that 100% of test events for students receiving any version of the assessment conform to the test blueprints. 		

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 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 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;">2.2 – Item Development (stemming from 2016 review)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See evidence regarding DOK and item pools in element 2.1 above. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Evidence #15a</i> – Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment Blueprints for Mathematics <i>Evidence #15b – Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment Blueprints for ELA/L</i> <i>Evidence #S008</i> – Smarter Balanced Math Summative CAT and Interim Assessment Item Development Plan <i>Evidence #S009 – Smarter Balanced ELA Summative CAT and Interim Assessment Item Development Plan</i> <i>Evidence Packet #S010</i> – Smarter Balanced Blueprint Fidelity Study <i>Evidence Packet #S012 – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses</i> <i>Evidence #S013</i> – Gap Analysis and Development Plans <i>Evidence Packet #S014 – Member Managed Item Development Assignments</i> <i>Evidence #S029</i> – Summary of Smarter Balanced CAT Algorithm on Depth of Knowledge 	<p>The item selection procedures for the CAT should result in test events that, for every student and for all versions of the assessments, meet all blueprint constraints.</p> <p>See Comments on 2.1, bullets 2 and 4.</p>
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p> <p><u> </u>x The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See 2.1 B and C. 		

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 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 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;">2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>(stemming from 2016 review-individual States may provide own evidence to address this item)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of contingency plans to address potential technology issues during test administration 	<p>No evidence provided.</p>	<p><u>Peers assume this evidence is provided by States using Smarter Balanced.</u></p>
<p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence from States using SBAC is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of contingency plans to address potential technology issues during test administration. 		

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

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 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 Assessment Consortium

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 (stemming from 2016 peer review)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence as noted for all item pools in element 2.1 above. • Evidence of a summary report that the CAT administered test forms matched test blueprints. • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #S005 – Hawaii Smarter Balanced Technical Report, 2014-2015 (pp. 42-46) • Evidence #S006 – South Dakota Technical Report 2014-2015 (pp. 44-49) • Evidence Packet #S010 – Blueprint Fidelity • Evidence Packet #012 – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses • Evidence Packet #S010 – Blueprint Fidelity • Evidence #S011 – Smarter Balanced Technical Report, 2015-2016 (pp. 6-6 through 6-9) • Evidence Packet #S010 – Blueprint Fidelity • Evidence #S030 – WestEd Alignment Study Proposal • Evidence #S032 – WestEd Alignment Study • Evidence #104 – Fordham Institute – Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation Assessments (p. 18) • Evidence #S008 – Smarter Balanced Math Summative CAT and Interim Assessment Item 	<p>See Comments in 2.1.</p> <p>See Comments in 2.1, bullets 2 and 4. The evidence was provided but it does not support the claim that the CAT administered test forms matched the test blueprints in every case.</p> <p>This evidence has been provided. See Comment in 2.1, bullet 3.</p> <p>The WestEd alignment study (S032) assessed the extent to which each item in the noted grades matched its targeted CCSS standard. However, for DoK (cognitive complexity), the study did not assess the extent to which each item matched the cognitive complexity implied by its targeted standard. Rather, it documented experts’ judgments of the level of cognitive complexity at which the item appears to be assessing the standard. The study’s design can furnish appropriate evidence to support (or refute) a claim concerning the degree of content alignment between items and standards, but it cannot provide appropriate evidence for a claim about the match between the cognitive complexity of a test and the cognitive complexity of the standards to which the test is written.</p> <p>Peers felt that the study does not address the question “Does the item match the DoK of the standard?”</p> <p>The measures taken to improve alignment are entirely appropriate. However, evidence of <i>improved</i> alignment was not provided. Peers expected to see a before-after comparison.</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 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 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"> Evidence of improved alignment of the tests, based upon the findings of the independent alignment study. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Plan <i>Evidence Packet #S010</i> – Blueprint Fidelity Evidence Packet #S012 – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses <i>Evidence #S013</i> – Gap Analysis and Development Plans Evidence Packet #S014 – Member-Managed Assignments <i>Evidence Packet #S015</i> – Member-Managed Item Development Training 	
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p> <p><u> </u>x<u> </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See 2.1 B and C. Evidence of alignment of sample test forms for grades 3, 4, 6 and 7 in R/LA and mathematics, specifically with respect to cognitive complexity (DoK). Evidence of improved alignment of the tests, based upon the findings of the independent alignment study. 		

