



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable James F. Lane  
Superintendent of Public Instruction  
Virginia Department of Education  
P.O. Box 2120  
Richmond, VA 23218

February 5, 2019

Dear Superintendent Lane:

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

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

External peer reviewers and Department staff carefully evaluated VDOE's submission and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that the components of your assessment system meet some, but not all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of section 1111(b)(1) and (3) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB. I understand that subsequent to this cycle of assessment peer review, VDOE has made substantial changes to its general assessments in grades 3-8 reading/language arts and mathematics assessments in terms of both test design and in the academic content standards upon which these assessments are based. As a consequence of these changes, we are not providing a formal determination on the peer review of the State's legacy assessments in these subject areas. Because this is a substantive change to these assessments, VDOE will need to submit a full set of new evidence for peer review based upon the revised assessments after the 2019-2020 school year. The peer notes enclosed may be helpful to you in your work.

For those assessments that are not being substantially revised, based on the recommendations from this peer review and our own analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following for the remaining assessments:

- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in high school (SOL tests for end-of-course (EOC) Algebra I, EOC Geometry, EOC Algebra II, EOC English 11): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**
- General assessments in science for grades 5 and 8 (SOL tests): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**

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.*

- Science general assessments in high school (SOL tests for EOC Earth Science, EOC Biology, EOC Chemistry): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**
- Reading/language arts and mathematics alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) for grades 3-8 and high school (VAAP): **Does not meet requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA.**
- Science AA-AAAS for grades 5, 8 and high school (VAAP): **Does not meet requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA.**

**Substantially meets requirements** means that these components meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required.

As indicated above, I have determined that VDOE is administering an AA-AAAS that **does not meet** the requirements of the statute and regulations. I understand that VDOE has indicated it will develop a new AA-AAAS in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science. I want to note the current design of the State's AA-AAAS (which is entirely portfolio based) does not meet requirements of the ESEA, as amended by ESSA. Section 1111(b)(2)(B)(vi) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, only authorizes an individual State assessment to be based partially upon a portfolio. I want to advise you that VDOE will need to redesign or replace the VAAP such that it complies with the statute. Under the orderly transition authority in section 4(b) of the ESSA, I am granting VDOE until January 5, 2021, to submit evidence of an AA-AAAS that meets the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA.

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 VDOE peer review was conducted under the requirements of this statute. Beginning in the 2017-2018 school year, the assessment requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, will apply to State assessments.

Given that this review began under the requirements of the ESEA as amended by the NCLB, it is important to indicate that while several of the State's assessments meet some of the peer review guidance criteria under the NCLB, the State is still responsible to ensure that these assessments also comply with the requirements of the ESSA. Department staff carefully reviewed VDOE 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 VDOE assessments need to meet one additional requirement related to alternate academic achievement standards. As you revise or replace the VAAP, please ensure that the AA-AAAS meets the requirement that the State's alternate academic achievement standards reflect professional judgment as to the highest possible standards achievable to ensure that a student who meets the alternate academic achievement standards is on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment.

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

recommendations for improving your assessment system beyond what is noted in the Department's feedback. Department staff will reach out to your assessment director in the next few days to discuss the peer notes and the Department's determination and to answer any questions you have.

Thank you for your ongoing commitment to improving educational outcomes for all students. I look forward to our continued partnership as we move ahead with this critical work. I appreciate the work you are doing to improve your schools and provide a high-quality education for your students.

If you have any questions, please contact Collette Roney of my staff at: [OSS.Virginia@ed.gov](mailto:OSS.Virginia@ed.gov).

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank T. Brogan  
Assistant Secretary for  
Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Shelley Loving-Ryder, Assistant Superintendent

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

**Note: Because of substantial revisions in test design and academic content standards (see previous discussion in memorandum), Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) must submit evidence for revised general assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics in grades 3-8 after the 2020 administration of the assessments. Because the current alternate assessment of alternate academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science does not meet the requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), VDOE must submit evidence of a significantly revised alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) in reading/language arts, mathematics and science by January 5, 2021.**

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<b>1.3 – Required Assessments</b>	For the SOL tests in mathematics and science in high school: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the requirement in the State’s assessment system that a single statewide assessment in each of mathematics and science (Algebra I and Biology) be administered to each student at least once in high school (grades 10-12), except those students with significant cognitive disabilities who are assessed with an AA-AAAS.</li> </ul>
<b>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</b>	For the assessments in the subject areas of reading/language arts and science: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has procedures in place for participation rate calculations that ensure that each student enrolled in a grade or grade span in which testing is required is tested in reading and science with assessments administered for that grade or grade-span under ESEA section 1111(b)(3).</li> </ul>
<b>1.5 – Participation Data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional evidence required in critical element 1.4 above also applies to this critical element.</li> </ul>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b>	For the general SOL tests in grades 5 and 8 for science and in high school for reading/language arts, mathematics, and science: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State’s assessments are designed to measure the breadth and depth of the State’s academic content standards and that the tests do not systematically exclude content standards.</li> <li>• Evidence that the State’s test design supports the development of assessments that measure the State’s academic content standards in terms of cognitive complexity (e.g., test blueprints or other documents that describe the structure of each assessment in terms of cognitive complexity or documentation of processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the cognitive complexity of the State’s academic content standards).</li> </ul>
<b>2.2 – Item Development</b>	For the general SOL tests in grades 5 and 8 for science and in high school for reading/ language arts, mathematics, and science: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 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 cognitive complexity.</li> </ul>

