



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Dr. Sydnee Dickson  
State Superintendent of Public Instruction  
Utah State Board of Education  
250 East 500 South  
P.O. Box 144200  
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-4200

November 28, 2018

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), which governed State assessments through the 2016-2017 school year. The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), which governs State assessments beginning in the 2017-2018 school year, maintains the essential requirements from NCLB that each State annually administer high-quality assessments in at least reading/language arts, mathematics, and science that meet nationally recognized professional and technical standards with a few additional requirements. I appreciate the efforts of the Utah State Board of Education (USBE) to prepare for the review, which occurred in March 2018, and which was a follow up to a review that occurred in 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.

External peer reviewers and Department staff carefully evaluated USBE's submission and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that the alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) for reading/language arts and mathematics in grades 3-8 and high school (Dynamic Learning Maps-Year-End Model (DLM-YE)) meet all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of section 1111(b)(1) and (3) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB. Congratulations on meeting these important ESEA requirements; an assessment system that produces valid and reliable results is fundamental to a State's accountability system.

In regard to the other assessments that USBE submitted for the March 2018 peer review, peer reviewers and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that the components of USBE's assessment system meet most, but not all, of the statutory and regulatory requirements of section 1111(b)(1) and (3)

400 MARYLAND AVE., SW, WASHINGTON, DC 20202  
[www.ed.gov](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.*

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

- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (Student Assessment of Growth and Excellence (SAGE) reading/language arts and mathematics 3-8). **Substantially meets requirements.**
- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in high school (SAGE end-of-course reading/language arts and mathematics). **Substantially meets requirements.**
- Reading/language arts and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE). **Meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB.**
- Science general assessments in grades 4-8 (SAGE 4-8 science). **Substantially meets requirements.**
- Science general assessments in high school (SAGE high school science). **Partially meets requirements.**

The component that **partially meets requirements** does not meet a number of the requirements of the statute and regulations and/or USBE will need to provide substantial additional information to demonstrate it meets the requirements. The Department expects that USBE may not be able to submit all of the required information within one year. **Substantially meets requirements means** that these components meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required.

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

Subsequent to the peer review, USBE notified the Department that it is significantly redesigning its general assessments in all subjects and grades. Once the State has implemented these redesigned assessments, it will need to submit evidence for all critical elements that apply for peer review after the first operational administration.

Because the 2018 peer review resulted in a designation of partially met requirements for the SAGE high school science general assessment, the condition on USBE's Title I grant award will continue. This condition will remain in place until such time as USBE presents evidence that the reading/language arts, mathematics, and science general assessments meet all of the requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. The condition also stipulates that the Department may take further action if the condition is not resolved in a timely manner. Additionally, the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) will monitor progress on matters pertaining to requirements in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) related to the participation of students with disabilities in Title I assessments. In particular, OSERS will monitor progress against critical elements 1.4, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4, and 6.3. Insufficient progress to address such matters may lead OSERS to place a condition on USBE's federal fiscal year 2019 IDEA Part B grant award.

In addition, the full peer review notes from the review are enclosed. These recommendations to the Department formed the basis of our determination. Please note that the peers' recommendations may differ from the Department's feedback; we encourage you to read the full peer notes for additional suggestions and recommendations for improving your assessment system beyond what is noted in the Department's feedback.

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. I wish you well in your continued efforts to improve student achievement in Utah. If you have any questions, please contact my staff at: [OSS.Utah@ed.gov](mailto:OSS.Utah@ed.gov).

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank T. Brogan  
Assistant Secretary, Office for  
Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Ann-Michelle Neal, Accountability Specialist/WIDA  
Darin Nielsen, Assistant Superintendent of Student Learning

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

Note: The Utah State Board of Education indicated that it is substantially redesigning all of its general assessments. As a result, it will need to submit complete information for peer review regarding these assessments after the State’s first administration.

