



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Steven R. Staples, Ph.D.
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Virginia Department of Education
PO Box 2120
Richmond, VA 23218

May 24, 2017

Dear Superintendent Staples:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education's (the Department) assessment peer review process under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) maintains the essential requirements from NCLB that each State annually administer high-quality assessments in at least reading/language arts, mathematics, and science that meet nationally recognized professional and technical standards. Therefore, as you know, the Department reinstated peer review of State assessment systems so that each State receives feedback from external experts on the assessments it is currently administering. We appreciate the efforts required to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in August 2016. State assessment systems provide essential information that States, districts, principals, and teachers can use to identify the academic needs of students, target resources and supports toward students who need them most, evaluate school and program effectiveness, and close achievement gaps among students. A high-quality assessment system also provides useful information to parents about their children's advancement against and achievement of grade-level standards. The Department's peer review of State assessment systems is designed to provide feedback to States to support the development and administration of high-quality assessments.

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

- Reading/ language arts (R/LA) and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (Standards of Learning assessments (SOL)): **Partially meets requirements**
- (R/LA) and mathematics general assessments in high school (SOL): **Partially meets requirements**
- Science general assessments in grades 5 and 8 (SOL): **Partially meets requirements**
- Science general assessments in in high school (SOL): **Partially meets requirements**

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

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

- R/LA alternate assessment aligned with grade-level academic achievement standards (AA-GLAS) in grades 3-8 for English learners with low English proficiency (Virginia Grade Level Alternative Assessment (VGLA)): **Does not meet requirements**
- R/LA and mathematics alternate assessments aligned with alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) for grades 3-8 and high school (Virginia Alternate Assessment Program (VAAP)): **Partially meets requirements**
- Science AA-AAAS for grades 5, 8, and high school (VAAP): **Partially meets requirements**

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

Regarding the VGLA, we understand that VDE does not plan to administer this assessment after this school year. This decision is consistent with an important change in the assessment requirements in the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. Beginning in the 2017–2018 school year, section 1111(b)(2)(B)(i) clarifies that a State must administer the same assessments to measure the achievement of all public elementary and secondary school students in the State, except if the State has developed an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, as authorized by ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(D)). Accordingly, a State may no longer administer an alternate assessment aligned with grade-level achievement standards. Similarly, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), as amended by the ESSA, no longer permits a State to conduct alternate assessments aligned with grade-level academic achievement standards in assessing the academic progress of students with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA if those students cannot participate in the regular Title I assessments even with accommodations. Specifically, section 9215(ss)(3)(B) of the ESSA amended IDEA section 612(a)(16)(C)(ii) to no longer provide for alternate assessments aligned with grade-level academic achievement standards, and now makes clear that the guidelines referred to in IDEA section 612(a)(16)(C) apply only to participation of children with the most significant cognitive disabilities in alternate assessments aligned with alternate academic achievement standards as indicated in their respective individualized education program (IEP).

The specific list of items required for VDE to submit regarding the other components of the VDE assessment system is enclosed with this letter. Because several components of Virginia’s assessment system have partially met the requirements, the Department is placing a condition on the State’s Title I grant award related to those components of the assessment system. To satisfy this condition, VDE must 1) submit satisfactory evidence to address the items identified in the enclosed list and 2) provide documentation that it has ceased administration of the VGLA beginning with the 2017–2018 school year. VDE must submit a plan and timeline within 30 days outlining when it will submit all required additional documentation for peer review. The Department will also host regular (e.g., quarterly) progress calls with the State to discuss the State’s progress on its timeline. If, following the peer review of the additional evidence, adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action. Additionally, the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) will monitor progress on matters pertaining to the participation of students with disabilities in Title I assessments. Insufficient progress to address such matters may lead OSERS to place a condition on VDE’s IDEA Part B grant award.

The Department notes that VDE requested and received approval on August 12, 2016, for a waiver from assessing speaking and listening standards for the 2016–2017, 2017–2018, and 2018–2019 school years.

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

Sincerely,

/s/

Jason Botel
Acting Assistant Secretary

Enclosures

cc: Shelly Loving Ryder, Assistant Superintendent of Assessment

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

| Critical Element | Additional Evidence Needed |
|---|--|
| 1.3 – Required Assessments | <p>For the SOL tests in mathematics and science in high school, VDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. |
| 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments | <p>For the entire assessment system, VDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that VDE requires all students to take the State’s grade-level assessments in all applicable grades for each subject. |
| 1.5 – Participation Data | <p>For the entire assessment system, VDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. |
| 2.1 – Test Design and Development | <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"> • 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.] • 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). • Evidence that the State has taken steps to strengthen the alignment of its assessments based on the results of the State’s alignment studies. |
| 2.2 – Item Development | <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"> • 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. <p>For the AA-AAAS for grades 3-8 and high school in R/LA, mathematics</p> |

| Critical Element | Additional Evidence Needed |
|--|--|
| | <p>and science (VAAP), VDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. |
| 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration | <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"> • 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. |
| 3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content | <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"> • Evidence of improved alignment, which will be addressed by evidence provided in element 2.1.E. <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"> • 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 |
| 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes | <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"> • 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. <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"> • 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. |
| 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure | <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"> • 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. |
| 3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables | <p>For each component in the assessment system, VDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that State has documented adequate validity evidence that the SOL and VAAP scores are related as expected with other variables. |

| Critical Element | Additional Evidence Needed |
|---|---|
| 4.1 – Reliability | <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"> • Evidence documenting the reliability of the assessments, as outlined in Critical Element 4.1, based on operational data for SOL grade 6 mathematics test. • 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"> ○ Test reliability; ○ Overall and conditional standard error of measurement (CSEM); ○ Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; ○ Evidence that the assessment produces test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement. ○ OR documentation of the subgroup size below which Virginia considers reliability analyses to be inappropriate and documentation of subgroups that fell below this number. <p>For the AA-AAAS in R/LA, mathematics and science (VAAP), VDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of decision consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results. |
| 4.2 – Fairness and accessibility | <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"> • Documentation of the actions taken by the State to address the results of DIF analyses. • 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. |
| 4.4 – Scoring | <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"> • Evidence that the State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Procedures for scoring when evidence submitted for a student is not appropriate for the target SOL; ○ Procedures to annually document adequate training for all scorers and evidence of such documentation for the most recent test administration; ○ Standardized criteria for qualifications of scorers; and ○ Documentation of improved rates of inter-rater agreement (e.g., in annual scoring audits). |

| Critical Element | Additional Evidence Needed |
|---|---|
| 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities | <p>For the entire assessment system, VDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State provides guidance to IEP teams, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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; ○ 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 ○ 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. |
| 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations | <p>For the entire assessment system, VDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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"> ○ Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; ○ Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; ○ Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; ○ Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; and ○ Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. |
| 6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting | <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"> • 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 • 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. |
| 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards | <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"> • 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. |

| Critical Element | Additional Evidence Needed |
|------------------------|---|
| 6.4 – Reporting | <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"> • 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 standard, including performance-level descriptors. <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"> • 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 standard, including performance-level descriptors. <p>For all assessments (SOL and VAAP):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Evidence that the State follows a process and timeline for delivering SOL and VAAP individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. |

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

August, 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR VIRGINIA

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 | 5 |
| 1.3 – Required Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only)..... | 9 |
| 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only)..... | 10 |
| 1.5 – Participation Data (reviewed by Department staff only)..... | 12 |
| SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS | 13 |
| 2.1 – Test Design and Development..... | 13 |
| 2.2 – Item Development..... | 16 |
| 2.3 – Test Administration | 19 |
| 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only) | 25 |
| 2.5 – Test Security | 26 |
| 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... | 32 |
| SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... | 34 |
| 3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... | 34 |
| 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... | 37 |
| 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure | 39 |
| 3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables | 40 |
| SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER | 41 |
| 4.1 – Reliability..... | 41 |
| 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... | 43 |
| 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... | 45 |
| 4.4 – Scoring | 46 |
| 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms | 49 |
| 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment | 50 |
| 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance..... | 51 |
| SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS | 52 |
| 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities | 52 |
| 5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... | 54 |
| 5.3 – Accommodations..... | 56 |
| 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations | 58 |
| SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . | 59 |
| 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students | 59 |
| 6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... | 62 |
| 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards | 64 |
| 6.4 – Reporting..... | 66 |

