



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Sydnee Dickson
State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Utah State Office of Education
250 East 500 South, PO Box 144200
Salt Lake City, UT 84114

March 13, 2017

Dear Superintendent Dickson:

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). The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) maintains the essential requirements from NCLB that each State annually administer high-quality assessments in at least reading/language arts, mathematics, and science that meet nationally recognized professional and technical standards. Therefore, as you know, the Department reinstated peer review of state assessment systems so that each State receives feedback from external experts on the assessments it is currently administering. We appreciate the efforts required to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in June and August 2016. State assessment systems provide essential information that States, districts, principals, and teachers can use to identify the academic needs of students, target resources and supports toward students who need them most, evaluate school and program effectiveness, and close achievement gaps among students. A high-quality assessment system also provides useful information to parents about their 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.

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

- Reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8. **Substantially meets requirements.**
- R/LA and mathematics general assessments in high school. **Substantially meets requirements.**
- R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (Dynamic Learning Maps, Integrated Model, DLM-IM). **Substantially meets requirements.**
- Science general assessments in grades 3-5 and 6-9. **Substantially meets requirements.**
- Science general assessments in high school. **Partially meets requirements.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

/s/

Monique M. Chism Ph.D
Acting Assistant Secretary
Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Jo Ellen Shaeffer, Assessment Director

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

Critical element	Additional Evidence Needed
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students	<p>For the science general assessments in grade spans 3-5, 6-9 and 10-12, USOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of formal adoption of the State’s 2012 revised Earth Science standards.
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards	<p>For the science general assessments in grade spans 3-5, 6-9 and 10-12, USOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of coherent and rigorous academic content standards in science in high school. • Evidence of a timeline for implementation of science standards in high school.
1.3 – Required Assessments	<p>For the science general assessments in grade spans 10-12, USOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that clearly indicates which science test in high school is required for all students, or it must provide evidence that confirms that all four science tests are required for all students in high school.
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments	<p>For the science general assessments in grade spans 10-12, USOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of inclusion policies that clearly indicates which science test in high school is required for all students, or it must provide evidence that of inclusion policies that confirms that all four science tests are required for all students in high school.
1.5 – Participation Data	<p>For the science general assessments in grade spans 10-12, USOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that clearly indicates the participation of all students in the one science test in high school that the State requires for all students, or evidence that clearly indicates the participation of all students in all four science tests that are required for all students in high school.
2.1 – Test Design and Development	<p>For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS, and Science general assessments in grade spans 3-5, 6-9 and 10-12, USOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that State has plan addressed the need to increase the item pool and to improve the precision of the computer-adaptive (CAT) algorithms used. • Evidence that the R/LA assessment design measures the full breadth and depth of the State’s R/LA academic content standards, including the speaking and listening aspect of the standards. <p>For the DLM IM AA-AAAS, USOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See evidence requested under elements 3.1 and 4.1 below.
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration	<p>For the entire USOE assessment system, including both general and alternate assessments, USOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that monitoring of test administration is implemented in districts and schools throughout the State (e.g., include reports or summaries of findings of monitoring of test administrations for special populations, or a summary of findings and appropriate action steps

Critical element	Additional Evidence Needed
	following findings from such monitoring).
2.5 – Test Security	<p>For the entire USOE assessment system, including both general and alternate assessments, USOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of procedures for remediation following test irregularities, security breaches, or unauthorized access of the secure system.
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	<p>For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS, and Science in grade spans 3-5, 6-9 and 10-12, USOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that State has plan addressed the need to increase the item pool and to improve the precision of the CAT algorithms used, as noted in element 2.1. • Evidence of alignment for each general assessment for R/LA grades 4, 5, 6 and 8; and mathematics grades 3, 5, 7 and 8 (i.e., in each subject assessed, for each grade assessed). <p>For R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and HS (DLM-IM), USOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of analysis that supports the assumptions of testlet interchangeability across linkage levels used by the tests, including analysis of model fit. • Evidence that provides detailed descriptions of the routing pathways within and across essential elements (content domains).
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes	<p>For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS, and science in grade spans 3-5, 6-9 and 10-12, USOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State’s assessments tap the appropriate cognitive processes for each content area at each tested grade level.
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	<p>For R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and HS (DLM-IM), USOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of consistency and accuracy of classifications resulting from the tests. • Evidence of item-level data (e.g., factor loadings or item-total correlations), or comparable node-level data that support the internal structure of the tests. • Evidence that reliability estimates are based upon known item and testlet parameters.
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	<p>For R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and HS (DLM-IM), USOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.

Critical element	Additional Evidence Needed
4.1 – Reliability	<p>For R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and HS (DLM-IM), USOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence regarding reliability estimation, which will be satisfied by response to element 3.3. • Evidence regarding consistency and accuracy of classifications, which will be satisfied by response to element 3.3. • Evidence of model fit analysis, which will be satisfied by response to element 3.1.
4.4 – Scoring	<p>For R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and HS (DLM-IM), USOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of scoring reliability statistics for writing items based upon test administrator ratings. • Evidence of a detailed description of the calibration used in scoring software (e.g., field test versus operational calibration). • Evidence that distinguishes between option level scoring and item level scoring.
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	<p>For R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and HS (DLM-IM), USOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of analysis that supports the assumptions of testlet interchangeability, which will be satisfied by response to element 3.1.
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	<p>For R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and HS (DLM-IM), USOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of analysis that supports the assumptions of testlet interchangeability, which will be satisfied by response to element 3.1.
5.3 – Accommodations	<p>For the entire USOE assessment system, including both general and alternate assessments, USOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State has a process to review individually and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	<p>For the entire USOE assessment system, including both general and alternate assessments, USOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that monitoring consistent with this critical element is implemented in districts and schools throughout the State (e.g., include reports or summaries of findings of monitoring of test administrations for special populations, or a summary of findings and appropriate action steps following findings from such monitoring).
6.4 – Reporting	<p>For the entire USOE assessment system, including both general and alternate assessments, USOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that USOE follows a timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.

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

August 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

Note: Peer review notes provide the combined recommendations of the individual peers to the U.S. Department of Education (Department), based on the statute and regulations, 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 UTAH

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS . 3
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students 3
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards 4
1.3 – Required Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 5
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 6
1.5 – Participation Data (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 8

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS 9
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 9
2.2 – Item Development..... 11
2.3 – Test Administration 12
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)13
2.5 – Test Security 15
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 16

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 17
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 17
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 19
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure 20
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables 21

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER 22
4.1 – Reliability..... 22
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 23
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... 25
4.4 – Scoring 26
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 27
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment 28
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance 29

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS 30
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 30
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 32
5.3 – Accommodations..... 33
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations 34

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

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of 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 UTAH

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State.</p>	<p>DLM Peer Review Notes and the State’s own DLM documents.</p> <p>2014-15 SAGE Technical Report, Volume 1</p> <p>1.1 May 19 (State submitted commentary for this critical element)</p> <p>B6 Board Minutes August 2010, pp. 3-5</p> <p>General Assessment Evidence B2 Board Minutes October 2012, pp. 17-19</p> <p>C6 Utah Administrative Code R277-700</p> <p>Q21 Essential Elements Board Approval Nov 2012</p>	<p>As stated in Utah Administrative Code R277-700, content standards in language arts, mathematics, and science formally adopted by the State Board of Education are binding upon all public elementary and apply to all students.</p> <p>The State provided evidence that the science standards for all student populations have not changed since the last Peer Review in 2009. However, a minor change was made in October 2012, in response to feedback from the field that the existing Earth Science standards contained insufficient content. Also, in the CRESST Alignment Study, there was mention of newly adopted Utah Science Standards. Evidence is needed regarding the adoption of these new science standards. It is unclear if the State has a new science test blueprint aligned to the newly adopted science content standards. This would require an additional submission of alignment evidence for science.</p> <p>Utah was granted an ESEA flexibility waiver on June 29, 2012 indicating that we have “demonstrated that it has college and career-ready expectations for all student”. The State formally adopted the Essential Elements in English Language Arts and Mathematics on November 2, 2012.</p>
<p>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence is needed regarding the adoption of new science standards. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR UTAH

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science specify what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school to succeed in college and the workforce; contain content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.</p>	<p>DLM Peer Review Notes and the State’s own DLM documents.</p> <p>2014-15 SAGE Technical Report, Volume 1</p> <p>1.2 May 9 (State submitted commentary for this critical element)</p> <p>Q19 Development Process CCSS Initiative</p> <p>Q12.2 Math Advisory Committee Agenda</p> <p>Q12.1 Math Advisory Committee</p> <p>2013-14 SAGE Technical Report Vol. 1, pp 17-26</p>	<p>Language arts and mathematics specialists convened stakeholder committees consisting of LEA content area specialists, classroom teachers, university professors, industry leaders, and parents who found the Common Core State Standards to be coherent, rigorous, and appropriate for success in college and the workforce. Additionally, NGO and CCSSO engaged stakeholders in the standards development.</p> <p>Evidence is needed regarding the adoption of these new science standards. It is unclear if the State has a new science test blueprint aligned to the newly adopted science content standards. This would require an additional submission of alignment evidence for science. A timeline for implementation of the new science standards needs to be a part of the evidence.</p>
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence needs to be provided that the new recently adopted science standards contain content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement. A timeline for implementation of the new science standards needs to be a part of the 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 UTAH

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</p> <p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system; • For English learners (EL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment; ○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years. 	<p>Utah Administrative Code R277-404-3 Utah Legislative Code 53A-1-1111 Utah Participation and Accommodations Policy 2015–2016 p. 8–14 / Section 3 Utah Participation and Accommodations Policy 2015–2016 p. 20 / Section 6.1 Utah Special Education Rules p. 62 / III.J.2.g Midyear Summative Test Administrators Manual p. 8 / Accommodations Spring Summative Test Administrators Manual p. 8 / Accommodations Utah Participation and Accommodations Policy 2015–2016 p. 16 Utah Special Education Rules p. 110 / VI.A.1.b Utah Participation and Accommodations Policy 2015–2016 p. 15 / Section 4—guidelines for assessment of English Learners English Learner Master Plan p. 58 / Section 4.6.3—Guidelines for Assessment of English Language Learners Spedometer September 2014 pp. 2 & 19–27 p. 6 Spedometer October 2014 p. 2 Spedometer June 2015 p. 5 Spring Summative Training Slides 7–11, 17–36, & 51–54 Assessment Director Meetings schedules Assessment Changes and Accommodations Power Point Slides 10–13 Assessment Addendum DLM Accessibility Manual p. 13–21 USEAM meeting schedules/agendas</p>	<p>Evidence does not clearly indicate which science test in high school is required for all students; nor does it indicate that all four science subject area tests are required for all students. As such, the inclusion policies must clearly indicate that all students must participate in the one high school science test used for Federal accountability purposes, or that all students must participate in all four science high school tests.</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 UTAH

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> X_State must provide evidence that clearly indicates which science test (of four shown) in high school is required for all students, or it must provide evidence that confirms that all four science tests are required for all students in high school.</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 UTAH

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>1.5 – Participation Data</p> <p>The State’s participation data show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system. In addition, if the State administers end-of-course assessments for high school students, the State has procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates on each required assessment and provides the corresponding data.</p>	<p>Spring Summative Test Administration Manual p. 10–11</p> <p>SB 204: Parental Rights in Public Education Amendments</p>	<p>Evidence does not clearly indicate which science test in high school is required for all students; nor does it indicate that all four science subject area tests are required for all students. As such, the participation evidence must clearly indicate that all students participate in the one high school science test used for Federal accountability purposes, or that all students participate in all four science high school tests.</p>
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u>X</u> Additional evidence is needed that clearly indicates that all students participate in the one high school science test used for Federal accountability purposes, or that all students participate in all four science high school tests.</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 UTAH