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Additional Evidence Needed</b>
<b>1.3 – Required Assessments</b>	For the (Student Assessment of Growth and Excellence (SAGE) science general assessments in high school: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that clearly indicates which science test in high school is required for all students.</li> </ul>
<b>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</b>	For the SAGE science general assessments in high school: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of inclusion policies that clearly indicates that all students are required to take the same science test in high school.</li> </ul>
<b>1.5 – Participation Data</b>	For the SAGE science general assessments in high school: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b>	For the SAGE reading/language arts and mathematics and science general assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that State addressed the need to increase the item pool and to improve the precision of the computer-adaptive test (CAT) algorithms.</li> </ul>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b>	For the SAGE reading/language arts, mathematics and science general assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that State has plan addressed the need to increase the item pool and to improve the precision of the CAT algorithms.</li> </ul>
<b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b>	For the SAGE reading/language arts, mathematics and science general assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State’s assessments tap the appropriate cognitive processes for each content area at each tested grade level.</li> </ul>
<b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b>	For the (Dynamic Learning Maps-Year-End Model (DLM YE) alternate assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1065, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act. Utah State Board of Education should provide this evidence by December 15, 2020.</li> </ul>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT  
CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## February 2018 State Assessment Combined Peer Review Notes for the DLM Year-End Assessment Consortium RESUBMISSION



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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT  
CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION**

**Contents**

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS ..... 3**  
    **2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 3**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER ..... 4**  
    **4.1 – Reliability..... 5**  
    **4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 7**  
    **4.4 – Scoring ..... 9**

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION**

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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);</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.</li> </ul>	<p><u>YE 01</u> (Technical Manual Update YE 2015-16)</p>	<p>DLM provides a brief but adequate explanation for why speaking and listening standards (part of CCSS) were not included in the DLM ELA assessment, to the effect that partner states had not assessed these standards in their general assessments. For all students, therefore, including SWSCD, speaking and listening were to be taught and assessed at the local level (YE 01, pp. 9-10).</p> <p>It might have been useful (but not essential) to include participating state’s waiver letters to support this statement.</p> <p>The supplementary submission evidence did not address part of the summary statement request for additional evidence—specifically, an explanation of why Language is not directly addressed. A brief explanation such as that offered for the question about Speaking and Listening would have been helpful—which the reviewers assume is that in their general assessments, all of the partner states assess Language in the context of Reading or Writing (e.g., as is the case with PARCC).</p>
<p><b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement (from August 2017 Peer Review)</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.1 – Reliability</b></p> <p>(from 2016 peer review)</p> <p>For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), WVDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of monitoring and refinement of the diagnostic classification models from subsequent test administrations</li> </ul>	<p>YE 01, pp. 43-46; 48-62.</p> <p>YE 03, pp. 102.</p>	<p>Overall, Peer Reviewers are impressed with the DLM learning and assessment models. Peers are hopeful that the psychometric model, which is less mature, will eventually be refined to a similar level, to capitalize on the advantages of the learning and assessment models.</p> <p>DLM provided detail in the Technical Manual Update YE 2016-17 (YE 01) as evidence of monitoring and refinement of the diagnostic classification models from test administrations subsequent to the initial administration. Given recommendations below, Peer Reviewers would expect that technical manuals in subsequent years continue to address and update evidence of monitoring and refinement of Diagnostic Classification Models.</p> <p>The DLM’s Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) discussed and indicated support for maintaining the current scoring model for 2017-18 while additional research is conducted on different methods for being able to support cross-linkage level inferences (YE 03).</p> <p>On p. 45, there is mention of the fact that non-masters sometimes have a greater than chance likelihood of providing correct responses to items measuring the linkage level, which may indicate that items or LLs as a whole are “easily guessable.” It would be useful to note what is being done to address that. Peer reviewers recommend checking this again with more operational data. If the issue remains, either model or items or both need to be changed.</p> <p>In reference to the issue of Model Fit, peers were satisfied with the methods being followed to ensure that the model fits the data. However, the Peers</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>suggest following the recommendations of the DLM Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to use a Bayesian estimation procedure to help address some of the methodological issues with the current approach to assessing model fit.</p> <p>Peers recommend that DLM continue to be guided by and to take into serious consideration the advice of the TAC in regards to refinement of the model and generation of data to demonstrate Model Fit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</b></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>YE 01 (Technical Manual Update YE 2015-16), pp. 10-11, 13-14</p> <p>Appendix A: ELA Text Photograph Guidelines</p>	<p>DLM provides an adequate explanation of the development and selection of reading passages, including steps taken to ensure passages are accessible to SWSCD.</p> <p>The peers found Table 5 (p. 11) very helpful in clarifying internal and external passage review criteria. While not essential to document attention to this CE factor, it would have been of interest to not only cite a source of more information on p. 10 of YE 01 (“For a complete summary of external review of ELA passages, see Results from External Review During the 2014–2015 Academic Year [Clark, Swinburne Romine, Bell, &amp; Karvonen, 2016]”), but to have provided it among sources of evidence.</p> <p>The explanation of steps taken in the selection and/or creation of graphic components was clear and complete. The reviewers appreciated inclusion of the specific guidelines used in selecting photographs for ELA passages.</p> <p>No additional evidence was required regarding steps taken to ensure that assessments are fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement (2017 review)</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION**