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Additional Evidence Needed</b>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b>	<p>For the general SOL tests in grades 5 and 8 for science and in high school for reading/language arts, mathematics, and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of improved alignment, which will be addressed by evidence provided in element 2.1.</li> </ul>
<b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b>	<p>For the general SOL tests in grades 5 and 8 for science and in high school for reading/language arts, mathematics, and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence for the SOL that 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.</li> </ul>
<b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b>	<p>For the general SOL tests in grades 5 and 8 for science and in high school for reading/language arts, mathematics, and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that State has documented adequate validity evidence that the SOL scores are related as expected with other variables.</li> </ul>
<b>4.2 – Fairness and accessibility</b>	<p>For the general SOL tests in grades 5 and 8 for science and in high school for reading/language arts, mathematics, and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the actions taken by the State to address the results of differential item functioning (DIF) analyses.</li> <li>• Evidence that the State has addressed any relevant issues in the design of the SOL in reading in grades 3-8 to address language barriers for English learners with low levels of English proficiency.</li> </ul>
<b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b>	<p>For the entire assessment system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State provides guidance to individualized education program (IEP) teams, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Guidance to inform decisions about student assessments that reflects only assessments options allowable under ESEA section 1111(b)(3) (i.e., SOLs and VAAP);</li> <li>○ Guidelines on accommodations;</li> <li>○ Guidance to parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, if their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards, of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA);</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Evidence that it 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.</li> </ul>
<b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b>	<p>For the entire assessment system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State monitors SOL and AA-AAAS test administration in its local educational agencies 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:</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>○ Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>○ Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>○ 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; and administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul>
<b>6.4 – Reporting</b>	<p>For the general SOL tests in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science at all grade levels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence that the State’s individual student reports for the SOL tests, report each student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standard, including performance-level descriptors.</li> </ul>

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## March 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes Resubmission (from 2016 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 Virginia Resubmission

Contents

**SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS . 3**  
1.3 – Required Assessments ..... 4  
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments ..... 6  
1.5 – Participation Data ..... 8

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS ..... 9**  
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 10  
2.2 – Item Development..... 13  
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration..... 16

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 18**  
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 ..... 24  
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables ..... 25

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER ..... 26**  
4.1 – Reliability..... 27  
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 29  
4.4 – Scoring ..... 31  
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities ..... 34  
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations ..... 37

**SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 39**  
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 39  
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards ..... 40  
6.4 – Reporting..... 42