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.1 – Test Design and Development 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>DLM Peer Review Notes and the State’s own DLM documents.</p> <p>2014-14 SAGE Technical Report, Volume 1</p> <p>2.1 May 20 RR (State submitted commentary for this critical element)</p> <p>S2 SAGE RFP</p> <p>W3 USOE SAGE Website</p> <p>Q19 Development Process CCSS Initiative</p> <p>A1.1 2013-14 SAGE Technical Report Executive Summary</p> <p>CRS1 CRESST Alignment Study</p> <p>AIR SAGE Config Summary 19MAY2016</p> <p>L3 Utah Legislative Code 53A-1-S603L4</p> <p>S25 SAGE Portal Website</p> <p>2013-14 SAGE Technical Report Vol. 1, pp. 1-24 2013-14 SAGE Technical Report Vol. 2, pp.2-24</p> <p>S18 SAGE Item Specs</p>	<p>The Peers noted that the number of items varied across grade levels for the computer adaptive tests and were fewer in the upper grades. Monitoring the item pool and item selection processes will be critical as the State moves forward. Evidence of a comprehensive plan for increasing the number of items in the item banks in order to support the intended uses of the assessments was not presented.</p> <p>As noted by the authors of the CRESST Alignment Study, evidence is needed that documents the State’s plan for addressing the need to increase the item pool and improve the precision of the algorithm used for all three content area assessments. An example is that the CRESST authors noticed that there needs be an increase in items at level 3 DOK for all three content areas.</p> <p>Particular attention needs to be focused on science in regard to evidence of item alignment to the new science standards, including DOK. It is unclear if the State has a new science test blueprint aligned to the newly adopted science content standards. This would require an additional submission of alignment evidence for science.</p> <p>While alignment evidence was presented for grades 3, 7, and 11 in ELA; 4, 6, and 9 for mathematics, and 5, 8 and biology in science, evidence for all grade level assessments in all content areas needs to be provided.</p>
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alignment evidence, related to an alignment study, for all grade level assessments in all content needs to be provided. (The CRESST Alignment Study provided evidence for only 3 grade levels in each content area.) • Evidence is needed that documents the State’s plan for addressing the need to increase the item pool and improve the precision of the algorithm used for 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of 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 UTAH

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
all three content area 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 UTAH

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.2 – Item Development</p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p>See DLM Peer Review Notes and the State’s own DLM documents.</p> <p>2014-15 SAGE Technical Report, Volume 1</p> <p>2.2 May 20 RR (State submitted commentary for this critical element)</p> <p>A3.17 Appendix D SAGE Technical Report Volume 2 (item writing specifications)</p> <p>S16 SAGE Item Development Procedures</p> <p>S20 Item Writing Training Materials</p> <p>2013-14 SAGE Technical Report Vol. 1, p 73</p> <p>2013-14 SAGE Technical Report Vol. 2, pp 33-46</p> <p>2013-14 SAGE Technical Report Vol. 4, pp 5-21</p>	<p>No additional evidence is required.</p>
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for Utah.</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 UTAH

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>See DLM Peer Review Notes and the State’s own DLM documents.</p> <p>2014-14 SAGE Technical Report, Volume 1</p> <p>2.3 May 24 (State submitted commentary for this critical element)</p> <p>MS1 Midyear Summative Test Administration Manual SS1 Spring Summative Test Administration Manual P8.11 p 19 Sec 6 Participation and Accommodations Policy P8.19 Participation and Accommodation Policy S6 pp 25-39</p> <p>C1.3 Utah Administrative Code R277-404-4 & 5 MS2 Midyear Summative Training SS2 Spring Summative Training A4.3 SAGE Technical Report Vol. 3, section 4 AD5 Assessment Director Meeting December 17 slide 42</p> <p>S1 AIR Contract SAGE Braille Certification manual</p> <p>E1.1 Testing Ethics Policy E2 Testing Ethics Policy Signature Page E4 Testing Ethics Policy Training</p>	<p>The training provided to the LEA assessment directors by the Utah State Board of Education (USBE) is taken by assessment directors and provided to the school personnel involved in the administration of the SAGE assessments (C1.3).</p> <p>LEA attendance is tracked at the SAGE trainings and follow up is done with LEA assessment directors who are not in attendance (S37).</p> <p>Though the State has a contingency plan for short-term interruptions, a plan to address a catastrophic, system-wide interruption is needed.</p>
<p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Though the State has a contingency plan for short-term interruptions, a plan to address a system-wide interruption is needed. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR UTAH

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p>Utah Administrative Code R277-404 Whole Document</p> <p>Mid-Year Summative Training Whole Document</p> <p>Spring Summative Training Whole Document</p> <p>SAGE ORS User Guide p. 65–78</p> <p>Summative Summary Sample Whole Document</p> <p>Testing Ethics Policy Whole Document</p> <p>Spring Summative Test Administration Manual Whole Document</p> <p>SAGE TIDE User Guide Whole Document</p> <p>SAGE Test Administrator User Guide Whole Document</p> <p>Utah Administrative Code R277-404-8-3 Section 8-3</p> <p>SAGE Braille Requirements and Testing Manual Whole Document</p> <p>SAGE Training Attendance Logs Whole Document</p> <p>Utah Administrative Code R277-404-4 p. 4</p> <p>Procedures for Monitoring SAGE Test Administration Whole Document</p> <p>Educator Misconduct Form Whole Document</p> <p>SAGE TIDE User Roles</p> <p>Testing Ethics Policy p. 7</p> <p>Utah Administrative Code R277-484-3 Whole Document</p> <p>Sample LEA Testing Plans Whole Document</p> <p>SAGE Help Desk Log Whole Document</p> <p>DLM test administration weekly update</p> <p>USED Letter DLM</p> <p>UAA Approval Letter</p>	<p>The state should provide evidence that monitoring procedures are implemented in districts and schools (e.g., summary reports of monitoring, reports of follow up actions).</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 UTAH

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
_ x The State should provide additional evidence that monitoring of test administration is implemented in districts and schools.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR UTAH

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.5 – Test Security</p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. 	<p>See DLM Peer Review Notes and the State’s own DLM documents.</p> <p>2014-14 SAGE Technical Report, Volume 1</p> <p>2.5 final draft (State submitted commentary for this critical element)</p> <p>C1.2 Utah Administrative Code R277-404-3 & 4 E1.1 Testing Ethics Policy E2 Testing Ethics Policy Signature Page E4 Testing Ethics Policy Training A4.5 SAGE Technical Report Vol. 3 Section 5 S27 SAGE Secure Browser Manual</p> <p>E4.1 Testing Ethics Policy Training 8 Q1 Educator Misconduct Form S9 SAGE Cheating Analysis E4.1 Testing Ethics Policy Training 8</p> <p>AD1 New AD Meeting August 2015 2.5 final draft, p. 6-7</p> <p>C5 Utah Administrative Code R277-106 2.5 final draft, p. 5-7</p> <p>S1 AIR Contract</p>	<p>The State presented a remediation plan that appears to be more of a disciplinary plan. Evidence of an ongoing remediation plan for the SAGE is needed. An example of such a plan is the DLM plan for remediation that includes a communication plan in lieu of test irregularities, security breaches or if unauthorized personnel are requesting access.</p>
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A comprehensive remediation plan that includes a communication plan addressing a course of action in lieu of test irregularities, security breaches or unauthorized personnel requesting access. 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of 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 UTAH

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 	<p>See DLM Peer Review Notes and the State’s own DLM documents.</p> <p>2014-14 SAGE Technical Report, Volume 1</p> <p>2.6 final draft (State submitted commentary for this critical element)</p> <p>S4 Affidavit of Nondisclosure AIR</p> <p>Q33 NDA Form USOE</p> <p>Q64 User Roles and Access 2015-20161</p> <p>A4.4 SAGE Technical Report Volume 3 p. 9-15</p> <p>E1 Testing Ethics Policy</p> <p>E2 Testing Ethics Signature Form</p> <p>E4 Testing Ethics Policy Training</p> <p>S1.1 AIR Amendment 2</p> <p>C3 Utah Administrative Code R277-487</p> <p>Q52 Student Privacy Presentation</p> <p>Q53 Student Privacy Terms and Conditions or Attachment for Contracts</p>	<p>The Utah State Office of Education (USOE) content specialist are the only individuals who have access our vendor’s Item Tracking System (ITS). This system requires individualized passwords and utilizes strong encryption in order to keep the test items secure.</p> <p>No additional evidence is required.</p>
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for Utah.</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 UTAH

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. 	<p>DLM Peer Review Notes and the State’s own DLM documents.</p> <p>2014-14 SAGE Technical Report, Volume 1</p> <p>3.1 Combined May 23 (State submitted commentary for this critical element)</p> <p>A3.2 pp 2-15 SAGE Technical Report Vol. 2</p> <p>CRS1 CRESST Alignment Study AIR SAGE Config Summary 19MAY2016</p> <p>CRS1 CRESST Alignment Study Utah Appendix 20May2016</p> <p>CRS2 CRESST Appendix</p> <p>CRS2 CRESST Study 2</p> <p>T5 TAC minutes May 2016</p>	<p>Related to CRS1 CRESST Alignment Study AIR SAGE Config Summary 19MAY2016, p10, it was unclear to reviewers, how a mismatch occurred between the blueprint configurations sent by AIR to CRESST and the AIR technical report. An explanation that clarifies how this happened is needed.</p> <p>The Peers noted that the number of items varied across grade levels for the computer adaptive tests and were lower in the upper grades. Monitoring the item pool and item selection processes will be critical as the State moves forward. Evidence of a comprehensive plan for increasing the number of items in the item banks in order to support the intended uses of the assessments was not presented.</p> <p>As noted by the authors of the CRESST Alignment Study, evidence is needed that documents the State’s plan for addressing the need to increase the item pool and improve the precision of the algorithm used for all three content area assessments. An example is that the CRESST authors noticed that there needs be an increase in items at level 3 DOK for all three content areas.</p> <p>Particular attention needs to be focused on science in regard to evidence of item alignment to the new science standards, including DOK. It is unclear if the State has a new science test blueprint aligned to the newly adopted science content standards. This would require an additional submission of alignment evidence for science.</p> <p>While alignment evidence was presented for grades</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 UTAH

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		3, 7, and 11 in ELA; 4, 6, and 9 for mathematics, and 5, 8 and biology in science, evidence for all grade level assessments needs to be provided.
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An explanation is needed regarding how the mismatch between the blueprint configurations sent by AIR to CRESST and the AIR technical report occurred. • A plan for increasing the item pool and improving the precision of the algorithm for all three content area assessments is needed to support the intended uses of the assessment. 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of 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 UTAH

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>DLM Peer Review Notes and the State’s own DLM documents.</p> <p>2014-15 SAGE Technical Report, Volume 1</p> <p>3.2 May 17 (State submitted commentary for this critical element)</p> <p>CRS1 CRESST Alignment Study AIR SAGE Config. Summary 19MAY2016</p> <p>T5 TAC minutes May 2016, p. 6</p> <p>2013-14 SAGE Technical Report Vol. 1, pp. 49-50</p> <p>2013-14 SAGE Technical Report Vol. 2, Appx. A, C, & D</p> <p>2013-14 SAGE Technical Report Volume 4, pp 5-6 & 27-28, Appx. G</p> <p>S21 SAGE Item Writing Workshop PPT</p>	<p>The CRESST Alignment Study identify weaknesses and issues that the State needs to address to document adequate validity evidence related to the existence of intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards. The Peers recommend that the State re-examine weaknesses identified in the evidence submitted for this critical element. Clarification of the evidence of validity that the State’s assessments tap the appropriate cognitive processes for each grade is needed. This may include evidence from the planned cognitive labs (CRESST Alignment Study).</p>
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of validity that demonstrates that the State’s assessments tap the appropriate cognitive processes for each content area at each tested grade level is needed. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR UTAH

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p>DLM Peer Review Notes and the State’s own DLM documents.</p> <p>2014-15 SAGE Technical Report, Volume 1</p> <p>3 3 May 21 (State submitted commentary for this critical element)</p> <p>Q 14</p> <p>2013-14 SAGE Technical Report Volume 4, Appendix E</p>	<p>Peers noted the low level of validity in some content areas at the sub-domain level and see that there are efforts being made to address this issue.</p> <p>Peers also noted plans for increasing the number of items in the item pool (2013-14 Technical Report, Volume 1, p. 10 & 17).</p> <p>No additional evidence is required.</p>
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for Utah.</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 UTAH

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>DLM Peer Review Notes and the State’s own DLM documents.</p> <p>2014-15 SAGE Technical Manual, Volume 1</p> <p>3.4 May 10 (State submitted commentary for this critical element)</p> <p>2013-14 SAGE Technical Report Volume 4</p> <p>Q9 Relationship Analyses between SAGE Scores and Course Grades</p> <p>Q10 Relationship Analyses between SAGE Scores and Other Assessment</p>	<p>No additional evidence is required.</p>
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for Utah.</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 UTAH