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></p> <p>(from 2016 review)</p> <p>For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), WVDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of monitoring procedures used for scoring DLM-YE writing items, including measures of inter-rater reliability.</li> </ul>	<p>Technical Manual Update YE 2016-17 (YE 01), pp. 106-113; 141-142</p>	<p>The sampling for the writing products seems to be small. Peer reviewers urge that an effort be made future studies to increase the number of samples and make sure that they represent the full range of abilities reflected in the underlying population.</p> <p>DLM describes the scoring of writing products by human raters (teachers) using a partially-crossed matrix design (multiple, different raters across products). Agreement was determined to be good to excellent; but see below:</p> <p>To some extent, a conventional treatment of interrater reliability is not applicable to scoring of writing products in DLM because a “high-inference process common in large-scale assessment such as applying analytic or holistic rubrics” is not used (p. 107). Evaluation based on presence of text features requires little/no inference and thus one would expect raters to assign identical scores.</p> <p>Nevertheless, to address questions about interrater reliability, DLM conducted a study in spring 2017 using writing products from that administration. Teachers’ original ratings from the operational administration were compared to the one additional rating or one randomly selected rating from the raters who participated in the study.</p> <p>While DLM points to agreement rates for intraclass correlation (ICC) as falling in the excellent range (<math>\geq .75</math> and Fleiss’s kappa in the good range (.60-.74), these ranges for comparable dichotomous decisions may be modest, but are certainly adequate (typically ICC should be <math>&gt; .80</math> to be considered “excellent”). It would be helpful to compare ranges applied to scoring of low inference items to those more typical</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE DLM YE ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>of direct assessment of writing. This might be addressed as part of the anticipated continuation of studies on writing score agreement.</p> <p>DLM indicates that they plan to conduct further study of interrater reliability of writing product scoring (p. 142), by expanding the collection and evaluation of written products.</p> <p>It might be useful for DLM to consider including as part of the study of rater agreement those scores assigned by teacher administrators for writing process items (which depend on administrator judgment). Such items were not included in the study in 2017.</p> <p>In addition, peer reviewers recommend some form of real time monitoring of teacher assigned scores by rescoring or second-scoring by a trained administrator of a small sample, rather than relying solely on post-hoc analyses.</p> <p>Raters' demographic may not be representative (YE01 Table 58, p. 110). It is hard to say, since state teacher demographics were not provided, but it seems that the raters in the study were overwhelmingly non-Hispanic white. Peer reviewers would urge that in subsequent studies, in so far as possible, a more diverse pool of raters be identified.</p>
<b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## Utah

### March 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes-Resubmission (based on 2016 peer review)



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Utah-Resubmission

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 ..... 5  
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments ..... 6  
1.5 – Participation Data ..... 7

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS ..... 8**  
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 8  
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration..... 9  
2.5 – Test Security ..... 10  
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 11  
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 12  
5.3 – Accommodations..... 13  
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations ..... 14

**SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 15**  
6.4 – Reporting..... 15

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

**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><b>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students (from 2016 review)</b>                      For the science general assessments in grade spans 3-5, 6-9 and 10-12, USOE must provide:                      Evidence of formal adoption of the State’s 2012 revised Earth Science standards.</p>	<p>Utah Board State Board Meeting Minutes, October 12, 2012 pg. 17                      SC1-1 p. 15-19 Board adoption of Standards: Earth Science Standards</p>	<p>No additional evidence required.</p>
<b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<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 Utah-Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</b>  <b>(from 2016 review)</b>                      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"> <li>• Evidence of coherent and rigorous academic content standards in science in high school.</li> <li>• Evidence of a timeline for implementation of science standards in high school.</li> </ul>	<p>SCI Utah Core Standards for Science</p> <p>UAC3 Utah Administrative Code R277-700-6 (pgs. 7-8)</p> <p>Utah Board State Board Meeting Minutes, October12, 2012 pg. 17</p>	<p>No additional evidence is required.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b></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 Utah-Resubmission**