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Virginia Resubmission

**SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS**

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Virginia 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></p> <p>For the SOL tests in mathematics and science in high school, VDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State’s assessment system includes a single statewide assessment or set of assessments in each of mathematics and science required for each student at least once in high school (grades 10-12), with the exception of students with a significant cognitive disabilities who are assessed with the VAAP.</li> </ul>	<p>This critical element was reviewed by ED staff.</p> <p>Virginia did not identify a single general high school mathematics assessment and a single general high school science assessment for all students or provide evidence of one assessment (or set of assessments) in mathematics and science that is required for each student at least once in high school (grades 10-12).</p> <p>For mathematics, VDOE indicates, “the mathematics pass rates used for federal accountability for Virginia high schools have traditionally included Algebra I, Geometry, and Algebra II as well as the mathematics scores for high school students with significantly cognitive disabilities who participate in the Virginia Alternate Assessment Program.” VDOE also indicates, “It is important to note that Virginia has been approved to use all three end-of-course mathematics tests in federal accountability since the initial peer review process beginning in 2005.” The waiver VDOE refers to is one ED approved on a temporary basis in 2009 (see <a href="http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/nclbfinalassess/vascience.pdf">www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/nclbfinalassess/vascience.pdf</a>) that was not extended or renewed, and would no longer be in effect under ESSA.</p> <p>For science, VDOE indicates, “Virginia has traditionally used the three end-of-course tests in science—Earth Science, Biology, and Chemistry—for the federal accountability pass rates for high schools. During the initial peer review of Virginia’s assessment system, questions were raised about Virginia’s use of the three end-of-course tests in science. Ultimately, the use of the three end-of-course science tests was approved because of the role the end-of-course tests play in Virginia’s graduation requirements.”</p>	<p>VDOE did not adequately address this requirement.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Virginia Resubmission**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the SOL tests in mathematics and science in high school, VDOE must provide:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State’s assessment system includes a single statewide assessment or set of assessments in each of mathematics and science required for each student at least once in high school (grades 10-12), with the exception of students with a significant cognitive disabilities who are assessed with the VAAP.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Virginia 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></p> <p>For the entire assessment system, VDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Evidence that VDE requires all students to take the State’s grade-level assessments in all applicable grades for each subject.</li> </ul>	<p>This critical element was reviewed by ED staff.</p> <p>In the previous peer review, VDOE documented that it administers the Virginia Substitute Evaluation Program assessment (VSEP), a AA-GLAS for SWD, on which a small number of students are assessed and counted as non-participants. VDOE did not provide evidence that these exclusions are no longer allowed such that VDOE requires all students to take the State’s grade-level assessments in all applicable grades for each subject. In fact, evidence submitted by VDOE documents that it continued to administer the VSEP in 2017-2018 (e.g., Evidence 245, 268)</p> <p>In the previous peer review, VDOE documented that it allows students in grades 3-8 to take the assessments of either the grade in which they are enrolled or the grade of instruction for the school year in a content area, and, as a result it was not clear how Virginia provides for inclusion in the State’s grade-level assessments administered for Title I of all students in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in grades 10-12. In the index submitted by VDOE for this review, VDOE documented that it does not require assessment of all students with the State’s grade-level assessments in all applicable grades for each subject. Instead, evidence submitted indicated, “students who are accelerated shall take the tests of the grade level enrolled or the tests for the grade level of the content received in instruction.”</p>	<p>VDOE did not adequately address this requirement.</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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the entire assessment system, VDOE must provide:</li> </ul>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Virginia 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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that VDOE requires all students to take the State’s grade-level assessments in all applicable grades for each subject (i.e., VDOE does not administer for certain students the Virginia Substitute Evaluation Program assessment (VSEP) as a substitute for its State’s grade-level assessments, and VDOE requires students in grades 3-8 to take grade-level assessments for the grade in which they are enrolled unless a current ED-approved exception applies).</li> </ul>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Virginia 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>For the entire assessment system, VDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has procedures in place for participation rate calculations that ensure that each student enrolled in a grade or grade span in which testing is required is tested in reading, mathematics and science.</li> <li>• Participation data that show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system for the grade in which the student is enrolled.</li> </ul>	<p>This critical element was reviewed by ED staff.</p> <p>VDOE did not submit evidence to address this requirement.</p>	<p>VDOE did not adequately address this requirement.</p>
<p align="center"><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p>For the entire assessment system, VDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has procedures in place for participation rate calculations that ensure that each student enrolled in a grade or grade span in which testing is required is tested in reading, mathematics and science.</li> <li>• Participation data that show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system for the grade in which the student is enrolled.</li> </ul>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Virginia 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
------------------	--	--