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.1 – Reliability</p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement. 	<p>DLM Peer Review Notes and the State’s own DLM documents.</p> <p>2014-15 SAGE Technical Manual, Volume 1</p> <p>4 1 Final (State submitted commentary for this critical element)</p> <p>Q14 2013-2014 SAGE Technical Report Vol. 1</p> <p>2013-14 SAGE Technical Report Vol. 4, pp 31-3, Appx. A</p> <p>CRS2 CRESST Utah Alignment Study 2 20May2016</p> <p>Q13 2013-2014 Marginal Reliability Coefficients for Overall and by Subgroup</p> <p>S1.2 AIR Contract Amendment 3</p> <p>B7 Board Minutes April 2016</p> <p>T4 TAC Agenda January 2016</p>	<p>2013-14 SAGE Technical Manual, pp. 10-17, Future field test item development continues to augment the benchmarks with limited items in the pool.</p> <p>The Peers reviewed the differences in the 2014 and 2015 Secondary Mathematics I, II, and III results for subgroups and noted the differences in performance, as noted in the final letter, from 0.08 to 0.39 and recognized the work this represents.</p> <p>4.1.2 For Special Populations and some sub-groups for the high school mathematics, the high standard error of measurement reflects the low number and high variability from on test taker to the next.</p> <p>The conditional standard errors of measurement for accountability subgroups across the entire range of test scores can be seen in Appendix B of document A5.15. Because some subgroups have more students on the extremes, their conditional standard errors of measurement tend to be somewhat larger than for other subgroups. This trend is also documented in the 2014-15 SAGE results with the standard errors improving in the current report.</p> <p>No additional evidence is required.</p>
<p>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</p> <p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required for Utah.</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 UTAH

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>DLM Peer Review Notes and the State’s own DLM documents.</p> <p>2014-15 SAGE Technical Manual, Volume 1</p> <p>4.2 May 18 (State submitted commentary for this critical element)</p> <p>2013-14 SAGE Technical Report Executive Summary, pp 1-5</p> <p>2013-14 SAGE Technical Report Vol. 1, pp 16, 29-41</p> <p>2013-14 SAGE Technical Report Vol. 2, pp 29-46, Appendix A, B, C</p> <p>2013-14 SAGE Technical Report Vol. 3, pp 17-20</p> <p>2013-14 SAGE Technical Report Vol. 4, pp 2-5, 50-51</p> <p>S21 SAGE Item Writing Workshop PPT</p> <p>S15 SAGE Item Development Participation Rolls</p> <p>S22 SAGE LABS Participant Demographics</p>	<p>A relatively large number of ELA items were flagged for differential item functioning compared with math and science items. A large percentage of flagged ELA items indicated DIF for special education students (41%), Hispanic students (25%), and low-income students (24%). Only 8% of ELA items flagged indicated DIF for limited English proficient students (2014-15 SAGE Technical Report, p.34).</p> <p>As previously indicated, all field-tested items had already been reviewed and approved for field test administration by the Content and Fairness Advisory Committee (CFAC). Any field test items that were flagged for any out-of-range statistics were further reviewed by the Content Data Review Committee and the Fairness Data Review Committee. The Content Data Review Committee consisted of USOE curriculum and assessment specialists as well as a few content area teachers. The Fairness Data Review Committee included community members, teachers, and USOE content area experts. Appendix L includes the PowerPoint presentations used to train committee members on evaluating items for content and fairness. Table 24 summarizes the number of rejected items by item type, and Appendix M details which items were rejected and at which committee (2014-15 SAGE Technical Report, p.39)</p> <p>The Content Data Review Committee reviewed the items flagged for item difficulty, item discrimination, and item fit index. Committee members examined the items for any indication that item content or construction might have caused the items to perform unexpectedly. For each rejected</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 UTAH

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>item, the committee provided the content reason for the rejection. USOE and AIR content specialists reviewed the reasons and incorporated the reasons into the future item development process.</p> <p>Fairness Data Review Committee Meeting</p> <p>The Fairness Data Review Committee reviewed items flagged for DIF. For each flagged item, committee members reevaluated whether the item violated any of the bias and sensitivity guidelines, which may have given rise to differential item functioning. Any item violating the bias and sensitivity guidelines were rejected from the pool. (2014-15 SAGE Technical Report, p.39)</p> <p>No additional evidence is required.</p>
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required for Utah.</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 UTAH

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>DLM Peer Review Notes and the State’s own DLM documents.</p> <p>2014-15 SAGE Technical Manual, Volume 1</p> <p>4.3 Peer Review Final Draft (State submitted commentary for this critical element)</p> <p>2013-14 SAGE Technical Report Vol. 1 pp 17-26</p> <p>A5.16 2013-14 SAGE Technical Report Vol. 4, pp 33-37</p> <p>Q37 PowerPoint from DOK Training Workshops</p> <p>B7 Board Minutes April 2016</p>	<p>No additional evidence is required.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for Utah.</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 UTAH

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>DLM Peer Review Notes and the State’s own DLM documents.</p> <p>2014-15 SAGE Technical Manual, Volume 1</p> <p>4 4 May 23 (State submitted commentary for this critical element)</p> <p>2013-14 SAGE Technical Report Vol. 1 Section 7, 9.1, 9.2, 11.2, Appx. J, K</p> <p>2013-14 SAGE Technical Report Vol. 2 Sec. 3.4.2, 3.4.5</p> <p>2013-14 SAGE Technical Report Vol. 5 Appendix A</p> <p>Q20 DRC Training Materials</p> <p>Q35 OPTION 1 One-Year Look Data Reflection Slides (FINAL) 2015-05-06</p> <p>Q43 Sample Writing Individual Student Report</p> <p>Q69 Writing Standards and Rubric</p> <p>SS1.6 Spring Summative Test Administration Manual p.15</p>	<p>The Q 35 PowerPoint has good representation of the meaning of a scale score and shows the range of scores and proficiency levels clearly.</p> <p>No additional evidence is required.</p>
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for Utah.</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 UTAH

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p>DLM Peer Review Notes and the State’s own DLM documents.</p> <p>2014-15 SAGE Technical Manual, Volume 1</p> <p>4.5 (State submitted commentary for this critical element)</p> <p>2013-14 SAGE Technical Report Vol. 1 Section 3.2, 8.1, Appx. H</p> <p>Q22 Evaluating Item Parameter Drift</p> <p>S1 AIR Contract</p> <p>S34 SAGE Test Blueprints</p> <p>T3 TAC Minutes January 2016</p>	<p>No additional evidence is required.</p>
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for Utah.</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 UTAH

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<p>DLM Peer Review Notes and the State’s own DLM documents.</p> <p>2014-15 SAGE Technical Manual, Volume 1</p> <p>4.6 (State submitted commentary for this critical element)</p> <p>2013-14 SAGE Technical Report Vol. 2 Section 3, 4, 5</p> <p>2013-14 SAGE Technical Report Vol. 3 section 3</p> <p>Q34 Operating System Effects on Testing</p> <p>Q57 System Requirements for online Testing 2015-2016</p> <p>S8 Braille Requirements and Testing Manual</p> <p>SS2 Spring Summative Training</p>	<p>No additional evidence is required.</p>
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for Utah.</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 UTAH

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p>DLM Peer Review Notes and the State’s own DLM documents.</p> <p>2014-15 SAGE Technical Manual, Volume 1</p> <p>4.7 May 23 (State submitted commentary for this critical element)</p> <p>Q23 Excerpt from Contract with Center</p> <p>Q51 Standards review process</p> <p>2013-14 Technical Manual, Volume 1, p. 50</p> <p>S3 AIR Technical Proposal</p> <p>T1 TAC Purpose</p>	<p>The test data files are routinely extracted throughout the testing window to monitor the quality assurance check, such as blueprint match rate, item exposure rate, item statistics, etc., for early detection of any unexpected issues. Any deviations, from the expected outcome are flagged, investigated, and resolved (4.7 May 23 Final Review).</p> <p>The Utah TAC consists of USOE employees and independent psychometricians and is facilitated by the Center for Assessment. The following are examples of changes made to the assessment and which were advised by the TAC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To respond to feedback that the SAGE tests were too long, the passages associated with writing prompts were reduced in size. This required hand scoring of the new prompts and equating between the old and new prompts. • The secondary mathematics tests were shortened from 50 questions to 40. This was done after the TAC advised that the reliability of the scores (and subscores) would not be adversely affected. • In the 2014 administration of SAGE, many tests were not finished to completion and therefore received no score. With the TAC’s recommendation, the policy was changed so that tests, which were completed to 85% would be scored based on the existing responses (4.7 May 23 Final Review). <p>No additional evidence is required.</p>
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for Utah.</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 UTAH

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards; • States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs; • Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment • Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities; • Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities; • Includes instructions that students eligible to be 	<p>DLM Peer Review Notes and the State’s own DLM documents.</p> <p>2014-15 SAGE Technical Manual, Volume 1</p> <p>5 1 Final Draft (State submitted commentary for this critical element)</p> <p>5.1 pp 90-100 Utah State Systemic Improvement Plan</p> <p>Q5.2 pp 100 Utah State Systemic Improvement AA1 Assessment Addendum</p> <p>D1.1 pp 90-94 Teaching with the Essential Elements</p> <p>Q15 2014 Summative Training Plan</p> <p>MS1.1 pp 8-12 Midyear Summative Test Administration Manual</p> <p>SS1.1 pp 8-12 Spring Summative Test Administration Manual</p> <p>5.1 Accommodation Policy, pp 22-35</p> <p>Participation and Accommodations Policy p. 8 – 14, 17, 21, 35, 43 Policy</p> <p>Q4.1 pp 62 Utah Special Education Rules</p> <p>Q49 Standards Based IEP Memo</p>	<p>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 UTAH

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student's achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State's general assessments); The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum. 	<p>Q26 pp 4-5 Graduation Guidelines For Students with Disabilities</p> <p>Q61 pp 9 UAA Manual</p> <p>Q66 UPIPS Manual p.20</p> <p>Q68 Writing Essential Element Based Annual Goals and Short Term Objectives</p>	
<p>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for Utah.</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 UTAH

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>DLM Peer Review Notes and the State’s own DLM documents.</p> <p>2014-15 SAGE Technical Manual, Volume 1</p> <p>5.2 final draft (State submitted commentary for this critical element)</p> <p>M1 English Learner Master Plan</p> <p>5.2 pp 35-36 Accommodation Policy</p> <p>2013-14 SAGE Technical Report Volume 1 p 13, Appx. E, K</p> <p>2013-14 SAGE Technical Report Vol. 3 Sec. 3 p. 3-6</p> <p>D14.2 pp 13-30 DLM Accessibility Manual</p> <p>AD1 New AD Training</p> <p>L1 Utah Legislative Code 53A-1-1111</p> <p>Participation and Accommodations Policy p. 8, 16, 21, 22, 25-36</p> <p>Q7.1 p16 NCLB Standards and Assessment, pp. 16, 19</p> <p>Q27 Guidance Inclusion of ELs with Disabilities SM2 Spedometer Sept. 2014 p. 2, 19-27</p> <p>SS1.2 pp 8-9 Spring Summative Test Administration Manual</p> <p>SS2 Spring Summative Training</p>	<p>No additional evidence is required.</p>
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required for Utah.</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 UTAH

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities (SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 	<p>DLM Peer Review Notes and the State’s own DLM documents.</p> <p>2014-15 SAGE Technical Manual, Volume 1</p> <p>5.3 Final (State submitted commentary for this critical element)</p> <p>AA1 Assessment Addendum</p> <p>CU Calculator Usage</p> <p>D14.1 DLM Accessibility Manual</p> <p>M1.2 English Learner Master Plan p. 58-61 MS1.2 SAGE Test Administrators Manual (Midyear Summative) pp.9-10</p> <p>Utah Accommodations and Participation Policy 2015-2016 pp 8, 19-42</p> <p>Q3 Scribe Accommodations Guidelines Q4.1 Utah Special Education Rules p. 62 Q16 504 Guidelines p. 33 and 37-57 Q17 Assisting Special Education Students (CCSSO or ASES) Accommodation Manual 3rd Edition</p> <p>SSS1.4 SAGE Test Administrators Manual (Spring Summative) pp. 9-10</p>	<p>Evidence was not provided to Peers that the State has a process to review individually and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</p>
<p>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the State has a process to review individually 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 UTAH