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR VIRGINIA

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|---|--|
| <p>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State.</p> | <p>Evidence 001: Memorandum: Virginia Peer Review Submission 2016</p> <p>Evidence 002: Standards of Learning Review Schedule</p> <p>Mathematics: Evidence 003: Superintendent's Memo INF61-08: Review of the Mathematics Standards of Learning</p> <p>Evidence 004: Board of Education Minutes (02/19/2009) Adoption of Revised Mathematics Standards of Learning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages 29-31 <p>Evidence 005: 2009 Mathematics Standards of Learning</p> <p>English: Evidence 006: Superintendent's Memo 111-09: Review of the English Standards of Learning</p> <p>Evidence 007: Board of Education Minutes (01/14/2010) Adoption of Revised English Standards of Learning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages 13-14 <p>Evidence 008: 2010 English Standards of Learning</p> <p>Science: Evidence 009: Superintendent's Memo 112-09: Review of the Science Standards of Learning</p> <p>Evidence 007: Board of Education Minutes</p> | <p>Evidence is sufficient to meet this critical element.</p> |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|--|--|
| | (01/14/2010) Adoption of Revised Science Standards of Learning. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages 15-16 Evidence 010: 2010 Science Standards of Learning | |
| Section 1.1 Summary Statement | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required. | | |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|--|--|
| <p>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science specify what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school to succeed in college and the workforce; contain content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.</p> | <p>Public Comment:</p> <p>Mathematics: Evidence 011: Superintendent's Memo INF265-08: Public Comment on Proposed Revised Mathematics Standards of Learning</p> <p>Evidence 012: Superintendent's Memo 199-09: Public Comment on the Proposed Revised 2009 Mathematics Standards of Learning Curriculum Framework</p> <p>Evidence 013: Superintendent's Memo 274-10: Public Comment on the Supplement to the Curriculum Framework for the 2009 Mathematics Standards of Learning</p> <p>English and Science:</p> <p>Evidence 014: Superintendent's Memo 300-09: Public Comment and Public Hearings on the Proposed Revised English Standards of Learning and Science Standards of Learning</p> <p>Evidence 015: Superintendent's Memo 232-10: Public Comment on the Proposed Revised 2010 English Standards of Learning Curriculum Framework & Proposed Revised 2010 Science Standards of Learning Curriculum Framework</p> <p>Adoption of Curriculum Frameworks:</p> <p>Mathematics:</p> <p>Evidence 016: Board of Education Minutes</p> | <p>Evidence is sufficient to meet this critical element.</p> <p>It was difficult to ascertain the level of rigor that students with significant cognitive disabilities were expected to achieve, using the documents cited as evidence. However, exhibit 73 in the state’s submission provides information about the rigor of the SOL as it applies to students with significant cognitive disabilities.</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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|------------------|--|--|
| | <p>(10/22/2009) Adoption of Revised Curriculum Framework for 2009 Mathematics Standards of Learning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages 164-165 <p>Evidence 017: Final Curriculum Framework for 2009 Mathematics Standards of Learning</p> <p>English, and Science:</p> <p>Evidence 018: Board of Education Minutes (11/18/2010) Adoption of Revised Curriculum Framework for 2010 English Standards of Learning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 210 <p>Evidence 019: Final Curriculum Framework for 2010 English Standards of Learning</p> <p>Evidence 018: Board of Education Minutes (11/18/2010) Adoption of Revised Curriculum Framework for 2010 Science Standards of Learning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 209 <p>Evidence 020: Curriculum Framework for 2010 Science Standards of Learning</p> <p>Virginia’s College and Career Readiness Initiative:</p> <p>Evidence 025: Virginia’s College and Career Readiness Initiative Report</p> <p>Evidence 026: Virginia’s Joint Agreement on College and Career Readiness</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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|------------------|---|--|
| | <p>Evidence 027: Virginia’s College and Career Ready Mathematics Performance Expectations</p> <p>Evidence 028: Virginia’s College and Career Ready Mathematics Performance Expectations Correlation with Virginia’s 2009 Mathematics Standards of Learning</p> <p>Evidence 030: Virginia’s College and Career Ready English Performance Expectations</p> <p>Evidence 031: Virginia’s College and Career Ready English Performance Expectations Correlation with Virginia’s 2010 English Standards of Learning</p> <p>Comparison with Common Core State Standards</p> <p>Mathematics: Evidence 021: Superintendent's Memo 035-11: Mathematics Standards of Learning Curriculum Framework Supplement & Analysis of Virginia’s 2010 Mathematics Standards of Learning Compared with the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics</p> <p>Evidence 022: Report on the Analysis of Virginia's 2009 Mathematics Standards of Learning Compared to the Common Core State Standards in Mathematics</p> <p>Evidence 029: Comparison of Virginia’s College and Career Ready Mathematics Performance Expectations with the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics</p> <p>English:</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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>Evidence 023: Superintendent's Memo 293-10: 2010 English Standards of Learning Curriculum Framework & Analysis of Virginia's 2010 English Standards of Learning Compared with the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts</p> <p>Evidence 024: Report on the Comparison of Virginia's 2010 English Standards of Learning with the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts</p> <p>Evidence 032: Comparison between Virginia's College and Career Ready English Performance Expectations and the Common Core Anchor Standards</p> | |
| Section 1.2 Summary Statement | | |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY | Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY |
|--|--|--|
| <p>1.3 – Required Assessments</p> <p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments (based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate academic achievement standards-AAAS) in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). | <p>Evaluate for grade/subject combinations listed in left column</p> <p>VA administers math and English tests in grades 3-8, and science tests in grades 5 and 8. (#33)</p> <p>Students take VA’s high school assessments in math and science when they complete course instruction in the particular course in that subject area. (#33) VA has a single high school assessment in reading. (#71, p. 48)</p> <p>VA’s AA-AAAS is the VAAP, in grades 3-8 in math and English, and grade 5 and 8 in science. It is given once in each subject in high school. (#33, #101).</p> | <p>VA does not appear to have identified a single high school assessment that students take in math and science in the high school grade span.</p> <p>VA appears to allow districts to administer VAAP in different grades (#75, p. 21).</p> |
| <p>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p> | | |
| <p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Evidence that the State administers a single alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards in one high school grade in each subject for students with significant cognitive disabilities. | | |

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR VIRGINIA

| Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY | Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY |
|--|--|---|
| <p>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</p> <p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system; • For English learners (EL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment; ○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years. | <p>Regarding all students: #36 (superintendent’s memo) is clear about requirements for all students to be tested, except for notes below. See also #35 (standards of accreditation), p. 5.</p> <p>Regarding SWD: #35, pp. 5 & 6; #37, p. 39, para 6; #38, pp. 5-6. See also #237 & #238.</p> <p>VSEP (VA Substitute Evaluation Program) is an AA-GLAS for SWD for the high school SOL and in some cases students in grades 3-8 on which a small number of students are tested and counted as non-participants. (Narrative, p. 7, #38)</p> <p>Regarding ELs: #40 is guidelines for EL participation in VA assessments. #35, p. 5 para G addresses all ELs, but says all ELs (not only newly arrived) may be granted a one-time exemption from SOL testing in science (and certain other non ESEA required subjects). #40, p. 3 says this exemption is no longer allowed.</p> <p>Beginning in 2015-2016, VGLA will remain only in reading and only for English Learners who meet specific eligibility criteria. VGLA designed for SWD. VGLA was offered to students, including SWD in 2014-15. (#40, Page 3; #33; #38, p. 3, para B)</p> | <p>With a few exceptions, VA has policies that require the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its grade-level SOL.</p> <p>VA administers a VA Substitute Evaluation Program assessment (VSEP), a AA-GLAS for SWD, on which a small number of students are assessed and counted as non-participants.</p> <p>In addition, VA 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.</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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY | Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY |
|--|--|---|
| Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY | | |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in the State’s assessment system for Title I, specifically the SOL, VGLA and VAAP, and does not allow for students to take any other assessments (i.e., the Virginia Substitute Evaluation Program, or VSEP) and be counted as non-participants or participants. • Evidence that Virginia requires inclusion in the State’s assessments administered for Title I purposes of all students in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in grades 10-12 in reading and mathematics and in grades 5, 8 and at least once in grades 10-12 in science. | | |

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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY | Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY |
|--|--|---|
| <p>1.5 – Participation Data</p> <p>The State’s participation data show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system. In addition, if the State administers end-of-course assessments for high school students, the State has procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates on each required assessment and provides the corresponding data.</p> | <p>#44: 2015-2016 Summary of Accountability Results Based on 2014-2015 Assessment Data, pp. 4-6 shows participation rate percentages for reading, math and science.</p> <p>#45: Generating Aggregate Numbers by Subgroup – this document outlines the assessment performance and participation calculations.</p> | <p>Virginia submitted data showing the percentage of students, by grade, who participated in the State’s reading, mathematics and science assessments; however, Virginia did not provide the numbers of students enrolled in each grade and the numbers of those students assessed on the assessment for the grade in which the student is enrolled.</p> <p>Virginia did not document that the State has procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates on each required assessment once during high school. Evidence submitted suggests that students are counted as participants not in the grades in which they enrolled but in the grade of instruction for the particular subject area assessed (e.g., seventh graders taking eighth grade mathematics are counted in the eighth grade mathematics participation rates).</p> |
| <p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p> | | |
| <p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Grade-enrollment data and participation data that show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system and that reflect implementation of 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. | | |