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Virginia Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></p> <p>For the general SOL tests in R/LA, mathematics, and science at all grade levels, VDE must provide:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State’s assessments are designed to measure the full range of the State’s academic content standards (e.g., standards related to writing, speaking, and listening, in R/LA) and that the tests do not systematically exclude content standards. [NOTE: Virginia has received a speaking waiver; therefore, the Department does not expect VDE to submit additional evidence regarding speaking and listening during the period of the waiver.]</li> <li>Evidence that the State’s test design supports the development of assessments that measure the State’s academic content standards in terms of cognitive complexity (e.g., test blueprints or other documents that describe the structure of each assessment in terms of cognitive complexity or documentation of processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the cognitive complexity of the State’s academic content standards).</li> </ol>	<p><b>General SOL Tests R/LA, Mathematics and Science</b></p> <p>070: Alignment Analysis of the 2012 Standards of Learning Tests in mathematics</p> <p>071: Alignment Analysis of the 2013 Standards of Learning Tests in Reading</p> <p>072: Alignment Analysis of the 2013 Standards of Learning Tests in Science</p> <p>237: Virginia Standards of Learning and Testing External Writer Training (Pearson)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No evidence of date of training or who was involved.</li> </ul> <p>238: ETS Item Writer Training. September 20 2014.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>slides did not address cognitive complexity.</li> </ul> <p>239: Sample Item Bank Analysis and Item Development Plan Template: Mathematics References overall estimated cognitive complexity as one criteria to complete on the template.</p> <p>240: Excerpt 2014 Grade 7 Reading Assessment Item Specifications</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence is sufficient. Test is a measure of reading, therefore no writing is assessed.</li> <li>Evidence is sufficient. Information on item writer training was provided, but could be enhanced with respect to cognitive complexity.</li> <li>Evidence is sufficient. Sample item analysis document was enhanced, and, if used, should address concerns raised in the alignment study results.</li> </ol> <p>Peers recommend that there be a process after items are written to confirm that items match the intended cognitive complexity. For example, there is no evidence that item review panels provide independent judgment as to the cognitive complexity of items written by the vendor.</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Virginia Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3. Evidence that the State has taken steps to strengthen the alignment of its assessments based on the results of the State's alignment studies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Last page provides definition of low, medium, high complexity level (referenced in slides in evidence 237</li> </ul> <p>241: Excerpt 2017 Test Construction Specifications</p>	
<p><b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Virginia 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 Virginia Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>2.2 – Item Development</b></p> <p>For the general SOL tests in R/LA, mathematics, and science at all grade levels, VDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Evidence that 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 cognitive complexity.</li> </ul> <p>For the AA-AAAS for grades 3-8 and high school in R/LA, mathematics and science (VAAP), VDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Evidence that 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.</li> </ul>	<p><b>General SOL Tests R/LA, Mathematics and Science</b></p> <p>070-071: Alignment Analyses of the 2012 Virginia Standards of Learning Tests</p> <p>237: Pearson Training on Cognitive Levels</p> <p>238: ETS Item Writer Training</p> <p>239: Sample Item Bank Analysis and Item Development Plan Template: Mathematics.</p> <p>240: Excerpt - 2014 Grade 7</p> <p>242: SOL Item and Test Review Committee: Data Review Training Presentation</p> <p>243: Data Training Presentation Script</p> <p><b>VAAP grades 3-8 and HS R/LA and Mathematics and Science</b></p> <p>074: Virginia Alternative and Alternate Assessments Manual 2014-15</p> <p>075: VAAP Implementation Manual</p> <p>121: 2014-15 Update Training For administrator to share with teachers and parents etc.</p>	<p>1. Evidence is sufficient. Pearson item writer training material and item development templates address this. Item bank analysis document now has an additional field that tracks cognitive complexity. See comments in 2.1 for suggestions related to further validation of cognitive complexity.</p> <p>2. More evidence is needed that the process yields an assessment system that provides information on student mastery of the full breadth of the content standards, and at the intended complexity levels of the ASOL. There is no evidence that the process is consistently applied by all teachers across all assessed standards. Teachers make the decision about which evidence is collected, but there is no evidence of a process in place to ensure balanced coverage of the content nor the complexity of the ASOL standards.</p> <p>Peers recommend that the state use the annual summary data of the standards assessed to identify those standards that are not being assessed nor being taught. One possible solution is for the state to provide teachers with more specific blueprints for annual assessment, and possibly sample all ASOLs over the period of some years.</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Virginia Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	244: VAAP Update Summer 2015  245: 2017-18 Administrator Updates  246: VAAP ASOLS and Levels of Performance Math Summer 2014  247: VAAP Working with Reading Summer 2014  248: VAAP Science Summer 2014 249: VAAP Writing Summer 2014	
<b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence for the VAAP that the State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to systematically select items to assess student achievement based on the full range of the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills (i.e., specifically, evidence of implementation of a process that ensures balanced coverage of the content and intended cognitive complexity of the ASOL standards).</li> </ul>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Virginia Resubmission**

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Virginia 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>For the AA-AAAS for grades 3-8 and high school in R/LA, mathematics and science (VAAP), VDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State adequately monitors the administration of the tests to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</li> </ul>	<p>This critical element was reviewed by ED staff.</p> <p>VDOE provided several documents as evidence to address this requirement. It appears that VDOE has implemented strategies for what it generally refers to as monitoring and pre-scoring plans for the Virginia Alternate Assessment Program (VAAP) Collections of Evidence (COE). However, the documentation VDOE provided about monitoring and pre-scoring plan pertains more to test administration procedures to support fidelity of implementation and post-administration activities, including scoring, than monitoring of actual test administration as required by this critical element. (Evidence 074, 075, 245, 250, 251, 252 and 253)</p> <p>Some evidence provided by VDOE to address Critical Element 5.4 relates to Critical Element 2.4 as well. Though this evidence suggests that VDOE may have in place some policies and procedures to adequately monitor test administration, it is not sufficient to address this requirement. Specifically, VDOE provided a test administration observation “audit” observation protocol from spring 2015; a protocol of questions for school testing coordinators, undated; and a protocol of questions for examiners. VDOE also provided is an e-mail to a district selected for test administration observation “audit” in spring 2015 following the observation. VDOE did not, however, provide evidence of its overall approach to monitoring, the scope of its monitoring (e.g., strategies for selecting districts, the number or percentage of districts monitored annually) or evidence of implementation of any strategies beyond 2015 and on an annual basis. (Evidence 144, 145, 146 and 147)</p>	<p>VDOE did not adequately address this requirement.</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Virginia Resubmission**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
	<p>Technical assistance for VDOE in addressing this critical element could include suggesting that VDOE consider the examples provided in the assessment peer review guidance.</p>	
<b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the AA-AAAS for grades 3-8 and high school in R/LA, mathematics and science (VAAP), VDOE must provide:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State adequately monitors the administration of the tests to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Virginia 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
------------------	--	--