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodation • 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>DLM Peer Review Notes and the State’s own DLM documents.</p> <p>2014-15 SAGE Technical Manual, Volume 1</p> <p>5.4 final draft (State submitted commentary for this critical element)</p> <p>5.4 p 9 Spring Summative TAM</p> <p>SS1.3 Spring Summative Test Administration Manual</p> <p>C1.2 Utah Administrative Code R277-404-4</p> <p>P8.1 Utah Participation and Accommodations</p> <p>Q3 Scribe Accommodations Guidelines</p> <p>Q25 General Education Teacher Questionnaire</p> <p>Q47 Special Education Teacher Questionnaire</p> <p>Q59 Test Administration Observation</p> <p>5.4 final draft, p. 6</p>	<p>No additional evidence is required.</p>
<p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for Utah.</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 UTAH

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; • The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels. 	<p>DLM Peer Review Notes and the State’s own DLM documents.</p> <p>2014-15 SAGE Technical Manual, Volume 1</p> <p>6.1 final draft (State submitted commentary for this critical element)</p> <p>B1 Board Minutes September 2014</p> <p>2013-14 SAGE Technical Report Volume 6</p> <p>S26 SAGE Results Companion Document</p>	<p>Evidence is needed regarding the adoption of these new science standards. It is unclear if the State has a new science test blueprint aligned to the newly adopted science content standards. This would require an additional submission that would include adopted academic achievement standards for science for all of the grade levels tested.</p> <p>No additional evidence is required.</p>
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for Utah.</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 UTAH

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p>DLM Peer Review Notes and the State’s own DLM documents.</p> <p>2014-15 SAGE Technical Manual, Volume 1</p> <p>6 2 final (State submitted commentary for this critical element)</p> <p>Q2 Egan, Schneider and Ferrara (2012)</p> <p>A7.0 SAGE Technical Report Volume 6</p> <p>B3 Board Minutes November 2013</p> <p>B5 Board Minutes May 2014</p> <p>Q11.1 USOE PLD Technical Report</p> <p>Q41 Review of Utah PLDs</p> <p>Q48 Standard Setting Technical Report</p> <p>Q67 Utah SAGE Range Descriptor Writing Workshop v3</p> <p>T2 TAC Minutes Jan 2014</p>	<p>It is unclear if the State has a new science test blueprint aligned to the newly adopted science content standards. This would require an additional submission that would need to include adopted academic achievement standards and cut scores for science for all of the grade levels tested.</p> <p>No additional evidence is required.</p>
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for Utah.</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 UTAH

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p>DLM Peer Review Notes and the State’s own DLM documents.</p> <p>2014-15 SAGE Technical Manual, Volume 1</p> <p>6 3 final (State submitted commentary for this critical element)</p> <p>Q10 Relationship Analyses between SAGE Scores and Other Assessment</p> <p>A5.5 SAGE Technical Report Volume 4</p> <p>2013-14 SAGE Technical Report Volume 6</p> <p>Q11.2 USOE PLD Technical Report</p> <p>6.3 charts</p>	<p>No additional evidence is required.</p>
<p>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for Utah.</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 UTAH

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.4 – Reporting</p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration; • The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results; • The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement; ○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors); ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; ○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to 	<p>DLM Peer Review Notes and the State’s own DLM documents.</p> <p>2014-15 SAGE Technical Manual, Volume 1</p> <p>6.4 Final Draft (State submitted commentary for this critical element)</p> <p>2013-14 SAGE Technical Report Volume 5</p> <p>FW</p> <p>S1 AIR Contract S1.2 AIR Contract Amendment</p> <p>Q6 Special Education Alternate Assessment Proficiency Spreadsheet</p> <p>Q8.1 Parent Interpretive Guide 2014-15 English Q8.2 Parent Interpretive Guide 2014-15 Spanish</p> <p>Q29 Learning the Online Reporting System</p> <p>Q35 OPTION 1 One-Year Look Data Reflection Slides (FINAL) 2015-05-06</p> <p>Q60 The Principals Assessment and Using SAGE Data presentation</p> <p>S28 SAGE Student Level Report Family Guide (Spanish)</p> <p>S28.1 SAGE Student Level Report Family Guide</p> <p>TW1 Training Worksheet ELA Data Dive for Teachers</p>	<p>Peers were not able to locate evidence of a timeline for the delivery of individual student reports. Evidence of timely reporting needs to be provided.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR UTAH

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. 	<p>TW2 Training Worksheet – Literacy</p> <p>TW3 Training Worksheet Math Data Dive for Teachers</p> <p>TW4 Training Worksheet Science Data Dive for Teachers</p>	
<p>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of a timeline for the delivery of individual student reports. 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of 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

June 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes DLM Integrated Consortium Evidence



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 DLM INTEGRATED

Contents

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS 3
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 3
2.2 – Item Development..... 6
2.3 – Test Administration 8
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)12
2.5 – Test Security 14
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 17

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 19
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 19
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 22
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure 25
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables 27

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER 28
4.1 – Reliability..... 28
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 31
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... 33
4.4 – Scoring 34
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 36
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment 38
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance..... 40

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS 42
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 42
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 46
5.3 – Accommodations..... 48
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations 51

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 53
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students
..... 53
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 54
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 56
6.4 – Reporting..... 58

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of 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 DLM Integrated

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Mathematics Testlets (p. 56) ii) Development of the Essential Elements (pp. 38-41) iii) Review of the Assessment Structure (pp. 37-38) iv) Test Blueprints (pp. 41-45) v) English Language Arts Reading Testlets (pp. 48-51) vi) Guiding Principles (p. 42-43) <p>English Language Arts Writing Testlets (pp. 52-54)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9) FILE 08 Essential Elements ELA 10) FILE 09 Essential Elements Math 11) FILE 10 Blueprint ELA 12) FILE 11 Blueprint Math <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 13) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Chapter I: Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Theory of Action (pp. 5-8) b) Chapter III: Item and Test Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Items and Testlets (p. 46) ii) Review of Assessment Structure (pp. 37-38) iii) Essential Element Concept Maps for Testlet Development (pp. 61-65) c) Chapter IV: Test Administration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Overview of Accessibility Supports (p. 131) 14) FILE 05 Test Administration Manual 2014-15 	<p>problematic. Peers suggested that these EEs could be assessed by teacher administration rather than computer administration.</p> <p>Peers are not clear on the rationales for omitting certain EEs from the assessment and potential impact of these omissions on measuring the full range of content standards.</p> <p>Peers noted that DLM node-based structure provides a visual display of the pathways that lead to higher order thinking skills. The DLM structure demonstrates how students are assessed on the component skills that build to the higher order thinking skills to which the assessment is aligned.</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 DLM Integrated

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design. 	<p>How the Assessment Systems Works (pp. 16-20)</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Item Pool and Selection Procedures</p> <hr/> <p>15) FILE06TechnicalManual2014- 15</p> <p>Chapter III: Item and Test Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Operational Assessment Items for 2014-2015 (pp. 103-108) b) Alternate Testlets for Students who are Blind or have Visual Impairments (pp. 60-61) c) The First Contact Survey (pp. 84-86) <p>16) Chapter IV: Test Administration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Testlet Selection During Instructionally Embedded Assessment (pp. 115-118) <p>17) Testlet Assignment During the Spring Window (pp. 118-120)</p> <hr/>	<p>The documentation describes testlet selection, rather than item selection. The bank has a total of 2,220 testlets across grades and content areas and Peers noted that this number of testlets may not be sufficient to support all of the grades and linkage levels of assessment without overexposure of testlets.</p> <p>Peers noted that the DCM model appears to support the test design and the testlet development from a theoretical perspective. A potential concern is whether the selection of the testlets and number of testlets administered is appropriate in practice, because of the dependence of the system on teacher input and their understanding of the overall assessment system. Teachers must be well trained and well-prepared for this task. Teachers could benefit from a feedback system that would help them develop the skills needed to operationalize this assessment.</p> <p>Peers expressed some concerns regarding assumptions regarding item fungibility and model fit. See sections 3.3 and 4.1 for a discussion of the evidence required to address this issue.</p>
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>X___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: See comments above regarding item fungibility and item fit, further described in section 3.3 and 4.1.</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 DLM Integrated

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.2 – Item Development</p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Chapter I: Introduction <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Assessments (p. 20-21) b) Chapter III: Item and Test Development <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Items and Testlets (p. 46) ii. General Testlet Structure and Item Types (pp. 47-48) iii. Review of Assessment Structure (pp. 37-38) iv. Item Writing Process (pp. 70-71) v. Item Writing Resource Materials (p. 70) vi. Item Writer Characteristics (pp. 66-69) vii. Item Writer Training (pp. 69-70) viii. Essential Element Concept Maps for Testlet Development (pp. 61-65) ix. Alternate Testlets for Students who are Blind or Have Visual Impairments (pp. 60-61) x. Student Performance Within and Across Complexity Bands (pp. 87-89) xi. Overview of the Testlet Development Process (pp. 46-47) xii. Overview of the Review Process (pp. 76-77) xiii. Review Assignments and Training (pp. 77-78) xiv. Results of Reviews (p. 82) xv. Educator Survey (pp. 90-94) c) Chapter IV: Test Administration 	<p>Peers thought the item development process was clearly described and documented.</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 DLM Integrated

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"> i. Overview of Accessibility Supports (pp. 131-132) <p>Chapter IX: Validity Studies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Student Cognitive Labs (pp. 224) ii. External Alignment Study (pp. 215-221) <p>2) FILE 18 Supplemental Evidence Related to Test Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Planning a Testlet (pp. 9-10) <p>Accessibility (pp. 11-15)</p> <p>3) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Chapter III: Item and Test Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Decisions and Criteria (p. 78-82) ii. Description of Field Tests (pp. 95-98) iii. Overview of the Testlet Development Process (pp. 46-47) iv. External Reviews (pp. 75-76) v. Field Testing (pp. 94-95) vi. Item Flagging Criteria (p. 99) vii. Operational Assessment Items for 2014- 15 (pp. 103-107) <p>Item Data Review Decisions (pp. 78-82)</p>	
Section 2.2 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM Integrated

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) FILE05 Test Administration Manual 2014-15 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Checklist (pp. 9-12) b) Educator Portal User Guide for Test Administrators: Manage Student Data (pp.90-117) c) Educator Portal User Guide for Test Administrators (pp. 78-150) d) KITE User Guide (pp. 150-158) e) Introduction to DLM Testlets: Computer-Delivered Testlets (pp. 23-39) f) Introduction to DLM Testlets: Teacher-Delivered Testlets (pp. 39-51) g) Other Allowable Practices (pp. 50-51) 2) FILE02 Assessment Coordinator Manual 2014-15 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Checklist (pp. 7-13) 3) FILE03 Data Steward Manual 2014-15 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Checklist (p. 8) 4) FILE 04 Technical Liaison Manual 2014-15 Checklist (pp. 6-7) <p>Communication</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5) FILE 17 Supplemental Evidence Related to Test Administration <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Sample state landing page from DLM website <p>Test updates – Website and Email Example</p>	<p>Guidelines and procedures were clearly described and documented. These materials also included supplementary supports that students with additional disabilities (e.g., vision, hearing) would need to participate in the assessment. Peers noted that the extensive training modules and quizzes are available to support teachers in their acquisition of knowledge and skills to administer the assessment. Certification through successful completion of the training quizzes ensures a degree of standardization to administration.</p> <p>Peers noted that it will be important for states to have procedures that ensure that the administration protocols are properly implemented by teachers.</p> <p>Peers would have found it helpful to have access to the test administration training videos that were provided to teachers. This would have given peers additional insight into the operation and administration of the test.</p> <p>Peers would have found it helpful to see more example items to get a more detailed picture of the test. In addition, peers wonder if teachers have access to sufficient examples of test items (released items) to become appropriately familiar with the nature and focus of the assessment. The released testlets and testlet statistics would be helpful to teachers. The mention of released testlets is mentioned in the training modules, but there is no mention of the number of released testlets planned or how frequently they are intended for release. Peers suggested that DLM create a plan and timeline for testlet and associated testlet statistic release.</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 DLM Integrated