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 VIRGINIA

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|--|---|
| <p>2.1 – Test Design and Development</p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; • Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design. | <p>Evidence 067: 2014-2015 Virginia Standards of Learning SOL Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages 1-13, Part I: Sections 2.1, 2.2, and 3; • Pages 37-39, Part I: Section 10.1; • Pages 43-71, Part II: Sections 1, 2.1 - 2.5 <p>Evidence 068: Virginia Alternative and Alternate Assessments: Overview of Technical Characteristics: Fall 2014-Spring 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VGLA 2.1 Test Development • VGLA 2.5 Scoring <p>Evidence 069: Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL) Computerized Adaptive Testing (CAT) Technical Manual</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages 6-19, 20-21, 24-29 <p>Evidence 070: Alignment Analysis of the 2012 Virginia Standards of Learning Tests in Mathematics</p> <p>Evidence 071: Alignment Analysis of the 2013 Virginia Standards of Learning Tests in Reading</p> <p>Evidence 072: Alignment Analysis of the 2013 Virginia Standards of Learning Tests in Science</p> <p>Evidence 169: Update on Virginia’s English Standards of Learning and Standards of Learning Assessments</p> <p>Standards of Learning Test Blueprints:</p> | <p>A question arose with the alignment analysis of science, reported in March 2014. Reviewers indicated that for grade 5, the test did not measure the standards at the desired DOK level. Peer reviewers wondered if anything had been done to revise the science test at grade 5 to ameliorate this issue for the 14-15 school year. No evidence was presented that shows more detailed specifications about the levels of DOK that are expected of the items that are developed.</p> <p>Reviewers noted that blueprints identified some standards that were excluded from the assessment for a particular grade and content. It appeared that such standards were difficult to measure using the present format. Are there plans to assess such standards moving forward?</p> <p>For the VGLA and the VAAP, as far as implementing a process to collect this type of evidence, Virginia is achieving this using a technically sound process.</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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|------------------|---|--|
| | <p>Mathematics SOL Test Blueprints: Evidence 046: Grade 3 Mathematics Test Blueprint Evidence 047: Grade 4 Mathematics Test Blueprint Evidence 048: Grade 5 Mathematics Test Blueprint Evidence 049: Grade 6 Mathematics Test Blueprint Evidence 050: Grade 7 Mathematics Test Blueprint Evidence 051: Grade 8 Mathematics Test Blueprint Evidence 052: Algebra I Test Blueprint Evidence 053: Geometry Test Blueprint Evidence 054: Algebra II Test Blueprint</p> <p>Reading SOL Test Blueprints: Evidence 055: Grade 3 Reading Test Blueprint Evidence 056: Grade 4 Reading Test Blueprint Evidence 057: Grade 5 Reading Test Blueprint Evidence 058: Grade 6 Reading Test Blueprint Evidence 059: Grade 7 Reading Test Blueprint Evidence 060: Grade 8 Reading Test Blueprint Evidence 061: End-of-Course Reading Test Blueprint</p> <p>Science SOL Test Blueprints: Evidence 062: Grade 5 Science Test Blueprint Evidence 063: Grade 8 Science Test Blueprint Evidence 064: Earth Science Test Blueprint Evidence 065: Biology Test Blueprint Evidence 066: Chemistry Test Blueprint</p> <p>Online Testing: Evidence 228: TestNav 7.5 Feature Guide: Online Virginia Standards of Learning Tests</p> <p>AA-AAAS Assessment: Virginia Alternate</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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>Assessment Program (VAAP)</p> <p>Evidence 068: Virginia Alternative and Alternate Assessments: Overview of Technical Characteristics: Fall 2014-Spring 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VAAP 3.1 Test Development • VAAP 3.5 Scoring <p>Evidence 073: Aligned Standards of Learning (ASOL) for the Virginia Alternate Assessment Program 2014-2015</p> | |
| Section 2.1 Summary Statement | | |
| <p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rationale for exclusion of some standards from some blueprints for the SOL/VGLA., and plans to assess omitted standards in the future. | | |

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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|---|---|
| <p>2.2 – Item Development</p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p> | <p>Evidence 067: 2014-2015 Virginia Standards of Learning SOL Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages 4-13, Part I: Section 3; • Pages 39-40, Part I: Section 10.2 <p>Evidence 068: Virginia Alternative and Alternate Assessments: Overview of Technical Characteristics: Fall 2014-Spring 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VGLA Sections 2 and 2.1 <p>Evidence 069: Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL) Computerized Adaptive Testing (CAT) Technical Manual Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages 6-19 and 24-29 <p>Evidence 070: Alignment Analysis of the 2012 Virginia Standards of Learning Tests in Mathematics</p> <p>Evidence 071: Alignment Analysis of the 2013 Virginia Standards of Learning Tests in Reading</p> <p>Evidence 072: Alignment Analysis of the 2013 Virginia Standards of Learning Tests in Science</p> <p>Evidence 117: Pearson’s Contract Requirements: Virginia Standards of Learning Assessment Item Development</p> <p>Item Writer Training: Evidence 100: Standards of Learning Plain English Mathematics Test Committee Training</p> <p>Evidence 175: Item Writer Training: Writing Test Items for Virginia Standards of Learning</p> | <p>Reviewers felt that the training materials were complete and well done, to norm the process for item reviewers.</p> <p>Reviewers did not find documents that explicitly link expected DOK levels of standards for the item writers to follow. Such documents must exist, since the researchers from VCU found a gap.</p> <p>Items for the VGLA and VAAP are developed by a process that teachers link the evidence to standards, but there is no evidence that the process is consistently applied by all teachers across all sampled standards. There was ample evidence to make sure the assessment process is implemented with fidelity, but that the end of the day, the teacher still makes the decision about which evidence is collected, and there is no standardization about the evidence collected.</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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|------------------|---|--|
| | <p>Assessments</p> <p>Evidence 176: Item Writer Training: Rigor and Cognitive Levels</p> <p>Evidence 113: Specific Guidelines for Writing Virginia SOL Items</p> <p>Educator Committee Materials:</p> <p>Evidence 222: Standards of Learning Item and Test Review Committees New Item Review Training Session</p> <p>Evidence 223: Standards of Learning Item and Test Review Committees General Training Session</p> <p>Evidence 225: 2009 Mathematics Standards of Learning PLAIN ENGLISH MATHEMATICS TESTS Information</p> <p>Evidence 100: Standards of Learning Plain English Mathematics Test Committee Training</p> <p>Evidence 099: Virginia Standards of Learning Item Development Plan Math Algebra I Item Bank Analysis Item Orders 2014</p> <p>AA-AAAS Assessment: Virginia Alternate Assessment Program (VAAP)</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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|---|--|
| | Evidence 068: Virginia Alternative and Alternate Assessments: Overview of Technical Characteristics: Fall 2014-Spring 2015 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages 14-17, VAAP Section 3 and 3.1 Test Development | |
| Section 2.2 Summary Statement | | |
| _X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the VGLA and VAAP used reasonable and technically sound procedures to select items. | | |