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Virginia Resubmission**

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</b></p> <p>For the general SOL tests in R/LA, mathematics, and science at all grade levels, VDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Evidence of improved alignment, which will be addressed by evidence provided in element 2.1.E.</li> </ul> <p>For the AA-AAAS for grades 3-8 and high school in R/LA, mathematics and science (VAAP), VDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Evidence that the VAAP shows adequate alignment 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</li> </ul>	<p><b>VAAP</b></p> <p>254: 2016-2017 Summary of Alternate Assessment Content Coverage (by Aligned Standard of Learning and Reporting Category)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data collection appears to be based on all students who took the assessment in 2016-17. It is not clear how each student is assessed on the breadth of content and cognitive complexity.</li> <li>Some ASOLs assessed with 200 students and some with 1.</li> <li>There does not to be any unrelated content.</li> </ul> <p>255: Development Process for Aligned Standards of Learning (ASOL)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>VDE reports assessment content specialists reviewed the new ASOLS developed based on DLM process to ensure consistent with objective of SOLS.</li> <li>The plan to move forward with developing ASOLs on the same schedule as SOLs with teacher input seems reasonable.</li> </ul> <p>245: 2017-2018 Administrator’s Updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Slides 67-94 address the selection of student evidence and common scoring</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence is sufficient. See 2.1</li> <li>Evidence was provided to support that VAAP shows adequate alignment to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content), however, more evidence is needed with respect to the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. See comments in 2.2.</li> </ol>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Virginia Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>issues. These slides are designed to make it clear that evidence has to align to the ASOL, and provides examples of evidence that does not meet the criteria with a rationale.</p>	
<b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As in 2.2, evidence that the VAAP shows adequate alignment to the State’s academic content standards in terms of the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities (i.e., evidence of implementation of a process for VAAP that ensures balanced coverage of the content and intended cognitive complexity of the ASOL standards).</li> </ul>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Virginia 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 Virginia 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</b></p> <p>For the general SOL tests in R/LA, mathematics, and science at all grade levels, VDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Evidence for the SOL that 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.</li> </ul> <p>For the AA-AAAS for grades 3-8 and high school in R/LA, mathematics and science (VAAP), VDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Evidence for the VAAPs that 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.</li> </ul>	<p><b>General SOL Tests R/LA, Mathematics and Science</b></p> <p>241: Excerpt - 2017 SOL Test Construction Specifications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>p. 2. Cognitive levels of items must minimally match cognitive level of SOL</li> </ul> <p>070-072: Alignment Studies</p> <p><b>VAAP</b> No evidence provided</p>	<p>1. Evidence is sufficient. Sample item analysis document was enhanced, and, if used, should result in test forms that measure the intended cognitive processes.</p> <p>Peers recommend that there be a process after items are written to confirm that items match the intended cognitive complexity. For example, there is no evidence that item review committees provide independent judgment as to the cognitive complexity of items written by the vendor.</p> <p>2. No evidence was provided. Findings in 2.2 and 3.1 relate to this issue, and the state’s future response to those Critical Elements may address some of the requested evidence here. For example, one consideration may be to implement an expert review of the samples of Collections of Evidence used in the most recent administration. Such a review could serve as 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><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Virginia Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence for the VAAP that 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.</li></ul>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Virginia Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b></p> <p>For the general SOL tests in R/LA, mathematics, and science at all grade levels, VDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Evidence that the State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its SOL 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.</li> </ul>	<p><b>General SOL Tests R/LA, Mathematics and Science</b></p> <p>256: Correlations Among Reporting Categories by SOL Test</p>	<p>1. Evidence is sufficient.</p> <p>Peers recommend reviewing Grade 7 Reading, as the correlations are somewhat lower than for other Reading tests. Also recommended is to examine disattenuated correlations for Science. Such correlations may be more accurate estimates of the relationships among scores. Lastly, it is recommended that the state analyze correlations across subjects in order to provide additional validity evidence.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Virginia Resubmission**