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments; 	<p>Administration with Accommodations</p> <p>6) FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-15</p> <p>a) Six Steps to Customize DLM Accessibility Features for Students: Step 3- Discuss and Select Appropriate Accessibility Features and Supports (pp. 19-22)</p> <p>b) Six Steps to Customize DLM Accessibility Features for Students: Step 2- Learn about the Accessibility Features and Supports (pp. 15-18)</p> <p>7) FILE 05 Test Administration Manual 2014-15</p> <p>a) Accessibility Supports (pp. 33-36) Other Allowable Practices (pp. 37-38)</p> <p>Training</p> <p>8) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15</p> <p>a) Chapter X: Training and Professional Development</p> <p>i) Training Content (pp. 257-260)</p> <p>ii) Facilitated Training and Self-Directed Training (pp. 256-257)</p> <p>iii) Completion of all modules (p. 260)</p> <p>iv) Training for Local Education Agency Staff (pp. 254-255)</p> <p>b) Chapter IV: Test Administration</p> <p>i) Formative Monitoring Techniques (p. 130)</p> <p>9) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15- Appendices</p> <p>a) Appendix G.1 – Required Test Administration Training</p> <p>b) Appendix C.14 – Monitor Assessments Webinar</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 DLM Integrated

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the State administers 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>10) FILE 16 Facilitator Guide for Required Test Administration Training 2014-15 a) Procedures for Delivering Facilitated Required Training, (p. 5)</p> <p>11) FILE02 Assessment Coordinator Manual 2014-15 a) Checklist (pp. 7-13)</p> <p>12) FILE03 Data Steward Manual 2014-15 a) Checklist (p. 8)</p> <p>13) FILE 04 Technical Liaison Manual 2014-15 Checklist (pp. 6-7)</p> <p>Technology Requirements</p> <p>14) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter IV: Test Administration i) The KITE System (pp. 112-114) b) Chapter X: Training and Professional Development i) Training Content (pp. 257-260)</p> <p>15) FILE07 Technical Manual 2014-15- Appendices a) Appendix G.1–Required Test Administration Training</p> <p>16) FILE 04 Technical Liaison Manual 2014-15 a) Educator Portal & KITE (pp. 9-12) b) Whitelist to Access Content (p. 8)</p> <p>17) FILE05 Test Administration Manual 2014-15 a) KITE User Guide: KITE Testing Devices</p>	<p>DLM provided extensive evidence for establishing and documenting procedures for training and administration of the 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 DLM Integrated

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>(pp. 150)</p> <p>b) Before Beginning Assessments: Practice Activities and Released Testlets (pp.63-65)</p> <p>18) FILE02 Assessment Coordinator Manual 2014-15 KITE Testing Devices (p. 54)</p> <p>Contingency plans for technology-based assessment administration</p> <p>19) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15</p> <p>a) Chapter IV: Test Administration</p> <p>i) KITE Client (Test Delivery Engine) (pp. 113-114)</p> <p>ii) Monitoring Assessment Administration (pp. 128-130)</p> <p>iii) Security in the KITE System (pp. 140-141)</p> <p>b) Chapter VII: Assessment Results</p> <p>i) Data Files (pp. 198-200)</p> <p>20) FILE07 Technical Manual 2014-15- Appendices</p> <p>a) Appendix C.7-Incident Summaries</p> <p>21) FILE 04 Technical Liaison Manual 2014-15</p> <p>a) Checklist (pp. 6-7)</p> <p>b) Local Caching Server (p. 12)</p> <p>FILE 17 Supplemental Evidence Related to Test Administration</p>	<p>DLM has clearly documented the technology requirements of the assessment. The existence of contingency plans was also well-documented.</p>
<p>Section 2.3 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 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 DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p>_____ policies and procedures apply to all grade-level and AA-AAAS in all subjects</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Chapter IV: Test Administration <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) Monitoring Assessment Administration (pp. 128-130) ii) Consortium Test Administration Observation Protocol(pp. 128-130) iii) Formative Monitoring Techniques (p. 130) iv) Monitoring Testlet Delivery (pp. 130-131) b) Chapter IX: Validity Studies <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) Evaluation of Test Administration (pp. 230-236) 2) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15- Appendices <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Appendix C.12: DLM Test Administration Observation Research Protocol b) Appendix C.13: Guide to Test Administration Observations: Guidance for Local Observers: Guide for Local Observers c) Appendix C.14: Monitoring webinar for local staff <p>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC MONITORING PROCEDURES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</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 DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
	<p align="center">Test administration monitoring</p> <p>3) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Chapter IX: Validity Studies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Observations of Test Administration (pp. 230-234) b) Chapter IV: Test Administration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Administration Errors (pp. 148-149) c) Chapter VII: Assessment Results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Data Files (pp. 198-200) <p align="center">THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC MONITORING RESULTS IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</p>	
Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
n/a State Specific		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of 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 DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.5 – Test Security</p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS</p> <p>Evidence of Prevention of Irregularities</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Chapter III: Item and Test Development <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) Overview of the Testlet Development Process (pp. 46-47) ii) Item Writer Training (pp. 69-70) iii) Item Writing Process (pp. 70-71) iv) Overview of Review Process (pp. 76-77) v) Reviewer Responsibilities (p. 78) b) Chapter IV: Test Administration <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) Training and Certification (pp. 138-139) ii) Secure Test Content (p. 141) iii) Maintaining Security During Test Administration (pp. 139-140) iv) State Specific Policies and Practices (pp. 141-142) c) Chapter X: Training and Professional Development <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) Test Security in the Dynamic Learning Maps Alternate Assessment (p. 258) 2) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 - Appendices <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Appendix B.3: Item Writer Security and Confidentiality Statement b) Appendix C.3 Sample State Summary Sheet 3) FILE 05 Test Administration Manual 2014-15 	<p>DLM provided manuals, webinars, and other resources to support test security issues and handling of irregularities.</p> <p>Plans for detection of irregularities are well documented, but monitoring by states will be critical in ensuring the maintenance of test security over time.</p> <p>The item/testlet pool is not very deep and also considering the heavy involvement of teachers magnifies the potential risk of item/testlet overexposure over time. Because teachers select the essential elements, there is a risk that teachers will select the same essential element repeatedly over time for which there may be a limited number of testlets available. It is unclear to what degree will this be monitored over time?</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 DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>a) Retrieve Testlet Information Page (p. 122-125)</p> <p>4) FILE 02 Assessment Coordinator Manual 2014-15</p> <p>a) Complete Security Agreement (p. 36)</p> <p>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC PREVENTION MEASURES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</p> <p>Evidence of Detection of Irregularities</p> <p>5) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15</p> <p>a) Chapter IV: Test Administration</p> <p>i) Forensic Analysis Plans (pp. 142-143)</p> <p>6) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 - Appendices</p> <p>a) Appendix C.15: DLMTAC Meeting Minutes 1/13/2016</p> <p>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC DETECTION EFFORTS IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</p> <p>Evidence of Investigation of Remediation Following Incidents</p> <p>7) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15</p> <p>a) Chapter IV: Test Administration</p> <p>i) Maintaining Security During Test Administration (pp. 139-140)</p> <p>Data Security (p. 141)</p> <p>8) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 - Appendices</p> <p>a) Appendix C.5: DLM Consortium Procedures for Data Security Breaches</p> <p>b) Appendix C.6: State Breach Response</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 DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p align="center">Communication Plan</p> <p>REMEDATION</p> <p>THIS PORTION OF THE CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</p>	
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS</p> <p>Security and Integrity of Test Materials</p> <p>1) FILE06 Technical Manual 2014- 15</p> <p>a) Chapter IV: Test Administration</p> <p>i) Security in the KITE System (pp. 140-141)</p> <p>ii) Data Security (p. 141)</p> <p>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE- SPECIFIC SYSTEMS IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</p> <p>Security of Student Data</p> <p>2) FILE06 Technical Manual 2014- 15</p> <p>a) Chapter IV: Test Administration</p> <p>i) Security of the KITE System (pp. 140-141)</p> <p>ii) State-Specific Policies and Practices (pp. 141-142)</p> <p>Data Security (p. 141)</p> <p>3) FILE07 Technical Manual 2014- 15 - Appendices</p> <p>a) Appendix C.4: PII Data Use Agreement</p> <p>b) Appendix C.5: DLM Consortium Procedures for Data Security Breaches</p> <p>c) Appendix C.6 State Breach Response Communication Plan</p> <p>THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE- SPECIFIC SYSTEMS IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</p>	<p>Documentation was provided to support integrity and privacy of data. Peers noted that data security is dependent on the proper operation of the KITE system.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM INTEGRATED

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"> To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 	<p>PII Protection in Reporting</p> <p>4) FILE06TechnicalManual2014- 15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Chapter IV: Test Administration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Data Security (p. 141) b) Chapter VII: Assessment Results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Subgroup Performance (pp. 192-194) ii) Aggregated Reports (p. 196) <p>PLEASE SEE INDIVIDUAL STATE RESPONSES FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING STATE- SPECIFIC MEASURES TO PREVENT DISCLOSURE OF PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION IN AGGREGATEDREPORTS.</p>	<p>Guidelines were provided for the protection of personally identifiable data.</p> <p>Peers suggested that DLM describe their data store to ensure that any data for analysis by state users has appropriate protection for any PII that is contained within the system.</p>
Section 2.6 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM INTEGRATED