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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|---|---|
| <p>2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. | <p>Test Implementation Manuals:</p> <p>Evidence 043: Spring 2015 Non-Writing Tests Manual for the Division Director of Testing and School Test Coordinators, Grades 3–8, Content Specific History, End-of-Course</p> <p>Evidence 074: Virginia Alternative and Alternate Assessments Administrator’s Manual 2014-2015</p> <p>Evidence 075: Virginia Alternate Assessment Program (VAAP) Implementation Manual 2014-2015</p> <p>Evidence 076: Virginia Grade Level Alternative Assessment (VGLA) Implementation Manual 2014-2015</p> <p>Examiner’s Manuals and Supplements to Examiner’s Manuals:</p> <p>Evidence 077: Examiner’s Manual Spring 2015 Grade 3 Reading, Mathematics</p> <p>Evidence 078: Supplement to the Standards of Learning Assessments Examiner’s Manual for Grade 3 Tests Reading and Mathematics</p> <p>Evidence 079: Examiner’s Manual Spring 2015 Grades 4 & 5</p> <p>Evidence 080: Supplement to the Standards of Learning Assessments Examiner’s Manual for Grades 4 & 5 Tests Reading, Mathematics, and Science</p> | <p>Evidence is sufficient to meet this critical element.</p> <p>Regarding contingency plans, exhibit 43 had a good description of contingencies related to technology issues.</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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|------------------|--|--|
| | <p>Evidence 081: Examiner’s Manual Fall 2014, Spring 2015, & Summer 2015 Grades 6, 7 & 8</p> <p>Evidence 082: Supplement to the Standards of Learning Assessments Examiner’s Manual for Grades 6, 7 & 8 Tests</p> <p>Evidence 083: Examiner’s Manual Fall 2014, Spring 2015, & Summer 2015 EOC Reading</p> <p>Evidence 084: Supplement to the End-of-Course Standards of Learning Assessments Examiner’s Manual for Reading Tests</p> <p>Evidence 085: Examiner’s Manual Fall 2014, Spring 2015, & Summer 2015 EOC Algebra I, Geometry, and Algebra II</p> <p>Evidence 086: Supplement to the End-of-Course Standards of Learning Assessments Examiner’s Manual for Algebra I, Geometry, and Algebra II Tests</p> <p>Evidence 087: Examiner’s Manual Fall 2014, Spring 2015, & Summer 2015 EOC Earth Science, Biology, Chemistry</p> <p>Evidence 088: Supplement to the End-of-Course Standards of Learning Assessments Examiner’s Manual for Earth Science, Biology, & Chemistry Tests</p> <p>Email Communication Regarding Test Materials: Evidence 095: Email Communication on Availability of Test Administration Documents. Sent to Division Directors of Testing</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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|------------------|---|--|
| | <p>Evidence 096: Emails Regarding Secure and Non-Secure Test Materials Memos. Sent to Division Directors of Testing</p> <p>Participation and Inclusion: Evidence 038: 2014 Students with Disabilities: Guidelines for Assessment Participation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages 3-5 <p>Evidence 089: Virginia Department of Education Students with Disabilities: Guidelines for Special Test Accommodations</p> <p>Evidence 040: Limited English Proficient Students: Guidelines for Participation in the Virginia Assessment Program</p> <p>Evidence 090: Guidelines for Administering the Read-Aloud Accommodation for the Virginia Standards of Learning Assessments</p> <p>Virginia Department of Education Training:</p> <p>Evidence 098: Standards of Learning Tests: Examiner and Proctor Training</p> <p>Evidence 097: The Virginia Standards of Learning Assessment Program Test Security Training 2014-2015</p> <p>Evidence 104: Fall 2014 Division Director of Testing (DDOT) Regional Meeting SOL Test Administration Fall 2014 Updates</p> <p>Evidence 105: Computer Adaptive Testing Regional DDOT Meeting Fall 2014</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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|------------------|--|--|
| | <p>Evidence 106: Updates for Students with Disabilities Regional DDOT Meeting Fall 2014</p> <p>Evidence 108: Spring 2015 Division Director of Testing (DDOT) Regional Meeting SOL Test Administration Spring 2015 Updates</p> <p>Evidence 109: Limited English Proficient Student Assessment Participation Reminders and Updates Regional DDOT Meeting Spring 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slides 14-18 <p>Evidence 121: 2014 - 2015 Alternate/Alternative Assessments Administrator Update Training</p> <p>Evidence 129: SOL Links to Practice Test and Guides</p> <p>Evidence 107: Virginia SOL Practice Item Guide: Grade 4 Mathematics</p> <p>Virginia Department of Education New and 2nd Year DDOT Training:</p> <p>Evidence 110: Division Director of Testing Training Schedule 2014-2015</p> <p>Contractor Training Sessions:</p> <p>Evidence 120: <u>Email</u> Fall 2015 Pearson Technology Webinars</p> <p>Evidence 122: <u>Training Workbook</u>: Administering Virginia Standards of Learning Assessments using PearsonAccess</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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|------------------|--|--|
| | <p>Evidence 123: Training Workbook: Using PearsonAccess for Virginia Alternate Assessments</p> <p>Online Testing Technology Requirements: The following, Evidence 130 – 139, are provided to school divisions by the contractor to communicate online testing technology requirements.</p> <p>Evidence 130: System Check for TestNav</p> <p>Evidence 131: PearsonAccess TestNav 7 Early Warning System User Guide</p> <p>Evidence 132: PearsonAccess TestNav 7 Proctor Caching User Guide</p> <p>Evidence 133: ProctorCache Requirements</p> <p>Evidence 134: TestNav 7.5 System Requirements</p> <p>Evidence 135: PearsonAccess Hardware and Software Guidelines for Virginia</p> <p>Evidence 136: PearsonAccess TestNav 7 Technology Guidelines</p> <p>Evidence 137: Managing Multiple Proctor Caching Servers</p> <p>Evidence 138: Integrate Proctor Caching with Practice Items</p> <p>Evidence 139: TestNav 7.5 Online Support</p> <p>Evidence 102: Superintendent’s Memo #056-14: Electronic Devices and Operating Systems Approved for Online Standards of Learning Test</p> | |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|--|--|
| | Administration | |
| Section 2.3 Summary Statement | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required. | | |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR VIRGINIA

| Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY | Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY |
|---|--|---|
| <p>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p> | <p>Materials appear to focus on SOL. About 3-5 divisions (of 227) are audited during each test administration.</p> <p>SOL: #140 is brief description of audit process; #141 - #148 are supporting documents. The test coordinator’s manual (#43) references audits.</p> <p>VGLA. Auditing is limited and seems to focus primarily on scoring. (#74, pp. 16, 15)</p> <p>VAAP. Auditing is limited and seems to focus primarily on scoring. (#74, pp. xiv, 33)</p> | |
| <p>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p> | | |
| <p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State adequately monitors the administration of the VGLA to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. • Evidence that the State adequately monitors the administration of the VAAP to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. | | |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|--|--|
| <p>2.5 – Test Security</p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. | <p>Test Irregularities Summary:</p> <p>Evidence 151: Test Security Violations 2014-2015</p> <p>Evidence 152: Corrective Action Plan Log (Redacted) Corrective action plans may be assigned to school divisions as a result of one or more test irregularities. Corrective action plans are logged at the Virginia Department of Education.</p> <p>Test Security Guidelines:</p> <p>Evidence 043: Spring 2015 Non-Writing Tests Manual for the Division Director of Testing and School Test Coordinators, Grades 3–8, Content Specific History, End-of-Course</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages 53-54, 2014-2015 School Division Personnel Test Security Agreement; • Pages 55-56, Legislation passed by the Virginia General Assembly; • Page 57, School Affidavit • Page 58, School Division Test Security Agreement; • Page 59 School Division Affidavit <p>Evidence 153: Code of Virginia, Title 22.1 Education, Chapter 2 Board of Education, § 22.1-19.1 Action for violations related to secure mandatory tests</p> <p>Evidence 154: Code of Virginia, Title 22.1 Education, Chapter 15 Teachers, Officers, and Employees, § 22.1-292.1 Violations related to secure mandatory tests</p> | <p>SOL, VGLA, and VAAP have procedures in place to prevent irregularities, and responses when irregularities are discovered.</p> <p>Reviewers recommend that Virginia continue to review their security procedures and responses as they transition to a larger CAT environment.</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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|------------------|--|--|
| | <p>Evidence 155: Virginia Administrative Code, Title 8 Education, Agency 20 State Board of Education, Chapter 22 Licensure Regulations for School Personnel, Section 690 Revocation</p> <p>Test Security Training: Evidence 097: The Virginia Standards of Learning Assessment Program Test Security Training 2014-2015</p> <p>Evidence 098: Standards of Learning Tests: Examiner and Proctor Training</p> <p>Secure Materials Transmittal Process:</p> <p>Evidence 043: Spring 2015 Non-Writing Tests Manual for the Division Director of Testing and School Test Coordinators, Grades 3–8, Content Specific History, End-of-Course</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages xii-xv, DDOT and STC Testing Checklists; • Pages 26-27, 5. Specific Duties of the DDOT/STC: During Testing; • Page 40, Receive All Testing Materials from Examiners; • Page 58, School Division Test Security Agreement; • Pages 61-65, Appendix B; • Pages 72-90, Appendix C Special Testing Accommodations <p>Security-related Topics Addressed in the Test Implementation Manuals:</p> <p>Evidence 043: Spring 2015 Non-Writing Tests Manual for the Division Director of Testing and</p> | |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|------------------|---|--|
| | <p>School Test Coordinators, Grades 3–8, Content Specific History, End-of-Course</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages 5-8, Training Topics for School Test Coordinators and Examiners/Proctors; • Page 10, Pre-testing discussion regarding cell phones, electronic devices, and other unauthorized materials during testing; • Page 12, Determine Where Tests Will Be Administered • Page 13, Schedule the School’s Testing Sessions; • Page 14, Review Procedures for Ensuring Test Security; • Page 32, Monitoring the test administration; • Page 34, Allowing student breaks during testing; • Page 35, Identifying and resolving testing irregularities. <p>Evidence 104: Fall 2014 Division Director of Testing (DDOT) Regional Meeting SOL Test Administration Fall 2014 Updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slides 58 - 59 <p>Test Security for Accommodations – Recording Sessions and Use of Transmittal:</p> <p>Evidence 043: Spring 2015 Non-Writing Tests Manual for the Division Director of Testing and School Test Coordinators, Grades 3–8, Content Specific History, End-of-Course</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 64-65, Appendix B Guidelines for Recording a Test Session <p>Evidence 090: Guidelines for Administering the Read-Aloud Accommodation for the Virginia</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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|------------------|---|--|
| | <p>Standards of Learning Assessments</p> <p>Test Security Emails:</p> <p>Evidence 156: Standards of Learning Test Security Training Webinars</p> <p>Evidence 157: Standards of Learning Test Security Webinar PowerPoint</p> <p>Evidence 158: Webinar to Introduce New Examiner and Proctor Training Resource</p> <p>Test Security Requirements:</p> <p>Evidence 043: Spring 2015 Non-Writing Tests Manual for the Division Director of Testing and School Test Coordinators, Grades 3–8, Content Specific History, End-of-Course</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page v, School Division Test Security Agreement; • Page xii, DDOT Testing Checklist; • Page xiv, STC Testing Checklist; • Page 15, Additional Security Procedures for Online Testing; • Page 53-59, Appendix A <p>Detecting and Reporting Irregularities:</p> <p>Evidence 043: Spring 2015 Non-Writing Tests Manual for the Division Director of Testing and School Test Coordinators, Grades 3–8, Content Specific History, End-of-Course</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 101, 2014-2015 Test Irregularity Form <p>Evidence 159: Virginia Board of Education Testing</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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|------------------|---|--|
| | <p>Irregularity Protocol</p> <p>Evidence 160: Virginia Board of Education Testing Irregularity Protocol</p> <p>Evidence 110: Division Director of Testing Training Schedule 2014-2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test Irregularities <p>Online Testing Technology Requirements: The following evidence is documentation provided to school divisions to avoid online test interruptions and test irregularities due to hardware, software, Internet connectivity, and Internet access issues.</p> <p>Evidence 130: System Check for TestNav</p> <p>Evidence 149: TestNav 7 Error Messages</p> <p>Evidence 150: Proctor Caching Verification Quick Start</p> <p>Evidence 131: PearsonAccess TestNav 7 Early Warning System User Guide</p> <p>Evidence 132: PearsonAccess TestNav 7 Proctor Caching User Guide</p> <p>Evidence 133: ProctorCache Requirements</p> <p>Evidence 135: PearsonAccess Hardware and Software Guidelines for Virginia</p> <p>Evidence 136: PearsonAccess TestNav 7 Technology Guidelines</p> <p>Reviewing Assessment Data</p> | |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|--|--|
| | Evidence 161: Record Description for Response Change Extract Non-Writing Tests 2014-2015 Evidence 170: Virginia Data Forensics Plan | |
| Section 2.5 Summary Statement | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required. | | |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|---|--|
| <p>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. | <p>Evidence 164: Virginia Department of Education Restricted-Use Data Agreement</p> <p>Evidence 165: Virginia Department of Education Data Breach Reporting Plan/Process</p> <p>Evidence 166: Critical Element 2.6 Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</p> <p>Evidence 167: Pearson Security and Confidentiality Requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages 7-11 through 7-14, Requirements included in Virginia’s State Assessment Contract with Pearson <p>Evidence 226: Pearson Test Security and Student Data Security Requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirements included in Virginia’s State Assessment Contract with Pearson <p>Evidence 043: Spring 2015 Non-Writing Tests Manual for the Division Director of Testing and School Test Coordinators, Grades 3–8, Content Specific History, End-of-Course</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages 53-59, Appendix A <p>Evidence 110: Division Director of Testing Training Schedule 2014-2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Account Management <p>Evidence 227: Pearson User Access and Account Management Requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirements included in Virginia’s State Assessment Contract with Pearson <p>Evidence 163: PearsonAccess User Role and</p> | <p>One issue reviewers wondered about was whether or not contractors and state actually implemented procedures to protect data integrity and privacy as described in exhibit 167. For example, monthly reports of progress or other documentation from vendor to the state, that the vendor met the terms of the contract on an ongoing basis, any scheduling issues regarding management or delivery of data/results, any breaches of PII, and resolutions.</p> <p>Additional evidence submitted by VA meets the evidence that reviewers were looking for, in addition to the legal citation offered by Dr. Loving-Ryder.</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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|---|--|
| | Permissions Evidence 162: Educational Information Management Dropbox Usage Instruction Evidence 168: SFTP User Instructions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A secure FTP site used to transfer secure data and test materials between Pearson and the Virginia Department of Education. | |
| Section 2.6 Summary Statement | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required. | | |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR VIRGINIA