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 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 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 (stemming from 2016 peer review-States may address this with State-level data)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that supports the internal structure of the Smarter Balanced assessments using operational data from the summative assessments (e.g., a correlational analysis of subscores and total scores). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Evidence #S004</i> - Assessing the Dimensionality of Smarter Balanced Summative Tests (pp. 2-4). 	<p>S004 provides the evidence requested.</p> <p>Recommendation: Peers recognize the challenge of assessing dimensionality using item scores in a CAT context; SBAC could contribute meaningfully to the literature on this topic by taking it on as a special research study.</p>
<p>Section 3.3 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 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 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;">3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>(stemming from 2016 peer review-States may address this with State-level data)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validity evidence that shows the Smarter Balanced assessment scores are related as expected with other variables for all student groups (e.g., comparison of subscore relationships within content areas to those across content areas; a confirmatory factor analysis of math & R/LA together; or other analyses that demonstrate positive correlations between assessment results and external measures that assess similar constructs). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence #S004 – Assessing the Dimensionality of Smarter Balanced Summative Test (pp. 2-5) Evidence #S005 – Hawaii Smarter Balanced Technical Report, 2014-2015 (pp. 48-50) Evidence #S006 – South Dakota Technical Report, 2014-2015 (pp. 53-55) Evidence #S007 – Dimensionality of the SBAC: An argument for its validity Evidence #S031 – South Dakota BOR Policy 	<p>Peers appreciated the concurrent validity studies for high school R/LA and Math (S005 and S006). We believe that these studies help establish external validity evidence for the program.</p> <p>However, no evidence of validity based on relationships with other variables was provided for Grades 3-8 Math and R/LA.</p> <p>Please provide the results of a study or studies addressing this CE, such as correlations between SBAC scores and grades or correlations between SBAC adjacent grade scores.</p>
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p> <p><u> </u>x<u> </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validity evidence that shows the Smarter Balanced assessment scores are related as expected with other variables for all student groups for Grades 3-8 R/LA and Math. 		

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 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 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>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility (stemming from 2016 peer review-States may address this with State-level data)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of estimated reliability for students receiving accommodations using operational data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Evidence #S011 – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Draft 2015-16 Technical Report</u>, Chapter 2 <i>Index</i> 	<p>Estimated reliabilities for the tests administered to these students are in the Index in Tables 11.1 and 11.2. Peers note that a few of the coefficients are low enough to raise concerns.</p> <p>It would be helpful in evaluating Tables 11.1 and 11.2 to know the source(s) of the data.</p> <p>Peers request a clarification about how item development plans (S013) specifically address the pool factors that are related to the low reliabilities for special versions of the test.</p> <p>Peers are also concerned by the statement in the Index “Students with lower scores have lower reliability than those with higher scores.” (p. 57). We were not sure that it was accurate.</p>
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peers request a clarification about how item development plans (S013) specifically address the pool factors that are related to the low reliabilities for special versions of the test. 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p> <p>(stemming from 2016 peer review)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See evidence regarding DOK and item pools in element 2.1 above. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Evidence #015a</i> – Final Blueprint for Mathematics Summative Assessment <i>Evidence #015b</i> – Final Blueprint for ELA/L Summative Assessment <i>Evidence Packet #S010</i> – Smarter Balanced Blueprint Fidelity Study <i>Evidence #S011</i> – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Technical Report, 2015-2016 <i>Evidence Packet #S012</i> – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses 	<p>See Comments for 2.1.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>x<u> </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See 2.1 B and C. 		