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Validity Framework and Overall Evaluation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) FILE06TechnicalManual2014- 2015 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chapter I: Introduction <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Theory of action (pp. 5-8) b. Chapter XI: Conclusion and Discussion <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Evaluation Summary (Tables 114 and 115, pp. 285-286) ii. Summary and Evaluation of Validity Evidence (pp. 270-287) iii. Evaluation Summary (Table 116, p.287) iv. Future Research (pp. 290-291) v. Operational Assessment (pp. 288-289) <p>Propositions for Score Interpretation and Use (p. 270)</p> <p>Measurement of Academic Content Standards</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2) FILE06TechnicalManual2014- 2015 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chapter I: Introduction <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Theory of Action (pp. 5-8) ii. System Components (pp. 10-21) iii. Claims and Conceptual Areas (pp. 14-17) iv. Essential Elements (pp. 17-19) b. Chapter II: Map Development 	<p>Initial evidence provided by DLM demonstrates acceptable alignment of the essential elements to the CCSS, as per the summary on page 5 of the external alignment study (File 15). .</p> <p>States should be aware that to the degree that state standards differ from CCSS, additional alignment studies may be needed at the state level. In addition, states need to be aware that some essential elements appear to have lower alignment than others (e.g., table 1, File 15, page 5), since this may have</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 DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Learning Targets: CCSS and Essential Elements (pp. 26-27) c. Chapter III: Item and Test Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Development of Essential Elements (pp. 38-41) ii. Test Blueprints (pp. 41-46) iii. Essential Element Concept Maps for Testlet Development (pp. 61-65) iv. Overview of the Test Development Process (pp. 46-47) Item Writer Training (pp. 69-70) vi. External Reviews (pp. 75-83) d. Chapter IV: Test Administration Testlet Selection During Instructionally Embedded Assessment (pp. 115-118) <p>Evaluative Evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3) FILE06 Technical Manual 2014- 2015 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chapter III: Item and Test Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Overview of the Review Process (pp. 76-77) ii. Decisions and Criteria (pp. 78-82) iii. Results of Review (p. 82) b. Chapter IX: Validity Studies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Evaluation of blueprint coverage (pp. 221-223) c. Chapter XI: Conclusion Operational Assessment (p. 289) 18) Chapter IV: Test Administration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Testlet Assignment During Spring Window (pp. 118-120) 	<p>alignment implications for an individual member state.</p> <p>DLM presented simulated data that was based on assumptions regarding item fungibility within linkage levels. The underlying scoring and patterns of mastery in student reports are based on these assumptions. However, evidence of model fit and item fit to these assumptions is needed to assess the impact on comparability of scores, adaptive routing decisions within and across essential elements, and estimates of classification consistency and accuracy. Peers could not locate evidence that supports the interchangeability of testlets. In the updated reliability statistics section of the February 2016 TAC notes (File23), the issues regarding the model and scoring assumptions were discussed.</p> <p>Peers also would like clarification regarding the adaptive routing pathways within and/or across EEs.</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 DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>4) FILE 12 External Review Report 2013-2014</p> <p>5) FILE 13 External Review Report 2014-2015</p> <p>6) FILE 15 External Alignment Study</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Overview of DLM Assessment System (pp. 8-9) b. Number of Essential Elements, Target Level Nodes, Linkage Levels, and Items Sampled in Study (Table 5, p. 16) c. Alignment Methodology - Panelists, Training, Reliability of Codes, and Quality Control Check (pp. 15-16) d. Appendix B: Panelist Evaluation Results e. Executive Summary (pp. 4-8) <p>7) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014- 2015 - Appendices Appendix H.1 – DLM Response to External Alignment Study</p>	
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: See comments above regarding evidence needed relative to model assumptions and fit.</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 DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>1) FILE06TechnicalManual2014- 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chapter III: Item and Test Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Essential Element Concept Maps for Testlet Development (pp. 61-65) ii. Item Writer Training (pp. 69-70) iii. Overview of the Testlet Development Process (pp. 46-47) iv. Item Writing Process (pp. 70-71) v. Overview of Review Process (pp. 76-77) b. Chapter IX: Validity Studies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Teacher Feedback (Table 101, p. 235) c. Chapter XI: Conclusion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Accessibility (pp. 276-277) <p>2) FILE 18 Supplemental Evidence Related to Test Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Item Writing Handbook <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Planning a Testlet (pp. 9-19) <p>Appendix A (p. 29)</p> <p>Interaction with Testlet Content</p> <p>3) FILE06TechnicalManual2014- 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chapter IX: Validity Studies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Student Cognitive Labs (pp. 221-228) <p>Teacher Cognitive Labs (pp. 229-230)</p> <p>Fidelity of Administration</p> <p>2) FILE06TechnicalManual2014- 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Chapter X: Training and Professional 	<p>DLM provided adequate documentation that the assessment taps the appropriate cognitive processes (e.g., Technical manual pg 221-230).</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 DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Completion of All Modules (p. 260) ii. Training Content (pp. 257-260) <p>b) Chapter IV: Test Administration</p> <p>Educator Experience (Table 55, p. 151)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Resources and Materials (pp. 123-124) iii. Chapter IV: Test Administration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i Consortium Test Administration Observation Protocol (pp. 128-130) iv. Chapter IX: Validity Studies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i Observations of Test Administration (pp. 230-234) <p>3) FILE07 Technical Manual 2014- 2015 - Appendices</p> <p>Appendix C.12: Test Administration Observation Research Protocol</p> <p>Accessibility</p> <p>6) FILE06 Technical Manual 2014- 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chapter IV: Test Administration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Accessibility (pp. 131-138) <p>User Experience- Accessibility (pp. 155-158)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test Administration Resources (Table 46, p. 124) • Practice Activities and Released Testlets (p. 126) • User Experience - Accessibility (Table 62, p. 158) <p>4) Chapter IX: Validity Studies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Test Administrator Feedback Studies (Table 101, p. 235) <p>5) Chapter XI: Conclusion</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 DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	a) Accessibility (pp. 276- 277) 6) Chapter X: Training and Professional Development Module 3: Accessibility for All Students (pp. 258-259)	
Section 3.2 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Scoring and reporting structures’ consistency with sub-domain structures</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) FILE06TechnicalManual2014- 2015 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chapter I: Introduction <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Claims and Conceptual Areas (pp. 14-17) b. Chapter III: Item and Test Development <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Blueprint Development Process (pp. 43-46) ii. Essential Element Concept Maps for Test Development (pp. 61-65) iii. Student Performance Within and Across Complexity Bands (Table 24, p 88) c. Chapter V: Modeling <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Additional DLM Categorizations: Essential Elements and Linkage Levels (pp. 166-168) d. Chapter VII: Assessment Results <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Individual Reports (pp. 195-196) ii. Data Files (pp. 198-199) iii. Aggregated Reports (p. 196) e. Chapter II: Map Development <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Development Process (pp. 25-30) ii. Educator and Expert Review (p. 35) iii. Nodes Reflect the Products of Learning and Cognitive Growth (pp. 28-29) 6) Chapter IX: Validity Studies <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Vertical Articulation of Linkage Levels for each Essential Element 	<p>Internal structure is classically related to how well items are working together to measure the construct. Peers could not locate item-level data such as factor loadings or item-total correlations, or comparable node-level data. Even when overall reliability indices are satisfactory, it is still conceivable that certain items and/or nodes are not contributing to the reliability of the mastery classifications. The practical consequence of this is that students may take test items that do not contribute significant information on how they are performing relative to the underlying construct. This issue was raised by the TAC in the minutes from the January 2016 meeting. Peers understand that DLM uses an innovative model and suggested that DLM may wish to evaluate whether or how the DCM model can accommodate differences in item difficulty.</p> <p>Peers recommend that operational data be used to provide percentage correct item level data as in Table 24, pg. 88 of File06, for all grades and content areas. Peers also question why more analyses of operational data from the 2014-2015 operational assessment were not included in the submission.</p> <p>As additional operational data becomes available, DLM should do additional analyses to support validity based on internal structure of the assessment.</p> <p>The reliability simulations do not consider the issue of variation of difficulty of items and testlets within linkage levels. Reliability estimates based on assumptions of equal item difficulty represent upper limits. Follow-up analyses need to be conducted when more data become available so that simulation studies can be conducted based on item and testlet</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 DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p align="center">(pp. 218-219)</p> <p>7) Chapter XI: Conclusion a) Propositions for Score Interpretation and Use (p. 270)</p> <p>2) FILE07TechnicalManual2014- 2015- Appendices a. Appendix E.1: Individual Student Score Report Sample b. Appendix E.2: Aggregated Reports Sample</p> <p>3) FILE15ExternalAlignmentStudy Focus #3: Vertical Articulation of Linkage Levels (pp. 23-24)</p> <p>Consistency of Measurement</p> <p>4) FILE06TechnicalManual2014- 15 a. Chapter VIII: Reliability Evidence Content-Area (Performance-Level) Reliability Evidence (pp. 208-209) ii. Essential-Element Reliability Evidence (pp. 210-211) Linkage-Level Reliability Evidence (pp. 212-214) Differential Item Functioning (DIF)</p> <p>5) FILE06TechnicalManual2014- 15 a. Chapter IX: Validity Studies i. Evaluation of Item Level Bias (pp. 236-242) b. Chapter XI: Conclusion and Discussion Future Research (p.290)</p>	<p>parameters.</p> <p>Peers noted that the student score reports contain a great deal of detailed information. The concern was raised that the current system may not have the level of reliability evidence to support this level of detail with confidence considering the intended inferences. DLM may wish to consider the comments above regarding model fit and item level data as they evaluate how to address the reporting issue.</p> <p>An estimate of classification consistency (and accuracy) is needed for each level within each EE, conditional on true mastery being at that level. Estimates based on the overall distribution of mastery in the simulated population will be high for extreme high or low linkage levels mainly because most simulated examinees are not close to these levels.</p>
Section 3.3 Summary Statement		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: See comments above in the right-hand column.</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 DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Score Relationship to Other Variables</p> <p>1) FILE06TechnicalManual 2014-2015</p> <p> a. Chapter III: Item and Test Development</p> <p> i. Student Performance Within and Across Complexity Bands (Table 24, p. 88)</p> <p> b. Chapter IX: Validity Studies</p> <p>Evidence based on Relationships to other Variables (Table 108, p. 243)</p>	<p>The DLM assessment is new and as a result there is limited evidence of validity based on relationships with other variables.</p> <p>State members of the DLM consortium may need to provide additional evidence to address this critical element.</p>
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence presented for this critical element was limited due to the newness of the assessment. DLM should present additional evidence with future submissions when that is available. DLM Consortium member states may also wish to provide evidence to address this critical element.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM INTEGRATED

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.1 – Reliability</p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) FILE06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Chapter V: Modeling <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) Linkage Level Model with Fungible Item Parameters (pp. 169-170) b) Chapter VII: Assessment Results <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) Score Reports (pp. 195-198) c) Chapter VIII: Reliability <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) Content-Area (Performance-Level) Reliability Evidence (pp. 208-209) ii) Essential Element Reliability Evidence (pp. 210-211) <p>Linkage Level Reliability Evidence (pp. 212-214)</p>	<p>As previously noted, the reliability simulations do not consider the issue of variation of difficulty across testlets. DLM will also need to consider whether assumptions made about item fungibility are valid. Follow-up empirical analyses need to be conducted with additional operational results.</p> <p>The reliability evidence presented by DLM is not clearly related to the decisions that are going to be made about students based on the student reports. Peers need to know the consistency with which students are classified at or above a given linkage level. This aligns with reporting the highest level mastered on the student reports. DLM should provide supplementary analyses that address the consistency and accuracy of the highest level of mastery of the linkage levels within the essential elements.</p> <p>Peers were concerned about the possibility of underreporting the data and analyses necessary to demonstrate content area and EE reliability. Peers recommend that student reports include more reliability data to help parents and teachers better interpret the assessment results. Peers noted that the reliability evidence from the simulation studies provided an initial estimate of reliabilities, but additional analyses based on operational are desirable as evidence of reliability of the assessment. Peers also noted that the simulations do not appear to have considered the impact of variation in item difficulty has on reliability. Peers suggested that DLM consider reporting the distribution of student performance on</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM INTEGRATED