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|---|---|
| <p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. | <p>Evidence 067: 2014-2015 Virginia Standards of Learning SOL Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part I: Sections 2.1 and 10 • Part II: Sections 1.5 and 2.5; • Pages 44, 64-71 <p>Evidence 068: Virginia Alternative and Alternate Assessments: Overview of Technical Characteristics: Fall 2014-Spring 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VGLA 3.8.1 Validity Evidence based on Test Content <p>Evidence 069: Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL) Computerized Adaptive Testing (CAT) Technical Manual</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages 6-24 <p>Evidence 070: Alignment Analysis of the 2012 Virginia Standards of Learning Tests in Mathematics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages i-iii, Executive Summary; • Pages 21-38, Mathematics SOL Tests Alignment Review Results: Grades 3-8 • Pages 39-47, Mathematics SOL Tests Alignment Review Results: End-of-Course Subjects <p>Evidence 071: Alignment Analysis of the 2013 Virginia Standards of Learning Tests in Reading</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages i-iii, Executive Summary; • Pages 30-47, Reading SOL Tests Alignment Review Results: Grades 3-8 • Pages 48-52, Reading SOL Tests Alignment Review Results: End-of-Course | <p>Virginia provided evidence regarding alignment studies for SOL. For VAAP, state should provide evidence of audit results of COE coverage of ASOL. For VGLA the alignment study report (exhibit 71), mentions Webb’s criteria to include Categorical Concurrence, and Balance of Representation. However, the tables 18-23 do not show data for these two omitted categories.</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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|------------------|---|--|
| | <p style="text-align: center;">Subjects</p> <p>Evidence 072: Alignment Analysis of the 2013 Virginia Standards of Learning Tests in Science</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages i-iii, Executive Summary; • Pages 29-40, Science SOL Tests Alignment Review Results: Grades 3-8; • Pages 41-54, Science SOL Tests Alignment Review Results: End-of-Course Subjects <p>Standards of Learning Test Blueprints: Mathematics SOL Test Blueprints: Evidence 046: Grade 3 Mathematics Test Blueprint Evidence 047: Grade 4 Mathematics Test Blueprint Evidence 048: Grade 5 Mathematics Test Blueprint Evidence 049: Grade 6 Mathematics Test Blueprint Evidence 050: Grade 7 Mathematics Test Blueprint Evidence 051: Grade 8 Mathematics Test Blueprint Evidence 052: Algebra I Test Blueprint Evidence 053: Geometry Test Blueprint Evidence 054: Algebra II Test Blueprint</p> <p>Reading SOL Test Blueprints: Evidence 055: Grade 3 Reading Test Blueprint Evidence 056: Grade 4 Reading Test Blueprint Evidence 057: Grade 5 Reading Test Blueprint Evidence 058: Grade 6 Reading Test Blueprint Evidence 059: Grade 7 Reading Test Blueprint Evidence 060: Grade 8 Reading Test Blueprint Evidence 061: End-of-Course Reading Test Blueprint</p> <p>Science SOL Test Blueprints: Evidence 062: Grade 5 Science Test Blueprint Evidence 063: Grade 8 Science Test Blueprint Evidence 064: Earth Science Test Blueprint</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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|--|--|
| | Evidence 065: Biology Test Blueprint Evidence 066: Chemistry Test Blueprint Evidence 219: Standards of Learning Item and Test Review Committees Test Forms Review Training Session Evidence 223: Standards of Learning Item and Test Review Committees General Training Session AA-AAAS Assessment: VAAP Evidence 068: Virginia Alternative and Alternate Assessments: Overview of Technical Characteristics: Fall 2014-Spring 2015 VAAP Section 3.8.1 Validity based on Test Content | |
| Section 3.1 Summary Statement | | |
| <p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of audit results of COE coverage of ASOL for the VAAP. • Evidence regarding alignment, specifically for Categorical Concurrence, and Balance of Representation for the VGLA. | | |

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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|---|---|
| <p>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p> | <p>Evidence 070: Alignment Analysis of the 2012 Virginia Standards of Learning Tests in Mathematics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages 90-106, Appendix E: Mathematics Standards of Learning Grades 3-8: Depth of Knowledge Level Results; • Pages 107-116, Appendix F: Mathematics Standards of Learning End-of-Course Subjects: Depth of Knowledge Level Results <p>Evidence 071: Alignment Analysis of the 2013 Virginia Standards of Learning Tests in Reading</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages 124-142, Appendix H: Reading SOL Depth of Knowledge Levels <p>Evidence 072: Alignment Analysis of the 2013 Virginia Standards of Learning Tests in Science</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages 96-115, Appendix G. Science SOL Grades 3-8: Depth-of-Knowledge Level Results; • Pages 116-125, Appendix H. Science SOL End-of-Course Subjects: Depth-of-Knowledge Level Results <p>Evidence 067: 2014-2015 Virginia Standards of Learning SOL Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part I, Section 10.2 <p>Evidence 068: Virginia Alternative and Alternate Assessments: Overview of Technical Characteristics: Fall 2014-Spring 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 12, VGLA Section, 2.8.2 Validity Evidence based on Response Processes | <p>Regarding VGLA and VAAP, state should provide evidence of validity based on cognitive processes. One possible method would be expert review of the samples of COEs used in standard setting.</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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>Educator Committee Training:</p> <p>Evidence 222: Standards of Learning Item and Test Review Committees New Item Review Training Session</p> <p>AA-AAAS Assessment: VAAP</p> <p>Evidence 068: Virginia Alternative and Alternate Assessments: Overview of Technical Characteristics: Fall 2014-Spring 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 24, VAAP Section 3.8.2 Validity Evidence based on Response Processes | |
| Section 3.2 Summary Statement | | |
| <p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of validity based on cognitive processes for VGLA and VAAP, possibly through interviews with teachers of specific students. | | |