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 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 Assessment Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>(stemming from 2016 peer review-States may address this with State-level evidence)</p> <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. Evidence that the State has monitored the quality and reliability of performance task scoring conducted during its test administration for the Smarter Balanced tests. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence #065a – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium: State Procedures Manual, 2014 Evidence #S001 – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium: Member Procedures Manual, 2016 <p>No evidence cited.</p>	<p>Peers appreciate the new guidance provided by the Consortium (S001). We believe the evidence requested was provided.</p> <p>Peers’ understanding is that this evidence is to be provided by States using Smarter Balanced.</p>
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence from States using SBAC is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the State has monitored the quality and reliability of performance task scoring conducted during its test administration for the Smarter Balanced tests. 		

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 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 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;">4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</p> <p>(stemming from 2016 peer review)</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); and ○ paper in Spanish (math). • Evidence that item pools for these above-listed additional computer adaptive versions can support the adaptive test design. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Evidence #011a</i> – Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines • Evidence #143 – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium: Signing Guidelines • <i>Evidence Packet #S010</i> – Blueprint Fidelity Studies • Evidence #144 – Unified English Braille Implementation Guide • <i>Evidence #146</i> – Theory of Test Translation Error • Evidence #S011 – Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment Technical Report, 2015-2016 • <i>Evidence Packet #S012</i> – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses • Evidence #S013 – Gap Analysis and Development Plans • <i>Evidence #S016</i> – Literature Review of Testing Accommodations and Accessibility Tools for Students with Disabilities • Evidence #S017 – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Style Guide • <i>Evidence #S018</i> – Tri-Lin Proposal Response to Smarter Balanced RFP 13 • Evidence #S019 – Grade 8 Mathematics Item Specifications Claim 1 Target A 	<p>See Comments in 2.1 and 4.2.</p>
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>_x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Comments in 2.1 B and C, and 4.2. 		

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 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 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 (stemming from 2016 peer review-States may address this with State-level evidence)</p> <p>Evidence of guidance regarding selection of the Spanish version of the Smarter Balanced assessments for English learners, and evidence of procedures for communication of this guidance to districts, schools, teachers and parents.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #11a – Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines (p. 11; pp. 32-33) • Evidence #68 – Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Implementation Guide • Evidence #69h – Accessibility and Accommodations Training Module (Slide 59) • Evidence #99 – Resources and Practices Comparison Crosswalk (p. 4) • Evidence #127 – ISAAP Training Module Screenshot • Evidence #S002 – UAAG Survey • Evidence #S003 – Including All Students in Assessments Digital Library Module • Evidence #S020 – Template Letter for Parents of English Learners 	<p>The SBAC response shows where to locate evidence of the guidance in the original submission, and evidence of communication of this guidance to school personnel. Provision of #S020 shows evidence of communication of this guidance to parents.</p> <p><u>The Peers understand that provision of greater specificity beyond the guidance provided by SBAC is a State level responsibility for any State using SBAC.</u></p>
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>x<u> </u> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p> <p><u> </u>x<u> </u> The following additional evidence from States using SBAC is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of guidance regarding selection of the Spanish version of the Smarter Balanced assessments for English learners at a level of specificity such that an educator can apply the decision for an individual student. 		

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 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 Assessment Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">5.3 – Accommodations (stemming from 2016 peer review-States may address this with State-level evidence)</p> <p>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>		<p>SBAC did not provide evidence for this request.</p> <p><u>Peers’ understanding is that States using Smarter Balanced are to provide this evidence.</u></p>
<p>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence from States using SBAC is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 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 MSAA ASSESSMENT
CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

February 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes for the NCSC/MSAA Assessment Consortium RESUBMISSION

(follow up on evidence requested from 2016 and 2017 Peer Reviews)



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

Note: Peer review notes provide the combined recommendations of the individual peers to the U.S. Department of Education (Department), based on the statute and regulations 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 THE MSAA ASSESSMENT
CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION**

Contents—NOTE—The items shown below represent areas from the 2017 consortium peer review where additional evidence was requested

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS	3
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	4
2.3 – Test Administration	7
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	10
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	15
SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER	16
4.1 – Reliability.....	16
4.4 – Scoring	17
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	20
5.3 – Accommodations.....	23
6.4 – Reporting.....	26