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"> 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>Overall and Conditional Standard Error of Measurement</p> <p>e. FILE06TechnicalManual2014- 15</p> <p>i. Chapter VIII: Reliability</p> <p> i Background Information on Reliability Methods (pp.201-214)</p> <p> ii. Chapter XI: Conclusion Future Research (pp. 290-291)</p> <p>Achievement Levels</p> <p>4) FILE06TechnicalManual2014- 15</p> <p>a. Chapter VIII: Reliability Content-Area (Performance-Level) Reliability Evidence (pp. 208-209)</p> <p>Computer-Adaptive Tests</p> <p>8) FILE06TechnicalManual2014- 15</p> <p>9)</p> <p>a. Chapter VIII: Reliability Linkage Level Reliability Evidence (pp. 212-214)</p>	<p>which the simulation is based. DLM has provided promising reliability statistics, but these may be insufficient for demonstrating that the assessment provides reliable results for the range of uses of the assessment.</p> <p>See also the Peers’ comment about reliability and model fit in section 3.1.</p> <p>Because DLM is based on a DCM model, the evidence did not include traditional measures of SEM. Peers recommended, however, that DLM provide additional information on the achievement level classification accuracy as aggregated across all simulated students.</p> <p>DLM states on page 212 of File06 that Kappa values above .6 indicate substantial agreement between simulated and estimated linkage-level mastery status. However, page 213 of File06, table 82, indicates that nearly one-third of the linkage levels have a Kappa statistic less than the target value of .6. DLM should provide classification accuracy information based on one linkage level for each student. More evidence is required to meet this critical element.</p> <p>The evidence provided does not appear to relate to the linkage levels. Reliability estimates in the DLM system are dependent on teacher input and potential override of system recommendations. While the system appears to be well-designed, the evidence that this has been carried out reliably needs further support.</p> <p>Peers commend DLM’s use of simulations in this area. More specifics and details need to be reported in the future.</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 DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: See comments in the right-hand column for specific recommendations.		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of 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 DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Accessibility</p> <p>1) FILE06TechnicalManual2014- 15</p> <p>a) Chapter III: Item and Test Development</p> <p>i. Essential Element Concept Maps for Testlet Development (pp. 61-65)</p> <p>ii. Items and Testlets (pp. 46-61)</p> <p>iii. Introduction (pp. 37)</p> <p>iv. Item Writing Process (pp. 70-71)</p> <p>v. The First Contact Survey (pp. 84-85)</p> <p>vi. Item Writing Resource Materials (p. 70)</p> <p>vii. Essential Element Concept Maps for Testlet Development (pp. 61-65)</p> <p>viii. Review Criteria (pp. 79-82)</p> <p>b) Chapter IV: Test Administration</p> <p>i. Overview of Accessibility Supports (pp. 131-136)</p> <p>ii. Testlet Assignment During the Spring Window (pp. 118-120)</p> <p>c) Chapter IX: Validity Studies</p> <p>i. Student Cognitive Labs (pp. 224-228)</p> <p>Observations of Test Administration (pp. 230-234)</p> <p>a) FILE01 Accessibility Manual 2014-15</p> <p>i) Step 2 – Learn about the</p>	<p>Peers noted that evidence of item level fairness and accessibility review appeared to be complete, including DIF analyses. In addition, DLM used two different cognitive labs to address fairness and accessibility (one study was student-focused and the other teacher-focused). The assessment design reflected consideration of accessibility and fairness issues. Teachers are given latitude and flexibility to address accessibility issues, and are required to pass a certification quiz to ensure consistency and fairness in administration.</p> <p>Students are given opportunity to practice prior to the administration of the assessment.</p> <p>Peers noted and agreed that the type of disability could not be considered as part of the eligibility criteria for the assessment.</p> <p>Page 258 of the technical manual discussed the Personal Needs and Preference Profile, which is an important aspect of how the fairness is addressed in the assessment implementation.</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 DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p style="text-align: center;">Accessibility Features and Supports (pp. 15-18)</p> <p>b) FILE 18 Supplemental Evidence Related to Test Development</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">i) Principles of Item Writing: Accessibility (p. 11)</p> <p>c) FILE 19 Pilot Administration Technical Report Initialization (pp. 5-16)</p> <p>Fairness</p> <p>5) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a) Chapter III: Item and Test Development</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">i. Item Writing Process (pp. 70-71)</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">ii. Review Criteria (pp. 79-82)</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">b) Chapter IV: Test Administration Allowable Practices (pp. 136-138)</p>	
Section 4.2 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Adequately Precise Estimate Across the Continuum</p> <p>v. FILE06TechnicalManual2014- 15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ï Chapter III: Items and Test Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ï The First Contact Survey (pp. 84-85) ï Chapter IV: Test Administration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ï Linkage Level Selection and Adaptive Delivery (pp. 114-120) ï Chapter V: Modeling <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ï Linkage Level Model with Fungible Item Parameters (pp. 169-170) ï DLM Scoring: Mastery Status Assignment (p. 170) ï Chapter VII: Assessment Results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ï Student Performance (pp. 190-194) ï Linkage Level Mastery (p. 194) ï Chapter VIII: Reliability Evidence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ï Content-Area (Performance-Level) Reliability Evidence (pp. 208-209) <p>Essential-Element</p>	<p>Peers noted that Table 78 on page 195 of File06 indicated that a significant percentage of students had no evidence of mastery on some essential elements. This may simply be a reflection of the characteristics of the student population.</p> <p>Peers commend the overall design of the DLM system appears to represent the full range of performance.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 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 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 DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Standardized Scoring Procedures</p> <p>7) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Chapter III: Item and Testlet Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. General Testlet Structure and Item Types (pp. 47-48) ii. English Language Arts Writing Testlets (pp. 52- 55) b) Chapter V: Modeling <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Psychometric Background Information (pp. 159-160) ii. Linkage Level Model with Fungible Item Parameters (pp. 169-170) iii. DLM Scoring: Mastery Status Assignment (p. 170) c) Chapter VI: Standard Setting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Results (pp. 180-185) d) Chapter VII: Assessment Results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Score Reports (pp. 195- 198) ii. Quality Control Procedures for Data Files and Score Reports (pp. 199-200) iii. Data Files (pp. 198-200) e) Chapter VIII: Reliability Evidence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Content-Area (Performance-Level) Reliability Evidence (pp 208-209) 2) Essential-Element Reliability Evidence (pp. 210-211) 3) Linkage-Level Reliability Evidence (pp. 212-213) f) Chapter X: Training and Professional Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Modules 4-7 (pp. 259-260) 	<p>Peers noted that the DCM model appears appropriate for this type of assessment.</p> <p>Peers noted that most scoring is automated.</p> <p>Peers noted that writing scores appear to be derived in part from test administrators observing and rating the writing process and products through the use of checklists. Peers were unable to locate evidence of writing scoring reliability statistics that are typically generated as a result of such a process.</p> <p>Peers noted that the scoring of the writing assessment is unclear; more information is needed on the R-script (how it was developed, the pilot population on which it was originally calibrated, the need for any scoring guide, etc.) and whether the scoring model was recalibrated once operational data were available.</p> <p>More information is needed on what scoring at the ‘option level’ versus scoring at the ‘item level’ means.</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 DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	5) FILE 05 Test Administration Manual 2014-15 a) Teacher Administered Testlets (pp. 39-51) 6) FILE 17 Supplemental Evidence Related to Test Administration Writing FAQ	
Section 4.4 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: More information and evidence regarding the scoring of writing and other open-ended items is needed.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Assessment Forms Represent Academic Content Standards</p> <p>8) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Chapter III: Item and Test Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i Operational Assessment Items for 2014-2015 (pp. 103-107) b) Chapter IV: Test Administration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i Instructionally Embedded Assessments (p. 109) i Testlet Selection During Instructionally Embedded Assessment (pp. 115-118) i Spring Assessments (p.109) i Testlet Assignment During the Spring Window (pp. 118-119) i Administration Errors (pp. 148-149) i Monitoring Testlet Delivery (pp. 130-131) <p>9) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 – Appendices Appendix C.7 Incident Summaries 2014-2015</p> <p>Assessment Forms Yield Consistent Score Interpretations</p> <p>8) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Chapter III: Item and Test Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i Operational Assessment Items for 2014-15 (pp. 103-107) i Item Flagging Criteria (p. 99) 	<p>DLM makes an underlying assumption about the fungibility of item parameters. If that assumption is not valid, then comparability of test forms may be impacted.</p> <p>Peers noted that the instructionally embedded testlet bank is separate from the spring testlet bank. DLM may need to consider conducting simulation studies to explore the comparability of the difficulty of testlets in the two testlet banks.</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 DLM INTEGRATED

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"> i Essential Element Concept Maps for Testlet Development (pp. 61-65) i Item Writing Process (pp. 70-71) i Field Testing (pp. 94-103) b) Chapter V: Modeling Linkage Level Model with Fungible Item Parameters (pp. 169-170) 	
Section 4.5 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: See comments in the right-hand column.		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of 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 DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Comparable Interpretation of Results</p> <p>14) FILE06TechnicalManual2014- 15</p> <p>a) Chapter III: Item and Test Development</p> <p>i) Alternate Testlets for Students who are Blind or Have Visual Impairments (pp. 60-61)</p> <p>ii) Item Writing Process (pp. 70-71)</p> <p>iii) Item Writing Resource Materials (pp. 70)</p> <p>Essential Element Concept Maps for Testlet Development (pp. 61-65)</p> <p>Documented Evidence of Comparability</p> <p>2) FILE06TechnicalManual2014- 15</p> <p>a. Chapter III: Item and Test Development</p> <p>i. Item Flagging Criteria (pp. 99)</p> <p>ii. Operational Assessment Items for 2014-2015 (pp. 103-108)</p> <p>b. Chapter IV: Test Administration</p> <p>i. Overview of Accessibility Supports (pp. 131)</p> <p>ii. Practice Activities and Released Testlets (pp. 126-127)</p> <p>iii. Additional Allowable Practices (pp. 136-138)</p> <p>c. Chapter V: Modeling Linkage Level Model with Fungible Item Parameters</p>	<p>DLM has documented the design and development process that in theory supports comparable interpretations of results. However, the possible variability of difficulty of testlets calls into question the comparability of the meaning and interpretation of assessment results.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	(pp. 169- 170)	
Section 4.6 Summary Statement		
X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: See right-hand column for additional information 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 DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Monitoring, Maintaining, and Improving Quality of Assessment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Chapter III: Item and Test Development <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Item Writing (pp. 65-75) ii. Item Flagging Criteria (p. 99) iii. ItemDataReviewDecisions (pp. 99-100) b) Chapter IV: Test Administration <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Forensic Analysis Plans (pp. 142-143) ii. Adaptive Delivery (pp. 143- 147) c) Chapter IX: Validity Studies <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Evidence Based on Internal Structure (pp. 236-242) d) Chapter XI: Conclusion and Discussion <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Future Research (pp. 290-291) ii. Table 114: Dynamic Learning Maps Alternate Assessment Propositions and Sources of Related Evidence for 2014-15 (p. 285) iii. Table 115: Evidence Sources Cited in Previous Table (pp. 286-287) 2) FILE 15 External Alignment Study FILE 20 Scoring Reporting and Analysis 4) FILE 23 TAC Materials 5) FILE 14 Standard Setting Technical Report 2015 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Appendix B: Rationale for 	<p>DLM has a highly qualified TAC that is consulted regularly about assessment and measurement issues.</p> <p>Peers noted that on page 3 of the TAC meeting minutes (January 2016) that there are recommendations for modeling/review of simulation study plans and the need to review model assumptions and fit issues. Peers supported this process for addressing classification uncertainty addressing issues of model fit and more specific calibrations of nodes with regard to reliability estimates, routing algorithms, and mastery inferences.</p> <p>Peers recommended that DLM prioritize and work with states to determine a plan and timeline for conducting forensic analyses to ensure that issues identified are followed-up on an ongoing basis.</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 DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p align="center">Determining Mastery and Developing Profiles (pp. 58-59)</p> <p>6) FILE 15 External Alignment Study</p> <p>a) Focus 3: Vertical Articulation of Linkage Levels (pp. 23-24)</p> <p>b) Focus 4: Learning Map Nodes within a Linkage Level and Assessment Items (pp. 24-30)</p> <p>7) FILE 22 Scope of Work</p>	
Section 4.7 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required. See suggestions above for recommendations regarding ongoing maintenance of the assessment.		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of 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 DLM INTEGRATED

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards; • States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs; • Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment; 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS</p> <p>State evidence</p> <p>State evidence</p> <p>Guidelines for choice of assessment</p> <p>3) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a. Chapter X: Training and Professional Development Accessibility for All Students (pp. 258-259)</p> <p>2) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 - Appendices a) Appendix C.16: Dynamic Learning Maps Participation Guidelines b) Appendix G.1: Required Test Administration Training</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 DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides 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; 	<p>Information on Supports and Accommodations</p> <p>5) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chapter IV: Test Administration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Accessibility (pp. 131-137) b. Chapter X: Training and Professional Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Accessibility for All Students (pp. 258-259) <p>6) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 - Appendices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Appendix G.1: Required Test Administration Training <p>7) FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Step 2: Learn about the DLM Accessibility Features: What Does DLM Provide? (pp. 15-18) <p>Guidance on Selection of Accommodations</p> <p>19) FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Accessibility by Design: Customization for Each Student (pp. 11-12) b) Step 3 – Discuss and Select Appropriate Accessibility Features and Supports: Considerations for Individual Education Plan (IEP) Teams (pp. 19-22) c) Step 6 – Evaluate the Accessibility Features Used After the Assessment (p. 30) <p>20) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Chapter X: Training and Professional Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Accessibility for All Students (pp. 258-259) 	<p>Peers noted that DLM provides adequate and appropriate guidelines and supports to states regarding selection of appropriate accommodations, participation in the appropriate assessment, etc. However, it is incumbent upon the states to have sound plans to operationalize and monitor these guidelines and supports.</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 DLM INTEGRATED

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"> Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA; Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high 	<p>21) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 Appendices</p> <p>a) Appendix G.1: Required Test Administration Training</p> <p>22) FILE 05 Test Administration Manual 2014-15</p> <p>a) Complete Access (Personal Needs and Preferences (PNP)) Profile (p. 96)</p> <p>b) Before Beginning Assessments: Evaluate and Choose Accessibility Supports (PNP Settings) (p. 61)</p> <p>c) Prepare for Next Year: Evaluate Accessibility Supports (PNP Setting) (p. 77)</p> <p>Disability Categories for Alternate Assessment</p> <p>2) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15- Appendices</p> <p>a) Appendix C.16: Dynamic Learning Maps Participation Guidelines</p> <p>State Evidence</p> <p>Promote Access to the General Curriculum</p> <p>4) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15</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 DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chapter IV: Test Administration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Instructionally Embedded Assessments (p. 109) b. Chapter X: Training and Professional Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Professional Development Participation and Evaluation (pp. 261-267) ii. Instructional Professional Development (pp. 260-261) iii. Overview of the Dynamic Learning Maps Alternate Assessment System (pp. 257-258) <p>FILE07 Technical Manual 2014-15- Appendices</p>	
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM INTEGRATED