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>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b></p> <p>For all tests in the assessment system, VDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Evidence that State has documented adequate validity evidence that the SOL and VAAP scores are related as expected with other variables.</li> </ul>	<p><b>General SOL Tests R/LA, Mathematics and Science</b></p> <p>257: Correlations between SOL Assessments Tables produced from spring 2017 data in response to Peer Review request.</p> <p>258: Student Performance on SOL EOC Tests and the SAT  Tables developed in response to peer review.</p> <p>259: Student Performance on SOL EOC Tests and the ACT</p>	<p>1. Evidence is sufficient for SOL. Correlations between SOL and ACT/SAT are as expected.</p> <p>Evidence was not provided for VAAP.</p> <p>One suggestion for evidence is to calculate correlations between VAAP Reading and VAAP Math. Another suggestion, per USDOE guidance, would be to document the time spent on instruction. The state could then provide correlations between assessment results and instructional time spent teaching academic content based on grade-level standards.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.4 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 that State has documented adequate validity evidence that the VAAP scores are related as expected with other variables.</li> </ul>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Virginia 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 Virginia 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>For the general SOL tests in R/LA, mathematics, and science at all grade levels, VDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1. Evidence documenting the reliability of the assessments, as outlined in Critical Element 4.1, based on operational data for SOL grade 6 mathematics test.</li> <li>• 2. Evidence documenting the reliability of the assessments, as outlined in Critical Element 4.1, for the Native-American/Alaskan Native, Asian, Hispanic, students with disabilities, English learners and economically disadvantaged student groups) for each SOL test, specifically:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Test reliability;</li> <li>○ Overall and conditional standard error of measurement (CSEM);</li> <li>○ Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>○ Evidence that the assessment produces test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement.</li> <li>○ OR documentation of the subgroup size below which Virginia</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>General SOL Tests R/LA, Mathematics and Science</b></p> <p>260: Reliability Estimates for SOL tests (updated document version, dated 3/19/2018)</p> <p><b>VAAP</b> 261: VAAP Pass/Fail Agreement Rates for Multiple Years</p> <p>Table shows rater agreement ( audit rater with division rater) by grade over 3 years</p> <p>Fairly consistent over all at 85% Very low agreement rate at some grades, 2016-17 concerns about Science 6-8 and HS.</p> <p>VDE states in general agreement rates have improved over time</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Evidence is sufficient. Reliability estimates were provided.</li> <li>2. Evidence is sufficient. An updated document with corrected information was provided.</li> </ol> <p>Peers noted that the minimum cell size of 200 used by the state in the Reliability Estimates for SOL tests was larger than normally expected. Cell sizes of approximately 50 would yield more information about the performance of these critical student groups.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Evidence is sufficient.</li> </ol> <p>Peers noted in the VAAP Pass/Fail Agreement Rates for Multiple Years document that there were high overturn rates for Grades 5 and 8 and high school Science. Peers recommend that the state examine these assessments to determine causes of and possible solutions for this issue.</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Virginia Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>considers reliability analyses to be inappropriate and documentation of subgroups that fell below this number.</p> <p>For the AA-AAAS in R/LA, mathematics and science (VAAP), VDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 3. Evidence of decision consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results.</li> </ul>		
<b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b>		
_X_ No additional evidence is required		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Virginia 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>For the general SOL tests in R/LA, mathematics, and science at all grade levels, VDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Documentation of the actions taken by the State to address the results of DIF analyses.</li> <li>2. Evidence that the State has addressed any relevant issues in the design of the SOL in reading in grades 3-8 to address language barriers for English learners with low levels of English proficiency.</li> </ul>	<p><b>General SOL Tests R/LA, Mathematics and Science</b></p> <p>113: Specific Guidelines for Writing Virginia SOL Items Supplement 2014 document</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The document addresses application of universal design principles that assists in developing assessments that are accessible to students with disabilities and non-native speakers of English. There is not information on the design components to be used to accomplish this.</li> </ul> <p>262: ETS Guidelines for Fair Tests and Communications (2015)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appendix 1 guidelines for using accessible language</li> </ul>	<p>1. No evidence was provided. One possible measure to address DIF issues could be the common practice of bringing these items back to Bias Review committees for an additional review in light of the DIF flags.</p> <p>2. Evidence is not sufficient. Both pieces of evidence that were provided pre-date the previous peer review, and do not show how issues related to language barriers for ELs with low levels of English proficiency have been addressed in the design of SOL reading tests.</p> <p>Evidence could include specific training for item writers on the characteristics of this population in order to inform item development, and item review committee member demographics that show panelist expertise with this population.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.2 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>Evidence of the actions taken by the State to address the results of DIF analyses.</li> <li>Evidence that the State has addressed any relevant issues in the design of the SOL in reading in grades 3-8 to address language barriers for English learners with low levels of English proficiency.</li> </ul>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Virginia 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 Virginia Resubmission**