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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|---|---|
| <p>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p> | <p>Evidence 067: 2014-2015 Virginia Standards of Learning SOL Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part I, Section 10.3; • Part II Sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4 <p>Evidence 171: Summary of Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL) Dimensionality Analysis</p> <p>Evidence 068: Virginia Alternative and Alternate Assessments: Overview of Technical Characteristics: Fall 2014-Spring 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages 22-24 , 3.8.3 Validity Evidence based on Internal Structure • Pages 28-31, Appendix B | <p>Reviewers did not find enough information to be able to judge the suitability of the evidence for this critical element. Recommendation might be to build a more thorough dimensionality analysis: 1) provide full results of an exploratory factor analysis, 2) show which items loaded on which factor/dimension, 3) show correlations between reporting categories, as is done for the VAAP.</p> <p>What reviewers were looking for were results of the factor analysis, and a correlation matrix showing the relationships among the various dimensions. The FA should show the loadings for each factor with the final rotation, and a description of how the items load on the different dimensions (factors).</p> |
| <p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that provides a more thorough dimensionality analysis, especially related to scoring and reporting structures for the SOL. | | |

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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|---|---|
| <p>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p> | <p>Evidence 173: Proposed Comparison SOL SAT ACT Performance</p> <p>Evidence 068: Virginia Alternative and Alternate Assessments: Overview of Technical Characteristics: Fall 2014-Spring 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 12, VGLA Section 2.8.4 Validity Evidence based on Relationships to Other Variables • Page 24, VAAP Section 3.8.4 Validity Evidence based on Relationships to Other Variables | <p>Reviewers encourage Virginia to execute their plans to study the relationships of other variables that might be related to academic achievement.</p> |
| <p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validity evidence showing the predictive relationships between the assessments and other variables not limited to other cognitive assessments (e.g., student behavioral outcome measures, teacher evaluations of student ability, employment outcomes, etc.) for the SOL, VGLA and VAAP. • Reports of convergent/divergent validity based on intercorrelations across the other general assessments for the SOL, VGLA and VAAP. | | |

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 VIRGINIA

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|---|--|
| <p>4.1 – Reliability</p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement. | <p>Evidence 067: 2014-2015 Virginia Standards of Learning SOL Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part I Section 9; • Part II, Sections 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 2.2, 2.4, and 2.5 <p>Evidence 231: 2013-2014 Virginia Standards of Learning Technical Report: Part II Only</p> <p>Evidence 069: Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL) Computerized Adaptive Testing (CAT) Technical Manual</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages 6-21, 24-29 <p>Evidence 068: Virginia Alternative and Alternate Assessments: Overview of Technical Characteristics: Fall 2014-Spring 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages 9-11, VGLA Section 2.7 Reliability <p>Educator Committee Training Sessions: Evidence 221: Standards of Learning Item and Test Review Committees Data Review Training Session</p> <p>Evidence 223: Standards of Learning Item and Test Review Committees General Training Session</p> <p>AA-AAAS Assessment: VAAP: Evidence 068: Virginia Alternative and Alternate Assessments: Overview of Technical Characteristics: Fall 2014-Spring 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages 22-23, VAAP Section 3.7 Reliability; • Pages 28-31, Appendix B | <p>SOL Reports did not show reliability estimates for all subgroups, by content, grade. State indicates that subgroup sizes do not allow calculations by subgroups. Please provide justification and data to support claims. If VA has evidence that the n-sizes are too small, provide a table of n-counts, by grade and content area.</p> <p>Reviewers felt that sample size requirements for reliability are less than for other analyses. If a grade and content area have several hundred students, that should suffice for reliability analysis. Based on n-counts from other sources, VA could have estimated reliabilities for most other student groups.</p> <p>Reviewers felt that subgroup sizes were likely too small to calculate reliability indices for VGLA and VAAP.</p> <p>Reported CAT reliabilities were computed with simulated data. Please provide updated reliabilities based on operational data.</p> <p>Consider decision consistency analysis for students taking the VGLA or the VAAP.</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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|--|--|
| Section 4.1 Summary Statement | | |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SOL subgroup reliabilities for the remaining ESEA subgroups. • CAT reliabilities based on operational data. | | |

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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|---|---|
| <p>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p> | <p>Evidence 067: 2014-2015 Virginia Standards of Learning SOL Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part I, Sections 3 and 4.4 <p>Evidence 117: Pearson’s Contract Requirements: Virginia Standards of Learning Assessment Item Development</p> <p>Evidence 113: Specific Guidelines for Writing Virginia SOL Items</p> <p>Evidence 232: Standards of Learning Special Forms Development For Large Print and Braille Virginia Department of Education 2014 – 2015</p> <p>Evidence 225: 2009 Mathematics Standards of Learning PLAIN ENGLISH MATHEMATICS TESTS Information</p> <p>Educator Committees:</p> <p>Evidence 111: Superintendent’s Memo #310-14: Nominations for the 2015 Standards of Learning Item and Test Review Committees</p> <p>Evidence 112: Superintendent’s Memo #058-14: Nominations for the 2014 Standards of Learning Assessments Review Committee for Special Test Forms</p> <p>Evidence 222: Standards of Learning Item and Test Review Committees New Item Review Training Session</p> <p>Evidence 220: Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL) Assessments</p> | <p>For the VAAP and VGLA, a disproportionate percentage of students were classified as proficient or advanced, compared to SOL. This raises the issue of comparability of scoring with the SOL assessments.</p> <p>The additional evidence submitted by VA for DIF documentation shows a high percentage of items flagged for potential DIF. Does the ‘items deleted’ column reflect the items that were deleted due to DIF concerns? If not, what was the percent of items deleted based on DIF and follow up review?</p> <p>Other actions taken by state to address issues of fairness and accessibility for students meet the critical element, at least in the design phase of development.</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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|--|--|
| | Special Forms Review Committee Training Evidence 100: Standards of Learning Plain English Mathematics Test Committee Training Evidence 174: VAAP Pass Rates by Disability Status | |
| Section 4.2 Summary Statement | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actions taken based on DIF analysis review. | | |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|--|--|
| <p>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p> | <p>Evidence 067: 2014-2015 Virginia Standards of Learning SOL Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part II: Statistical Summaries for 2014-2015 <p>Evidence 172: VAAP Score Histograms Overall and by Disability Group</p> | <p>The distributions of scores for the VGLA and VAAP indicate ceiling effects, and that some students taking the VGLA might benefit by taking the regular SOL. State should review reasons why so many students are scoring at the higher end of the distribution. Virginia might want to consider criteria for eligibility for the VGLA to ensure the higher achieving students who could benefit by participation in the SOL take the SOL.</p> |
| <p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p> | | |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|---|--|
| <p>4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p> | <p>Evidence 067: 2014-2015 Virginia Standards of Learning SOL Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 26-33, Part I Section 8; • Pages 43, Part II Section 1.3; • Pages 56-61, Part II Section 2.3 <p>Evidence 068: Virginia Alternative and Alternate Assessments: Overview of Technical Characteristics: Fall 2014-Spring 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VGLA 3.5 Scoring; • VGLA 3.7 Reliability; <p>Alternative Assessment:</p> <p>Evidence 076: Virginia Grade Level Alternative (VGLA) Assessment Implementation Manual 2014-2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages 10-13, Section 6 • Page 14, Section 7 <p>Evidence 125: VGLA Local Scorer’s Guide 2014-2015</p> <p>Evidence 126: VGLA Scorer Agreement</p> <p>Evidence 127: Virginia Grade Level Alternative (VGLA) Scoring Train-the-Trainer Workshop</p> <p>Alternate Assessment:</p> <p>Evidence 075: Virginia Alternate Assessment Program (VAAP) Implementation Manual 2014-2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages 12-17, Section 6 • Page 17, Section 7 | <p>SOL process meets criteria.</p> <p>The process appears well-designed for these assessments. However, the results indicate lower inter-rater reliabilities for the VGLA and VAAP. State might wish to investigate possible reasons for this.</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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|------------------|--|--|
| | <p>Evidence 179: VAAP Local Scorer’s Guide 2014-2015</p> <p>Evidence 180: VAAP Scorer Agreement</p> <p>Evidence 128: Virginia Alternate Assessment Program (VAAP) Scoring Train-the-Trainer Workshop</p> <p>Audit Process: Evidence 074: Virginia Alternative and Alternate Assessments Administrator’s Manual 2014-2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page xiv, Local Scoring of VAAP Collections; • Page 12, 6.4.2 VGLA Scorers; • Page 16, 6.5 VGLA Audit Process; • Page 33, 8.5 VAAP Audit Process; • Page 45, 11.2.3 Implement Scoring Quality Control Activities <p>Evidence 177: VGLA Cumulative Inter-Rater Reliability by Item</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data from VGLA Audit conducted by the contractor <p>Evidence 178: VAAP Cumulative Inter-Rater Reliability by Item</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data from VGLA Audit conducted by the contractor <p>Evidence 043: Spring 2015 Non-Writing Tests Manual for the Division Director of Testing and School Test Coordinators, Grades 3–8, Content Specific History, End-of-Course</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 41, Testing Status Codes | |