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; 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS</p> <p>Determining Appropriateness of Accommodation</p> <p>4) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter VII: Assessment Results i Results – Student Participation (pp. 180-190)</p> <p>5) FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-15 a) Six Steps to Customize DLM Accessibility Features for Students (pp. 13-30)</p> <p>Information on Supports and Accommodations</p> <p>3) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter IV: Test Administration i. Accessibility (pp. 131-138) b) Chapter X: Training and Professional Development i. Accessibility for All Students (pp. 258-259)</p> <p>FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15- Appendices a) Appendix G.1 Required Test Administration Training</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FILE 05 Test Administration Manual 2014-15 i CD Testlets/Accessibility Supports/Language Translation (pp. 33-36) i TA Testlets/Accessibility Supports/Language Translations(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 DLM INTEGRATED

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"> Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. 	<p align="center">49)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-15 <p>Guidance on Selection of Accommodations</p> <p>7) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Chapter IV: Test Administration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Accessibility (pp. 131-138) b) Chapter X: Training and Professional Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Accessibility for All Students (pp. 258-259) <p>8) FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Step 2: Learn about the DLM Accessibility Features: What Does DLM Provide? (pp. 15-18) b) Step 6: Evaluate the Accessibility Features Used After the Assessment (p. 30) <p>9) FILE 05 Test Administration Manual 2014-15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) KITE User Guide/Change An Accessibility Support During Testing (pp. 150-158) b) Before Beginning Assessments/Evaluate and Choose Accessibility Supports (pp. 56-61) 	
Section 5.2 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS;</p> <p>Evidence of appropriate accommodation availability</p> <p>7) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter IV: Test Administration i Accessibility (pp. 131-138) b) Chapter X: Training and Professional Development i Training Content/Module 6 & Module 7 (p.260)</p> <p>8) FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-15 a) Accessibility by Design: Customization for each Student (pp. 11-12) b) Step 2: Learn about the DLM Accessibility Features: What Does DLM Provide? (pp. 15-18)</p> <p>9) FILE 05 Test Administration Manual 2014-2015 Allowable Practices (pp. 53-54)</p> <p>Evidence of appropriate accommodations for English learners</p> <p>10) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter IV: Test Administration i Testlet Information Pages (pp. 125-126) b) Chapter VII: Assessment Results Student Participation (pp. 188-190)</p> <p>2) FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-15 a. Step 2: Learn about the DLM Accessibility</p>	<p>Peers noted that DLM provides adequate and appropriate guidelines and supports to states regarding accommodations. However, it is incumbent upon the states to have sound plans to implement and monitor these guidelines and supports.</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 DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has 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; 	<p>Features: Category 3- Supports provided outside the DLM System (pp. 17-18)</p> <p>3) FILE 05 Test Administration Manual 2014-15 Introduction to DLM Testlets - Computer-Delivered Testlets: Accessibility Supports, Language Translation (pp. 36)</p> <p>Appropriateness and effectiveness of accommodations</p> <p>5) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chapter IV: Test Administration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Implementation Evidence - Accessibility (pp. 155-158) ii. User Experience with Assessment Administration and KITE Experience (pp. 149-155) iii. Accessibility/Overview of Accessibility Supports (pp. 155-158) iv. Additional Allowable Practices (pp. 136-138) v. Category 2: Supports Requiring Additional Materials (pp. 133-134) b. Chapter IX: Validity Studies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Opportunity to Learn (pp. 223-224) ii. Observations of Test Administrations (pp. 230-234) c. Chapter XI: Conclusion and Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Accessibility (pp. 276-277) <p>Future Research (pp. 290-291)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. FILE 05 Test Administration Manual 2014-15 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Kite User Guide/Change an Accessibility 	

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of 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 DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 	<p>Support During Testing (p. 158)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ï Spring Operational Assessments/Key Steps (p. 56) ï KITE User Guide/Access Practice Activities and Released Testlets (pp. 150-152) <p>iii. FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ï Step 6: Evaluate the Accessibility Features Used After the Assessment (p. 30) <p>FILE 21 First Contact: A Census Report</p> <p>State Evidence</p>	
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS;</p> <p>Accommodations and participation decisions are consistent with state policy</p> <p>3) FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-2015</p> <p>a) Accessibility by Design: Customization for each Student (pp. 11-12)</p> <p>b) Step 2: Learn about the DLM Accessibility Features: What Does DLM Provide? (pp. 15-18)</p> <p>4) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15- Appendices</p> <p>a) Appendix C.16: Dynamic Learning Maps Participations Guidelines</p> <p>Appropriateness of accommodations and participation decisions for addressing student needs</p> <p>7) FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-2015</p> <p>a) Accessibility by Design: Customization for each Student (pp. 11-12)</p> <p>b) Step 2: Learn about the DLM Accessibility Features: What Does DLM Provide? (pp. 15-18)</p> <p>Consistent with accommodations during instruction and/or practice</p> <p>4) FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-2015</p> <p>a) Accessibility by Design: Customization for each Student (pp. 11-12)</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 DLM INTEGRATED

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"> • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b) Step 3: Discuss and Select Appropriate Accessibility Features and Supports: Considerations for IEP Teams (pp. 19-22) 5) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Chapter IV: Test Administration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Implementation Evidence from 2014-2015 Test Administration (pp. 143-158) b) Chapter XI: Conclusion and Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Future Research (pp. 290-291) Consistent with accommodations identified by team 3) FILE 02 Assessment Coordinator Manual 2014-15 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Access Reports and Data Extracts: View a Data Extract (pp. 44-46) Administered with fidelity to procedures 7) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Chapter IV: Test Administration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Consortium Test Administration Observation Protocol (pp. 128-130) <p>Chapter IX: Validity Studies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Observations of Test Administration (pp. 230-234) 	
Section 5.4 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM INTEGRATED

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; • The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels. 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>State Evidence</p>	
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p> <p><u> </u>N/A<u> </u> No additional evidence is required – state evidence to be provided.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Technically Sound Method</p> <p>2) FILE 14 Standard Setting Tech Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Chapter 2: Standard Setting Methods <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Rationale and general approach (pp. 19-20) ii) Profile selection (pp. 20- 24) iii) Evaluation Procedures (pp. 26-27) b) Chapter 3: Standard Setting Panel Meeting Participation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Panel Facilitator Training (p. 31) c) Chapter 4: Standard Setting Panel Meeting Procedures <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Procedures (pp. 37-40) ii) Advanced Panelist Training (pp.32-33) iii) On-site Panelist Training (33-34) iv) Table 9 (p.33) v) Independent Evaluations of Panel-Recommended Cut Points (pp. 40-41) d) Chapter 5: Results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Statistical adjustment (pp. 50-54) ii) Final results (p. 54) iii) Evaluations (pp.42-49) <p>Appendix C: Sample Profile (pp. 60-64)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> f) Appendix G: Panel Training Materials (pp.139-163) g) Appendix B: Rationale for Determining Mastery and Developing Profiles (pp. 62- 63) <p>4) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15</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 DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>a. Chapter VIII: Reliability Evidence Content-Area (Performance-Level) Reliability Evidence (pp. 208-210)</p> <p>Panelist experience and expertise</p> <p>f. FILE 14 Standard Setting Tech Report</p> <p>i. Chapter 3: Standard Setting Panel Meeting Preparation</p> <p> i. Panelist Recruitment (p.28)</p> <p> i. Selection of Panel Participants (p. 28)</p> <p> i. Panelist Characteristics (pp.29-31)</p> <p>ii. Appendix E: Standard Setting Panelist Recruitment Letter and Survey (pp. 66-70)</p> <p>iii. Table 18, item #8 (p. 48)</p> <p>Appendix L: TAC Resolution, commentary #6-7 (p. 98)</p>	
Section 6.2 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Challenging Alternate Academic Achievement Standards</p> <p>3) FILE06TechnicalManual2014- 15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i Chapter I: Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ï Essential Elements (pp. 17-19) ï Chapter II: Map Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ï Learning Targets: CCSS and Essential Elements (pp. 26-27) ï Chapter III: Item and Test Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ï Development of the Essential Elements (pp. 38-41) <p>4) FILE15ExternalAlignment Study</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ï Focus 3: Vertical Articulation of Linkage Levels (pp. 23-24) <p>5) FILE18SupplementalEvidence Related to Test Development</p> <p>Edvantia Stakeholder Survey Summary (pp. 63-67)</p> <p>4) FILE06TechnicalManual2014- 15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chapter VI: Standard Setting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Standard Setting Approach: Rationale and Overview (pp. 171-172) ii. Grade Level/Content Performance Level Descriptors (pp.185- 187) <p>Policy Performance Level Descriptors(pp. 173)</p> <p>Differentiated content across grades</p> <p>1) FILE06TechnicalManual2014- 15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chapter I: Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Learning Map Models (pp 10-13) 	

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of 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 DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	b. Chapter II: Map Development i. Learning Targets: CCSS and Essential Elements (pp. 26-27) c. Chapter VI: Standard Setting Grade Level/Content Performance Level Descriptors (pp. 185- 187)	
Section 6.3 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.4 – Reporting</p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration; The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results; 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Reporting Results</p> <p>6) FILE06 Technical Manual 2014- 15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Chapter VI: Standard Setting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Policy Performance Level Descriptors (p. 173) b) Chapter VII: Assessment Results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Data Files (pp. 198-200) c) Chapter XI: Conclusion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Operational Assessment (pp.288-290) <p>7) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014- 15 – Appendices– Appendix E.7: Guide to Scores and Reports</p> <p>Assessment results reported to support appropriate uses of results</p> <p>3) FILE06 Technical Manual 2014- 15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Chapter V: Modeling <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Linkage Level Model with Fungible Item Parameters (pp. 169- 170) <p>Chapter VII: Assessment Results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Score Reports (pp. 195- 198) vi. Chapter IX: Validity Studies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ï DLM Score Report Design and Use (pp. 244-245) ï Report Use for Planning Instruction (pp.250- 252) <p>6) FILE07 Technical Manual 2014- 15-</p>	<p>Peers were unable to locate itemized (e.g., testlet, EE, or conceptual area) score analyses at the state and district level. Peers suggested that state- and district-level summaries include frequency information on which EEs were assessed and which were mastered. This information would be useful for state and district management of the program and in helping to drive pattern analyses and overall decisions impacting instruction.</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 DLM INTEGRATED

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"> • 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, 	<p>Appendices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Appendix E.2: Aggregated Reports Sample b) Appendix E.1: Individual Student Score Report Sample <p>Interpretive Guides</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4) FILE06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Chapter VII: Assessment Results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Interpretation Resources (pp. 196-197) 5) FILE07 Technical Manual 2014- 15- Appendices Appendix E.3: Parent Interpretive Guide 3) Appendix E.9: Parent Letter Teacher Version 4) Appendix E.10: Parent Letter Superintendent Version 5) Appendix E.4: Teacher Interpretive Guide 6) Appendix E.5: Scoring and Reporting Guide for Administrators 7) FILE20 Scoring, Reporting, and Analyses <p>Delivery of Student Reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10) FILE06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Chapter VIII: Reliability Evidence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Reliability Evidence (pp. 201-214) b) Chapter IX: Validity Studies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. DLM Score Report Design and Use (pp. 244-245) c) Chapter VII: Assessment Results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Interpretation Resources (pp. 196-198) 	<p>Peers noted that DLM has made a concerted effort to produce materials to support interpretation and effective use of the assessment results by teachers and parents. It is incumbent upon states to implement the use of the materials and resources within their schools and districts.</p> <p>Peers noted that the individual student score reports do not appear to include any mention of estimates of uncertainty regarding mastery classification or potential measurement error associated with student scores. Reports should include this information to meet the requirements of the critical element and APA standards. Consideration of measurement error may impact the level of detail that is able to be supported on the score reports, based on the types of inferences intended to be made from the assessment data.</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 DLM INTEGRATED

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand; <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>d) Chapter XI: Conclusion i) Proposition 1 (pp. 271- 280)</p> <p>11) FILE07TechnicalManual2014- 15- Appendices Appendix E.3: Parent Interpretive Guide</p> <p>Process and Timeline</p> <p>11) FILE06TechnicalManual2014- 15 a) Chapter VII: Assessment Results i) Score Reports (pp. 195- 198) b) Chapter XI: Conclusion i) Operational Phase (pp. 288-290)</p> <p>12) FILE07TechnicalManual2014- 15- Appendices a) Appendix E.6: File Structure Data Dictionary</p>	<p>Peers were unable to locate evidence of score reports in alternate formats. States may need to request reports in alternate formats if those are required under the circumstances.</p>

Section 6.4 Summary Statement

 X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: See comment above regarding inclusion of estimates of uncertainty on student score reports.

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of 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.