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><b>1.3 – Required Assessments</b> (from 2016 review) For the science general assessments in grade spans 10-12, USOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<p>Pages 1-2 of the 1.3 document</p> <p>Page 7 of the 1.3 UAC3 UT Admin Code R277-700-6 document</p> <p>1.3 SC2 2016 SAGE Science Core Codes document</p>	<p>USBE makes the argument that “the statewide policy which applies to all public schools and students outlining the pathway from 1) graduation requirements to 2) science coursework to 3) science assessment is consistent with the ESEA requirement to assess science for each student at least once in high school.” As explained, students are required to take a science assessment associated with their science course of study. As students are required to study at least two areas of science, the USBE argues that this means each student will meet the ESEA requirement of being tested at least once in grades 10-12. These tests are all part of the SAGE summative assessment.</p> <p>Staff does not find this to be sufficient to meet this requirement. States must establish that all high school students in a required subject be tested to the same standard. This by definition means that all students Statewide must take the same high school assessment.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: For the science general assessments in grade spans 10-12, USOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>		

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

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><b>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</b> (from 2016 review)</p> <p>For the science general assessments in grade spans 10-12, USOE must provide: 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.</p>	<p>Pages 10-11 of the Utah Participation and Accommodations Policy 2016-2017</p>	<p>USBE provides documentation that reinforces the information provided in section 1.3, which explains that all high school students are required to take the science assessment associated with the specific course of study.</p> <p>Staff does not find this to be sufficient to meet this requirement. States must establish that all high school students in a required subject be tested to the same standard. This by definition means that all students Statewide must take the same high school assessment. Because the State does not administer the same high school assessment in science for all students, it cannot demonstrate policies that provide for the inclusion of all students in the required test.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: For the science general assessments in grade spans 10-12, USOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>		

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

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"><b>1.5 – Participation Data</b></p> <p>(from 2016 review)                      For the science general assessments in grade spans 10-12, USOE must provide: 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.</p>	<p>Page 7 of the 1.3 UAC3 UT Admin Code R277-700-6 document</p> <p>1.3 SC2 2016 SAGE Science Core Codes document</p> <p>Page 6 of 1.5 COE</p>	<p>To address the requirement that all students must participate in a science assessment, USBE references the information provided in section 1.3 explaining that all high school students are required to take the science assessment associated with the specific course of study. In addition, USBE provided data that at least 95 percent of all students participated in the 2016 and 2017 science assessments.</p> <p>Staff does not find this to be sufficient to meet this requirement. States must establish that all high school students in a required subject be tested to the same standard. This by definition means that all students Statewide must take the same high school assessment. Because the State does not administer the same high school assessment in science for all students, it cannot demonstrate that indicates the percentage of all students taking the required test.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:                      For the science general assessments in grade spans 10-12, USOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>		

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

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b> (from 2016 review)</p> <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"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p>For the DLM IM AA-AAAS, USOE must provide: Per DLM consortium review.</p>	<p>WB1 Webb’s Depth of Knowledge DLM1_USED_Letter_DLM.pdf pg. 2 footnote 2</p>	<p>Peer Reviewers did not locate evidence to support the requested information relevant to a State plan to increase the item pool and improve the precision of the computer-adaptive (CAT) algorithms used. While the State noted a plan to move from an item-level to a multi-stage adaptive test, details that describe how this will be accomplished were not provided at the time of this submission.</p> <p>Peer Reviewers noted that the State intends to continue testing and reporting on listening, but will request a waiver from testing speaking. Evidence of this will need to be provided.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has a plan to address the need to increase the item pool and to improve the precision of the computer-adaptive (CAT) algorithms used 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.</li> <li>• Evidence that indicates the State is testing speaking or has been granted a waiver from USED.</li> </ul>		

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

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"><b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b></p> <p>(from 2016 review)                      For the entire USOE assessment system, including both general and alternate assessments, USOE must provide: 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 following findings from such monitoring).</p>	<p>OB1 2017 SAGE Observation Schedule</p> <p>Assessment Director’s Meeting</p> <p>OB3 Assessment Observation form and Questionnaire</p>	<p>USBE provided a full list of all districts and schools that were visited during the Spring 2017 testing window. As a means of highlighting the observations, the USBE provided a document that highlighted the successes and challenges of the visit and the formed used to conduct observations. However, no information was provided that demonstrated a summary of findings and appropriate action steps to address monitoring findings.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the USBE has a test administration monitoring system that includes built-in components to identify findings and appropriate action steps to address and resolve them.</li> </ul>		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>2.5 – Test Security</b> <b>(from 2016 review)</b></p> <p>For the entire USOE assessment system, including both general and alternate assessments, USOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of procedures for remediation following test irregularities, security breaches, or unauthorized access of the secure system.</li> </ul>	<p>ETHICS-2</p>	<p>Peer Reviewers noted that the State provided “The Standard Test Administration and Testing Ethics Policy (ETHICS-2)” which outlines unethical testing practices, and provides a protocol that LEAs should follow for remediating violations. Evidence, such as guidelines that support procedures for LEAs to implement test security remediation following test irregularities, security breaches, or unauthorized access of the secure system are needed for the SAGE assessments, similar to what has been provided for the DLM assessment ( DLM3 pg. 1-2).</p>
<p><b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guidelines that support procedures for LEAs to implement test security remediation following test irregularities, security breaches, or unauthorized access of the secure system are needed for the SAGE assessments.</li> </ul>		