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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|--|--|
| Section 4.4 Summary Statement | | |
| _X_ No additional evidence is required. | | |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|--|--|
| <p>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p> | <p>Evidence 067: 2014-2015 Virginia Standards of Learning SOL Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part I: Section 3 and Section 8 | <p>Pursuant to 8.3.2 and 8.3.3 of exhibit 67, what were the results (and actions) based on the pre- and post-equating procedures?</p> <p>Not applicable to VGLA or VAAP.</p> |
| <p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p> | | |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|---|--|
| <p>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. | <p>Evidence 067: 2014-2015 Virginia Standards of Learning SOL Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part I, Section 3 and Section 8 <p>Evidence 069: Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL) Computerized Adaptive Testing (CAT) Technical Manual</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pages 6-29 <p>Evidence 068: Virginia Alternative and Alternate Assessments: Overview of Technical Characteristics: Fall 2014-Spring 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pages 14-24, VAAP Sections 3, 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5 and 3.8 | <p>There is no evidence of comparability between SOL and VGLA.</p> |
| <p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of comparability between SOL and VGLA. | | |

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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|--|--|
| <p>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p> | <p>Evidence 067: 2014-2015 Virginia Standards of Learning SOL Technical Report</p> <p>Evidence 068: Virginia Alternative and Alternate Assessments: Overview of Technical Characteristics: Fall 2014-Spring 2015</p> <p>Evidence 070: Alignment Analysis of the 2012 Virginia Standards of Learning Tests in Mathematics</p> <p>Evidence 071: Alignment Analysis of the 2013 Virginia Standards of Learning Tests in Reading</p> <p>Evidence 072: Alignment Analysis of the 2013 Virginia Standards of Learning Tests in Science</p> | <p>Reviewers did not locate TAC agendas, schedules, membership lists, or minutes.</p> <p>Additional evidence lists four experts that make up a TAC. However, in the absence of formal agendas, VA did not provide the sets of slides referenced in emails authored by James Ingrisone. Also, no information about the decisions that were made as a result of TAC meetings was provided.</p> |
| <p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p> <p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TAC slide sets from James Ingrisone; evidence or description of decisions made based on TAC meetings. | | |

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR VIRGINIA

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|--|--|
| <p>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards; • States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs; • Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment; • Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities; • Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities; | <p>Evidence 035: Virginia Administrative Code, Title 8 Education, Agency 20 State Board of Education, Chapter 131 Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia, Section 30 Student Achievement Expectations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 6, Paragraph F <p>Evidence 036: Superintendent’s Memo 110-15: Student Participation in Virginia Standards of Learning Assessments</p> <p>Evidence 037: Regulations Governing Special Education Programs for Children with Disabilities in Virginia, 8VAC20-81-10 to 81-340</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 13, Paragraph 4; • Page 39, Paragraph 6 <p>Evidence 038: 2014 Students with Disabilities: Guidelines for Assessment Participation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages 3-5 • Pages 7 and 11, Determining State Assessment Participation • Page 12, Procedures for Determining Participation <p>Evidence 039: Code of Virginia, Title 51.5 Persons with Disabilities, Chapter 9 Rights of Persons with Disabilities, § 51.5-40 Nondiscrimination under state grants and programs</p> <p>Evidence 043: Spring 2015 Non-Writing Tests Manual for the Division Director of Testing and School Test Coordinators, Grades 3–8, Content Specific History, End-of-Course</p> | <p>State’s evidence meets criteria.</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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA; • Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments); • The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 6, Training Topics for School Test Coordinators; • Pages 10-11, Identify Students to Be Tested; • Pages 40-43, Complete Coding of Student Demographic Information <p>Training:</p> <p>Evidence 106: Updates for Students with Disabilities Regional DDOT Meeting Fall 2014</p> <p>Evidence 110: Division Director of Testing Training Schedule 2014-2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Session 7 | |
| Section 5.1 Summary Statement | | |
| <p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required.</p> | | |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|--|--|
| <p>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. | <p>Evidence 035: Virginia Administrative Code, Title 8 Education, Agency 20 State Board of Education, Chapter 131 Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia, Section 30 Student Achievement Expectations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 6, Paragraph G <p>Evidence 036: Superintendent’s Memo 110-15: Student Participation in Virginia Standards of Learning Assessments</p> <p>Evidence 040: Limited English Proficient Students: Guidelines for Participation in the Virginia Assessment Program</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages 1-5; • Page 25 <p>Evidence 041: Code of Virginia, Title 1 General Provisions, Chapter 5 Emblems, § 1-511 English designated the official language of the Commonwealth</p> <p>Evidence 042: Code of Virginia, Title 22.1 Education, Chapter 13 Programs, Courses of Instruction and Textbooks, § 22.1-212.1 Obligations of school boards</p> <p>Evidence 043: Spring 2015 Non-Writing Tests Manual for the Division Director of Testing and School Test Coordinators, Grades 3–8, Content Specific History, End-of-Course</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 36, Marking Test Complete Guidelines; • Page 41, Testing Status Codes; | <p>State’s evidence meets criteria.</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 VIRGINIA

| 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"> • Page 85, Exempting LEP Students from the Virginia Assessments <p>Training: Evidence 109: Limited English Proficient Student Assessment Participation Reminders and Updates Regional DDOT Meeting Spring 2015</p> <p>Evidence 110: Division Director of Testing Training Schedule 2014-2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Session 7 <p>Evidence 103: Superintendent’s Memo #083-14: Training on Accommodations for Limited English Proficient Students</p> | |
| Section 5.2 Summary Statement | | |
| <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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|---|--|
| <p>5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities (SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. | <p>Evidence 038: 2014 Students with Disabilities: Guidelines for Assessment Participation</p> <p>Evidence 089: Virginia Department of Education Students with Disabilities: Guidelines for Special Test Accommodations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages 7 – 17, Test Accommodations • Page 18, Special Assessment Accommodation Request • Pages 20-21, Appendix A <p>Evidence 040: Limited English Proficient Students: Guidelines for Participation in the Virginia Assessment Program</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages 5-9, Section IV • Page 9-10, Section V • Appendices B, C, and D <p>Evidence 043: Spring 2015 Non-Writing Tests Manual for the Division Director of Testing and School Test Coordinators, Grades 3–8, Content Specific History, End-of-Course</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages 67-94, Appendix C; • Pages 95- 98, Appendix D <p>Evidence 090: Guidelines for Administering the Read-Aloud Accommodation for the Virginia Standards of Learning Assessments</p> <p>Evidence 091: Explanation of Testing Accommodations for Students with Disabilities Math Aids – Accommodation Code 19</p> <p>Evidence 092: Explanation of Testing Accommodations for Students with Disabilities:</p> | <p>State’s evidence meets criteria.</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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>Assistive Technology Accommodations</p> <p>Evidence 093: Virginia Department of Education Calculator Accommodation Criteria for Student with Disabilities</p> <p>Evidence 094: Virginia Department of Education Calculator Accommodation Criteria for Student with Blindness or Visual Impairments</p> <p>Training: Evidence 109: Limited English Proficient Student Assessment Participation Reminders and Updates</p> <p>Evidence 110: Division Director of Testing Training Schedule 2014-2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Session 2 • Session 7 <p>Evidence 103: Superintendent’s Memo #083-14: Training on Accommodations for Limited English Proficient Students</p> | |
| Section 5.3 Summary Statement | | |
| <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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|---|--|
| <p>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. | <p>Evidence 236: Superintendent’s Memo 265-14: Results-Driven Accountability in Special Education</p> | <p>State should submit the plan that is developed, including a timeline for implementation of the plan, beginning with the next test implementation.</p> |
| <p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The completed state plan for monitoring test administration for special populations that is developed, including a timeline for implementation of the plan, beginning with the next test implementation. | | |