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>4.4 – Scoring</b></p> <p>For the AA-AAAS for grades 3-8 and high school in R/LA, mathematics and science (VAAP), VDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1. Evidence that the State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A. Procedures for scoring when evidence submitted for a student is not appropriate for the target SOL;</li> <li>○ B. Procedures to annually document adequate training for all scorers and evidence of such documentation for the most recent test administration;</li> <li>○ C. Standardized criteria for qualifications of scorers; and</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 2. Documentation of improved rates of inter-rater agreement (e.g., in annual scoring audits).</li> </ul>	<p><b>VAAP</b></p> <p>074: Virginia Alternative and Alternate Assessments Administrator’s Manual 2014-2015 Section 11 (pp. 40-46)</p> <p>267: VAAP Local Scorer’s Guide 2015-2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• #3 in scoring guide says review ASOL in manual to see if evidence matches ASOL. See note below about Agreement form.</li> </ul> <p>180: VAAP Scorer Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scorer attests that he/she understands evidence is not scored against ASOLs</li> </ul> <p>128: Virginia Alternate Assessment Program (VAAP) Scoring Train-the-Trainer Workshop (2015)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Slides 14-32 present the VAAP scoring process and scoring tools.</li> <li>• Slides 33-45 present the VAAP scoring rules.</li> <li>• Slides 46-50 present the VAAP training sets and qualification of scorers.</li> <li>• Slides 51-60 present the VAAP selection and training of scorers</li> </ul>	<p>1.A. Evidence is sufficient. The Local Scorer Guide is explicit on this topic.</p> <p>1.B. Evidence is sufficient, given the School Division Affidavit for Alternate and Alternative Assessments. Peers recommend documentation to confirm consistent and adequate training for each teacher/test administrator, rather than a blanket affidavit for the entire division, as the test is administered in a one-on-one setting by the teacher/test administrator.</p> <p>Peer discussion regarding this Critical Element led to an additional recommendation for teacher/test administrator training. The state could consider implementing a qualification process for teacher/test administrators for VAAP. Such a qualification process would help ensure that tests are administered with fidelity.</p> <p>1.C. Evidence is sufficient, given the implementation of scorer qualification criteria in the 2018-2019 school year. However, it will not be evident until after that administration as to whether the process yields improved reliability of the results.</p> <p>2. Evidence is sufficient. There has been</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Virginia Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>along with resources for scorers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scoring tools-scoring rubric, rubric addendum, VAAP Implementation Manual</li> </ul> <p>245: 2017-2018 Administrator’s Updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Slides 103 <u>States that beginning with the 2018-19 administration qualification sets must be used to qualify individual scorers.</u></li> <li>Slides 67-94 address the selection of student evidence and common scoring issues. These slides are designed to make it clear that evidence has to align to the ASOL, and provides examples of evidence that does not meet the criteria with a rationale.</li> </ul> <p>261: VAAP Pass/Fail Agreement Rates for Multiple Years</p> <p>263: VAAP Condition Codes Rubric</p> <p>264: 2017-2018 School Division Affidavit for Alternate and Alternative Assessments</p>	<p>some improvement. However, the rates of disagreement still appear high, and especially so for Grades 5 and 8 Science, as well as the Science EOC.</p> <p>This may be a function of having so many variables that factor into the establishment of the portfolio that it makes it difficult to standardize the outcomes. Science may be especially difficult to score due to the wide range of content for the Science ASOLs.</p>
<b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Virginia Resubmission**

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS**

<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 Virginia Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b>                      For the entire assessment system, VDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1. Evidence that the State provides guidance to IEP teams, including:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guidelines on accommodations; Guidance to parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, if their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards, of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy;</li> <li>• 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; and</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 2. Evidence that it 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.</li> </ul>	<p><b>General SOL Tests R/LA, Mathematics and Science</b>                      089: Virginia Department of Education Students with Disabilities: Guidelines for Special Test Accommodations (February 2105)</p> <p>245: 2017-2018 Administrator’s Updates</p> <p>276: 2017-2018 Standards of Learning</p> <p><b>VAAP</b></p> <p>038: 2014 Students with Disabilities: Guidelines for Assessment Participation</p> <p>265: Guidance Document: VAAP Participation Criteria and the Determination of Significant Cognitive Disabilities</p> <p>266: Guidelines for Participation in the Virginia Alternate Assessment Program (VAAP)</p> <p>245: 2017-2018 Administrators Update</p>	<p>1. Evidence is sufficient for SOL and VAAP. 2014 Students with Disabilities: Guidelines for Assessment Participation delineates consequences for taking the alternate assessment. Guidelines for Participation in the Virginia Alternate Assessment Program (VAAP) includes a statement related to category of disability.</p> <p>2. Evidence is sufficient for VAAP. The 2017-2018 Administrators Update includes slides related to the promotion of access to the general curriculum for this population.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Virginia Resubmission

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Virginia 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 Virginia Resubmission**

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>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b></p> <p>For the entire assessment system, VDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State monitors SOL and VAAP 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:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>○ Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>○ Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>○ 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; and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>General SOL Tests R/LA, Mathematics and Science</b></p> <p>147: Audit Cover Letter</p> <p>144: Audit Spring 2015 Non-Writing Audit</p> <p>145: Questions for School Test Coordinators</p> <p>146: Questions for Examiners</p> <p>276: 2017-2018 Standards of Learning</p> <p><b>VAAP</b></p> <p>268: Email to All School Divisions</p>	<p>Evidence is not sufficient. Evidence is needed that the audits proposed for 2018 were conducted, and that the state took appropriate action in response to audit findings for both SOL and VAAP test administrations. Documentation could include a sample of observations, monitoring schedules, data reviews, Division monitoring pre-scoring plans for VAAP, and feedback provided to schools and districts as a result of the SOL and VAAP audits.</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Virginia Resubmission**