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

**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><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content (from 2016 review)</b></p> <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"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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).</li> </ul> <p>For DLM—see consortium review notes</p>	<p>3.1.pdf</p> <p>CRST A CRESST Alignment Study__AIR_SAGE_Config Summary 19MAY2016.pdf</p> <p>WB1 Webbs Depth of Knowledge.pdf</p> <p>DLM1 USED Letter DLM.pdf</p>	<p>Peer Reviewers noted that the State will be contracting with a new service provider and intends to move from item-level to multi-stage adaptive testing, which will provide an opportunity to plan for an examination of the alignment between the adaptive algorithm specifications to Utah test blueprints for all grades and subjects. Submission of this plan is needed to support evidence of adequate alignment (see also 2.1 Summary Statement).</p>
<p><b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission of a plan for an examination of the alignment between the adaptive algorithm specifications to Utah test blueprints for all grades and subjects is needed to support evidence of adequate alignment (see also 2.1 Summary Statement).</li> </ul>		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes (from 2016 review)</b>                      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"> <li>Evidence that the State’s assessments tap the appropriate cognitive processes for each content area at each tested grade level.</li> </ul>	<p>Hess Cognitive Rigor Matrix                       TECH4 1 pgs. 13-21</p>	<p>Peer reviewers noted that the State will be contracting with a new service provider, which will allow for the opportunity to plan for an examination of the alignment between the adaptive algorithm specifications to Utah test blueprints for all grades and subjects. Though the State provides a document labeled ‘Hess Cognitive Rigor Matrix’ and a Confirmatory Factor Analysis study document, submission of a study is needed to support evidence of adequate alignment and depth of knowledge (DOK) related to Utah test items that target appropriate cognitive processes for each content area at each tested grade level (see also 2.1 Summary Statement).</p>
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission of a study to support evidence of adequate alignment and depth of knowledge (DOK) of Utah’s assessments is needed, related to Utah test items that target appropriate cognitive processes for each content area at each tested grade level (see also 2.1 Summary Statement).</li> </ul>		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>5.3 – Accommodations (from 2016 review)</b></p> <p>For the entire USOE assessment system, including both general and alternate assessments, USOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<p><b>ACC1-3 Utah Participation and Accommodations Policy 2017-2018 p. 27</b></p> <p><b>Exceptional Accommodation Request description.</b></p> <p><b>ACC2 Exceptional Accommodations Request Form for Assessment Request form for assessment when an IEP/504 team has designated an exceptional accommodation for a student.</b></p>	<p>Peer Reviewers noted that the State has provided a form for requesting exceptional accommodations, however, evidence of a process that describes when and how exceptional accommodations are requested for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed is needed. Documentation of this process will support administrators and educators in appropriately implementing State policies and should be referenced in the Utah Participation and Accommodations Policy.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of a process that describes when and how exceptional accommodations are requested for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed needs to be referenced in the Utah Participation and Accommodations Policy.</li> </ul>		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations (from 2016 review)</b>                      For the entire USOE assessment system, including both general and alternate assessments, USOE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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).</li> </ul>	<p>OB2 Assessment Accommodations Observation Summary Presentation: Assessment observation summary, findings, and suggestions to improve LEA practices.</p> <p>ACC3 Individual LEA Accommodations Assessment Data example: Assessment observation findings for individual LEA use to improve practices.</p> <p>ETHCS-3 Standard Test Administration and Testing Ethics Policy, p. 4: Testing Ethics Violations</p>	<p>No additional evidence is required.</p> <p>Peer Reviewers suggest that the State continue and expand the monitoring process described in the OB2 Assessment Accommodations Observation Summary Presentation.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b></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 Utah-Resubmission**

**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 style="text-align: center;"><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p> <p>(From 2016 review)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>	<p>ETHCS 1</p> <p>BD2-1</p> <p>TECH5-1</p> <p>DLM2-1</p>	<p>No additional evidence is required.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b></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.