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or 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 MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">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>The State did not provide evidence in the February 2018 submission for this critical element.</p>	<p>No relevant evidence located.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: State must provide evidence to support the NCSC/MSAA test design criteria for the writing portion of the reading/language arts AA-AAAS. This will also impact evidence for related critical elements in sections 3 and 4.</p> <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review: State must provide evidence to support the MSAA/NCSC test design criteria for the operational writing portion of the reading/language arts AA-AAAS. This will also impact evidence for related critical elements in sections 3 and 4.</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 MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State must provide evidence to support the MSAA/NCSC test design criteria for the operational writing portion of the reading/language arts AA-AAAS. This will also impact evidence for related critical elements in sections 3 and 4. 		

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 MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or 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 MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">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>MSAA Timeline for adding in writing item samples to the MSAA PowerPoint by February 2018 and Practice site by June 2018.</p>	<p>Final slide on PowerPoint: Display new sample writing items to practice site June 2018.</p> <p>Evidence is not sufficient to meet the outstanding requirement.</p> <p>After the sample writing items are added to the practice test, MSAA should provide evidence that this work was done, and describe how the sample items reflect the different components of the writing assessment.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide, then State must):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that State established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the NCSC/MSAA assessments that include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence of a troubleshooting guide for the NCSC/MSAA 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. <p>Evidence of training to ensure consistency of administration across districts and schools.</p> <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that State established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the MSAA/NCSC assessments that include evidence of a policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration in writing (including the assessment delivery devices, accessibility tools and 		

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 MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
features available for students, and item formats) prior to testing.		
Section 2.3 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that State established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the MSAA/NCSC assessments that include evidence of a policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration in writing (including the assessment delivery devices, accessibility tools and features available for students, and item formats) prior to testing. 		

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
------------------	--	--

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>3.1 – 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>The State did not provide evidence in the February 2018 submission for this critical element.</p>	<p>No relevant evidence located.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the NCSC/MSAA, 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 effect other critical elements in sections 3 and 4.</p> <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</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 writing (ELA) content standards. Following that, the State will need to document adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		including evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards for writing. This will also affect other critical elements in sections 3 and 4.
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As noted in element 2.1, evidence that demonstrates its assessments measure the full breadth and depth of the State’s writing (ELA) content standards. 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 for writing. This will also affect other critical elements in sections 3 and 4. 		

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>The State did not provide evidence in the February 2018 submission for this critical element.</p>	<p>No relevant evidence located.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p> <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review: For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p>		
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1. 		

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 align="center">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>MSAA Graphics Resizing Change Order 2017</p>	<p>MSAA scrolling issue evidence (validity based on internal structure)--change orders and an amendment to the MSAA contract with Measured Progress were created to address the scrolling issue. The peers noted how timely this issue was addressed by the MSAA.</p> <p>The change order generally indicates how the MSAA addressed answer choice presentation and impact of scrolling, but no evidence details the impact(s) of the implemented change orders.</p> <p>The MSAA may wish to consider pilot studies to address impact before full consortium implementation.</p> <p>While the change order was submitted, it is not clear exactly how this will impact dimensionality. Evidence must be provided that illustrates and provides data regarding the impacts after the change order has been implemented. The MSAA must submit evidence that item response theory (IRT) assumptions of test unidimensionality are met.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the NCSC/MSAA, additional evidence that supports the internal structure of the tests, specifically a plan and timeline for documenting how the test meets item response theory (IRT) assumptions of test unidimensionality.</p> <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence of how NCSC will address answer choice presentation and impact of scrolling in the administration of the test as evidenced by NCSC 104 and MSAA11. 		
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</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><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence that item response theory (IRT) assumptions of test unidimensionality are met. 		

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 align="center">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 State did not provide evidence in the February 2018 submission for this critical element.</p>	<p>No relevant evidence located.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p> <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review: For the MSAA/ NCSC, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p>		
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the MSAA/ NCSC, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1. 		