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"> <li>Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures</li> </ul>		
<b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the audits proposed for 2018 were conducted, and that the state took appropriate action in response to audit findings for both SOL and VAAP test administrations.</li> </ul>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Virginia 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><b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b></p> <p>For the AA-AAAS for grades 3-8 and high school in R/LA, mathematics and science (VAAP), VDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Documentation of the State’s process for developing performance level descriptors for the VAAP assessments linked to the State’s academic content standards in R/LA, mathematics and science</li> <li>2. Evidence that each VAAP standard setting panel in R/LA, mathematics and science included panelists with appropriate expertise and experience with students with significant cognitive disabilities and also related to the grade-level(s) and content standards in the subject and grade-level(s) for which they set standards.</li> </ul>	<p><b>VAAP</b></p> <p>269: Plan to Develop VAAP Performance Level Descriptors (PLDs)</p> <p>270: Email Invitation to Review VAAP Performance Level Descriptors (PLDs)</p> <p>271: Presentation for VAAP PLD Review Committee <i>May 23, 2013</i></p> <p>272: Summary of VAAP Standard Setting PLD Conference Call Notes summarizing the June 2013 call with teachers asked to provide feedback on the VAAP PLDs.</p> <p>273: Characteristics of the VAAP Standard Setting Committees</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Evidence is sufficient to document that a process was in place to develop PLDs for VAAP.</li> <li>2. Evidence is minimally sufficient to show that the panels included educators with appropriate expertise and experience with students with significant cognitive disabilities and also related to the grade-level(s) and content standards in the subject and grade-level(s) for which they set standards.</li> </ol> <p>Moving forward, the state should more thoroughly document the process used to create the PLDS, and to ensure that both the PLD committee and the Standard Setting committees include panelists with the appropriate experience and expertise with students with significant cognitive disabilities and also related to the grade-level(s) and content standards in the subject and grade-level(s) for which they set standards.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Virginia Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b>                      For the AA-AAAS for grades 3-8 and high school in R/LA, mathematics and science (VAAP), VDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Evidence that the State’s alternate academic achievement standards reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul>	<p><b>VAAP</b></p> <p>273: Characteristics of Standard Setting Committees</p> <p>186: Virginia Alternate Assessment Program Mathematics Standard Setting</p> <p>187: Standard Setting Report for VAAP Reading</p> <p>188: Virginia Alternate Assessment Program Science Standard Setting</p>	<p>Evidence is sufficient.</p> <p>Peers noted that this standard setting occurred 4 years ago and there has been significant instruction as well as a better understanding of what this population is capable of since then. The examples of evidence supporting knowledge and skills of ASOLs that were presented in training slides (for example 245: 2017-2018 Administrator’s Updates) have appropriately evolved over time. Given these factors, it may be appropriate to revisit the PLDs and cut scores.</p> <p>Issues with PLDs/ASOLs/cut scores noted throughout this document and in the evidence may be a contributing factor in the high audit turnover rate for portfolio scores submitted for audit. Peers recommend that the state continue to monitor the issue of turnover rates and use the information to further improve the VAAP assessment system, especially in science.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Virginia 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 Virginia Resubmission**

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>For the general SOL tests in R/LA, mathematics, and science at all grade levels, the VDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1. Evidence that the State’s individual student reports for the SOL, report each student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards, including performance-level descriptors.</li> </ul> <p>For the AA-AAAS for grades 3-8 and high school in R/LA, mathematics and science (VAAP), the VDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2. Evidence that the State’s individual student reports for the VAAP, report each student’s achievement in terms of the State’s alternate academic achievement standards, including performance-level descriptors.</li> </ul> <p>For all assessments (SOL and VAAP):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3. Evidence that the State provides for the delivery of SOL and VAAP individual student reports after each administration of its assessments that are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand.</li> <li>• 4. Evidence that the State follows a</li> </ul>	<p><b>General SOL Tests R/LA, Mathematics and Science and VAAP</b></p> <p>274: Testing Memo 1330: Student Score Reports in Braille or Large Print</p> <p>275: Superintendent’s Memo 282-17: Communicating Results of State Assessments</p> <p>275: Superintendent’s Memo</p> <p>282-17: Communicating Results of State Assessments</p>	<p>1.&amp; 2. Evidence was not provided with respect to inclusion of achievement levels or PLDs in the student score report for SOL or VAAP.</p> <p>3. &amp; 4. Evidence was sufficient.</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Virginia Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
process and timeline for delivering SOL and VAAP individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.		
<b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State’s individual student reports for the SOL and VAAP report each student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards, respectively, including performance-level descriptors.</li> </ul>		