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 VIRGINIA

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|--|--|
| <p>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; • The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels. | <p>Evidence 194: ESEA Flexibility Request Virginia Department of Education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 52, Section 1C <p>Virginia Standard Setting Reports:</p> <p>Standards of Learning Assessments: Evidence 181:EOC Mathematics Standard Setting</p> <p>Evidence 182: EOC Reading and Science Standard Setting</p> <p>Evidence 183: Mathematics Grades 3-8 Standard Setting</p> <p>Evidence 184: Reading Grades 3-8 Standard Setting</p> <p>Evidence 185: Science Grades 3, 5, & 8 Standard Setting</p> <p>Virginia Grade Level Alternative Assessment:</p> <p>Evidence 189: Virginia Grade Level Alternative Program Reading Standard Setting Alignment</p> <p>Evidence 190: Virginia Grade Level Alternative Program Science Standard Setting Alignment</p> <p>Evidence 124: Superintendent’s Memo #176-13: Score Ranges for the Virginia Grade Level Alternative (VGLA) Assessments for Grades 3-8 Reading and Grades 3, 5, and 8 Science Based on the 2010 English and Science Standards of</p> | <p>State’s evidence meets criteria.</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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|------------------|---|--|
| | <p>Learning (SOL)</p> <p>Evidence 224: Superintendent’s Memo #106-13: Anticipated Board Action on Recommended Cut Scores for the Virginia Grade Level Alternative (VGLA) Grades 3-8 Reading and Grades 3, 5, and 8 Science Assessments Based on the 2010 Science and English Standards of Learning (SOL)</p> <p>Performance Level Descriptors:</p> <p>Evidence 191: Virginia Standards of Learning Assessment Mathematics Performance Level Descriptors</p> <p>Evidence 192: Virginia Standards of Learning Assessment Reading Performance Level Descriptors</p> <p>Evidence 193: Virginia Standards of Learning Assessment Science Performance Level Descriptors</p> <p>Alternate Assessments:</p> <p>Evidence 186: Virginia Alternate Assessment Program Mathematics Standard Setting</p> <p>Evidence 187: Virginia Alternate Assessment Program Reading Standard Setting</p> <p>Evidence 188: Virginia Alternate Assessment Program Science Standard Setting</p> <p>Evidence 114: Explanation for Cut Scores</p> <p>Evidence 115: Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL) Tests Cut Scores as Adopted by the Virginia</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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>Board of Education</p> <p>Evidence 118: Superintendent’s Memo #175-13 Cut Scores Adopted by the Board of Education for the Virginia Alternate Assessment Program (VAAP) in Reading, Mathematics, Writing, and Science</p> <p>Evidence 119: Superintendent’s Memo #077-13 Cut Scores Adopted by the Board of Education for Grades 3-8 New Reading Tests Based on the 2010 Standards of Learning</p> <p>Evidence 229: TESTING MEMO NO. 951: Request for Participation in an Online Survey to Develop Performance Level Descriptors for the Virginia Alternate Assessment Program (VAAP) Mathematics</p> <p>Evidence 230: Virginia Department of Education Virginia Alternate Assessment Program (VAAP) Science Performance Level Descriptors Report</p> <p>Evidence 233: VAAP Mathematics Performance Level Descriptors</p> <p>Evidence 234: VAAP Reading Performance Level Descriptors</p> <p>Evidence 235: VAAP Science Performance Level Descriptors</p> | |
| Section 6.1 Summary Statement | | |
| <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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|--|--|
| <p>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p> | <p>Virginia Standard Setting Reports:</p> <p>Standards of Learning Assessments: Evidence 181: EOC Mathematics Standard Setting</p> <p>Evidence 182: EOC Reading and Science Standard Setting</p> <p>Evidence 183: Mathematics Grades 3-8 Standard Setting</p> <p>Evidence 184: Reading Grades 3-8 Standard Setting</p> <p>Evidence 185: Science Grades 3, 5, & 8 Standard Setting</p> <p>Virginia Grade Level Alternative Assessment:</p> <p>Evidence 189: Virginia Grade Level Alternative Program Reading Standard Setting Alignment</p> <p>Evidence 190: Virginia Grade Level Alternative Program Science Standard Setting Alignment</p> <p>Alternate Assessments:</p> <p>Evidence 186: Virginia Alternate Assessment Program Mathematics Standard Setting</p> <p>Evidence 187: Virginia Alternate Assessment Program Reading Standard Setting</p> <p>Evidence 188: Virginia Alternate Assessment Program Science Standard Setting</p> | <p>State’s evidence meets criteria.</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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|--|--|
| Section 6.2 Summary Statement | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required. | | |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|---|--|
| <p>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p> | <p>Evidence 194: ESEA Flexibility Request Virginia Department of Education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 52, Section 1C <p>Evidence 116: Developing Standards of Learning Tests to Support “College Path” Scores</p> <p>Virginia Standard Setting Reports:</p> <p>Standards of Learning Assessments:</p> <p>Evidence 181: EOC Mathematics Standard Setting</p> <p>Evidence 182: EOC Reading and Science Standard Setting</p> <p>Evidence 183: Mathematics Grades 3-8 Standard Setting</p> <p>Evidence 184: Reading Grades 3-8 Standard Setting</p> <p>Evidence 185: Science Grades 3, 5, & 8 Standard Setting</p> <p>Virginia Grade Level Alternative Assessment (VGLA):</p> <p>Evidence 189: Virginia Grade Level Alternative Program Reading Standard Setting Alignment</p> <p>Evidence 190: Virginia Grade Level Alternative Program Science Standard Setting Alignment</p> <p>AA-AAAS Assessment: Virginia Alternate Assessment Program (VAAP)</p> | <p>Reviewers were concerned that the VGLA’s achievement standards were not challenging, though they may be aligned. This is due to differential pass rates between VGLA and SOL, even after articulation based on percent correct.</p> <p>Recommendation: adequate sampling of VGLA data, maybe by aggregating multiple years of data.</p> |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|--|--|
| | Evidence 186: Virginia Alternate Assessment Program Mathematics Standard Setting Evidence 187: Virginia Alternate Assessment Program Reading Standard Setting Evidence 188: Virginia Alternate Assessment Program Science Standard Setting | |
| Section 6.3 Summary Statement | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required. | | |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|--|--|
| <p>6.4 – Reporting</p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration; • The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results; • The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement; ○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors); ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; ○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to | <p>Evidence 044: <u>2015 - 2016 Summary of Accountability Results Based on 2014-2015 Assessment Data</u></p> <p>Assessment Score Reports:</p> <p>Standards of Learning Reports:</p> <p>Evidence 195: <u>Standards of Learning (SOL) Assessment Reports for Non-Writing</u></p> <p>Evidence 217: <u>Student-Level Records Non-Writing Tests Grades 3-8, CSH and EOC 2014-2015</u></p> <p>Evidence 196: <u>Analysis of Subgroup Performance Report for the School</u></p> <p>Evidence 197: <u>Reporting Category Performance for Groups in the School</u></p> <p>Evidence 198: <u>Student Labels</u></p> <p>Evidence 199: <u>Group Summary Report</u></p> <p>Evidence 200: <u>Reporting Category Performance for Students in the Group</u></p> <p>Evidence 201: <u>Student Detail by Question</u></p> <p>Evidence 202: <u>Student Report</u></p> <p>Evidence 203: <u>Understanding Your Student’s Non-Writing Standards Of Learning (SOL) Score Report</u></p> | <p>Reviewers did not find evidence regarding whether exhibit 203 was available in alternate formats and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that non-English speaking parents can understand.</p> <p>Reviewers noticed that the ISR only had a link to the PLDs, not the actual PLD that the student achieved. Recommendations include putting the actual PLD for the student’s achievement level on the ISR, or print them on the back of the page. Consider a way to accommodate parents who do not have internet access to search the appropriate URL.</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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|--|--|
| <p>the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. | <p>Alternate and Alternative Assessment Reports:</p> <p>Evidence 204: Alternate and Alternative Assessments Reports</p> <p>Evidence 218: Record Description for Student-Level Records VAAP VGLA VSEP 2014-2015</p> <p>VAAP Reports:</p> <p>Evidence 206: VAAP Report to Parents Evidence 205: VAAP Audit Student Roster Evidence 207: VAAP Understanding Your Child’s VAAP Report</p> <p>Evidence 208: VAAP Student Performance Report</p> <p>Evidence 209: VAAP Student Performance Report</p> <p>VGLA Reports:</p> <p>Evidence 210: VGLA Audit Overturn Report Evidence 211: VGLA Report to Parents Evidence 212: VGLA Understanding Your Child’s VGLA Report Evidence 213: VGLA Student Performance Report</p> <p>Score Report Training:</p> <p>Evidence 214: VGLA Summary Report by State</p> <p>Evidence 215: Fall 2014 Standards of Learning Score Reports for Non-Writing Tests Division of Student Assessment and School Improvement</p> <p>Evidence 216: Spring 2015 Non-Writing Standards of Learning Score Reports</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 VIRGINIA

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|------------------|---|--|
| | <p>Performance Level Descriptors:</p> <p>Evidence 191: Virginia Standards of Learning Assessment Mathematics Performance Level Descriptors</p> <p>Evidence 192: Virginia Standards of Learning Assessment Reading Performance Level Descriptors</p> <p>Evidence 193: Virginia Standards of Learning Assessment Science Performance Level Descriptors</p> <p>Evidence 233: VAAP Mathematics Performance Level Descriptors</p> <p>Evidence 234: VAAP Reading Performance Level Descriptors</p> <p>Evidence 235: VAAP Science Performance Level Descriptors</p> | |

| Section 6.4 Summary Statement |
|---|
| <p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that individual student reports for the SOL, VGLA and VAAP are accessible in alternate formats and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that non-English speaking parents parents can understand. • Timeline for delivery of individual student reports for the SOL, VGLA and VAAP to parents. |

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.