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 align="center">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>The State did not provide evidence in the February 2018 submission for this critical element.</p>	<p>No relevant evidence located.</p> <p>MSAA indicated that constructed response writing items were field tested in 2017 and will be operational in 2018.</p> <p>When MSAA implements constructed response operational writing items, appropriate studies must be conducted to determine reliability.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p> <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If MSAA implements constructed response operational writing items, appropriate studies must be conducted to determine reliability. 		
<p>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When MSAA implements constructed response operational writing items, appropriate studies must be conducted to determine reliability. 		

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 align="center">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>The State did not provide evidence in the February 2018 submission for this critical element.</p>	<p>No relevant evidence located.</p> <p><i>Arizona Specific Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA) Policies – this document mentions training, but does not specify if the training includes training for scoring.</i></p> <p>It is unclear if these policies are just for AZ or for all MSAA states.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the NCSC/MSAA, evidence of documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols designed to produce reliable results and facilitate score interpretations for constructed-response items in reading/language arts and mathematics and also 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 model-data fit issue identified in item 3.3 has been resolved. <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</p> <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 reading/language arts and mathematics and also 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, and evaluation of inter-rater reliability. 		
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p> <p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evidence of documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols designed to produce reliable results and facilitate score interpretations for constructed-response items in reading/language arts and mathematics and also 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, and evaluation of inter-rater reliability. 		

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

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
------------------	--	--

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>Arizona Specific Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA) Policies</p> <p>Arizona – Multi State Alternate Assessment (MSAA) State Specific Guidance</p> <p>Accommodation Guidelines: <i>Selecting, Administering, and Evaluating Accommodations for Instruction and Assessment</i> July, 2017</p>	<p>EL Accommodations for MSAA--Any student that meets eligibility for the MSAA participation criteria will have access to the embedded accessibility tools including, Assessment Features, and Accommodations. If there is an additional tool or accommodation need, the Alternate Assessment Test Coordinator must contact the MSAA State Lead. This above section was also added into the MSAA State Specific Guidance Page for 2017.</p> <p>The procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s) and guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners should be expanded and strengthened, specifically with the addition of examples of accommodations decisions for sample profiles of students who are EL with disabilities that require them to take the MSAA.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide, then State must):</p> <p>For the NCSC/MSAA, evidence that 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); and Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); and • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. 		

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
Section 5.2 Summary Statement		
<u>X</u> 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
------------------	--	--

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 align="center">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>Accommodation Guidelines: <i>Selecting, Administering, and Evaluating Accommodations for Instruction and Assessment</i> July, 2017</p> <p>C.E. 5.3 MSAA AZ Accommodation Reliability from 2017</p>	<p>The Accommodations Guidelines provide discussion about the importance of accommodations not altering the construct being tested (p. 8) and about the difference between accommodations and modifications (p. 10-11).</p> <p>ADE provided a table of reliability based on all students, those using assistive response, scribe, and sign for each grade level. There was no discussion provided how this data ensures that the accommodations used do not alter the construct being assessed, and 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. However, the peers evaluated the data and determined that this data addressed this critical element.</p>

Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide, then State must):

- For both the NCSC/MSAA, evidence that the accommodations provided (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) 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 are available.
- For the NCSC/MSAA, 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.

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>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the accommodations provided do not alter the construct being assessed, and 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>		
<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
------------------	--	--

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 align="center">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>C.E. 6.4 MSAA Student Report 2017_2018 New Message 101617. See mock-up of last sentence. The letter will now state “If you require this letter or child’s report in a different format, please contact your child’s teacher or school”.</p> <p>C.E. 6.4 MSAA 2017 MSAA Test Administration Manual (TAM)3.3.17 (with Alternate Format Updates 101617)</p>	<p>There was no evidence located related to the process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</p> <p>Evidence was provided to verify 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.</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>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>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide, then State must):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the NCSC/MSAA evidence of a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. For the NCSC/MSAA, 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. <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</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, in a native language that parents can understand. No new relevant information was presented. 		
<p>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</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 		

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.