UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Rebecca Holcombe
Secretary of Education
Vermont Agency of Education
219 North Main Street, Suite 402
Barre, VT 05641

February 21, 2017

Dear Secretary Holcombe:

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 reinstituted peer review of State assessment systems so that each State receives feedback from external experts on the assessments it is currently administering. We appreciate the efforts required to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in June and August 2016. State assessment systems provide essential information that States, districts, principals, and teachers can use to identify the academic needs of students, target resources and supports toward students who need them most, evaluate school and program effectiveness, and close achievement gaps among students. A high-quality assessment system also provides useful information to parents about their children's advancement against and achievement of grade-level standards. The Department's peer review of State assessment systems is designed to provide feedback to States to support the development and administration of high-quality assessments.

On October 6, 2016, the Department sent a letter to chief State school officers outlining the outcomes for States related to the assessment peer review. I am writing to provide you feedback on your State's recent submission of evidence. External peer reviewers and Department staff evaluated the Vermont Agency of Education's (VAE) 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 (Smarter Balanced): **Substantially meets requirements**
- R/LA and mathematics general assessments in high school (Smarter Balanced): **Substantially meets requirements**
- Reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) in grades 3-8 and high school (Dynamic Learning Maps Integrated Model (DLM-Int)). **Substantially meets requirements.**

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

The specific list of items required for VAE to submit is enclosed with this letter. VAE must submit a plan and timeline within 30 days outlining when it will submit all required additional documentation for peer review. If adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action.

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

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

Sincerely,

/s/

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

Enclosure

cc: Michael Hock, State Assessment Director

Critical Elements Where Additional Evidence is Needed to Meet the Requirements for Vermont's Assessment System

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments	For all components of its assessment system, VAE must provide: • Evidence 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.
1.5 – Participation Data	For all components of its assessment system, VAE must provide: • Evidence that participation data includes students participating in the AA-AAAS.
2.1 – Test Design and Development	For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), VAE must provide: • Evidence that the Smarter Balanced test design aligns the assessments to the full depth and breadth for all of the academic content standards in R/LA (including speaking) and mathematics at each grade level. • Evidence that the item selection procedures for the CAT online assessment adequately deliver tests that meet test design requirements for the intended DOK of the assessments (also applies to evidence requested for element 2.2). • Evidence that, for cases where an assessment includes off-grade-level content, assessments produce grade level student achievement scores that are based only on grade-level items. • Evidence that the item pools for all versions of the assessments (i.e., general, American Sign Language, Braille and Spanish) are sufficient to support the test design requirements. For R/LA and mathematics alternate assessments of alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) in grades 3-8 and HS (DLM-Int), VAE must provide: • See evidence requested in elements 3.1 and 4.1 regarding item interchangeability and model fit.
2.2 – Item Development	For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), VAE must provide: • See evidence regarding DOK and item pools in element 2.1 above.
2.3 – Test Administration	For all components of its assessment system, VAE must provide: • Evidence of contingency plans to address potential technology issues during test administration For R/LA and mathematics alternate assessments of alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) in grades 3-8 and HS (DLM-Int), VAE must provide: • Evidence of procedures for training all individuals responsible for administering DLM assessments.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration	For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), VAE must provide: • Evidence that the State uses the vendor-provided data forensic reports to monitor test administration; OR • Evidence that the State has a quality assurance plan to ensure the LEA administrators are adequately monitoring standardized test administration procedures on behalf of the State.
2.5 – Test Security	For R/LA and mathematics alternate assessments of alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) in grades 3-8 and HS (DLM-Int), VAE must provide: • Evidence is needed regarding the State's process for investigating irregularities in DLM test administration.
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy	For all components of its assessment system, VAE must provide: • Evidence is needed regarding the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), VAE must provide: • Evidence as noted for all item pools in element 2.1 above. • Evidence of a summary report that the CAT administered test forms matched test blueprints. • Evidence that Smarter Balanced assessments that include off-grade level content conform to the on-grade level blueprint for the assessment. • Evidence of alignment of sample test forms for grades 3, 4, 6 and 7 in R/LA and mathematics. • Evidence of improved alignment of the tests, based upon the findings of the independent alignment study. For R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and HS (DLM-Int), VAE must provide: • Evidence of analysis that supports the assumptions of testlet interchangeability across linkage levels used by the tests, including analysis of model fit. • Evidence that provides detailed descriptions of the routing pathways within and across essential elements (content strands).
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	For R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and HS (DLM-Int), VAE must provide: • Evidence of consistency and accuracy of classifications resulting from the tests. • Evidence of item-level data (e.g., factor loadings or item-total correlations), or comparable node-level data that support the internal structure of the tests. • Evidence that reliability estimates are based upon known item and testlet parameters.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	For R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and HS (DLM-Int), VAE must provide: • Evidence that the assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.
4.1 – Reliability	For R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and HS (DLM-Int), VAE must provide: • Evidence regarding reliability estimation as noted in element 3.3 above. • Evidence regarding consistency and accuracy of classifications as noted in element 3.3 above. • Evidence of model fit analysis, as noted in element 3.1 above.
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility	For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), VAE must provide: • Evidence of estimated reliability for students receiving accommodations using operational data.
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum	For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), VAE must provide: • See evidence regarding DOK and item pools in element 2.1 above.
4.4 – Scoring	For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), VAE must provide: • Evidence that Smarter Balanced has clear, unambiguous criteria, including minimum thresholds, to ensure and document inter-rater reliability for States that are conducting hand-scoring of Smarter Balanced performance items. • Evidence of improved rates of exact agreement in the scoring of R/LA hand scored test items. For R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and HS (DLM-Int), VAE must provide: • Evidence of scoring reliability statistics for writing items based upon test administrator ratings. • Evidence of a detailed description of the calibration used in scoring software (e.g., field test versus operational calibration). • Evidence that distinguishes between option level scoring and item level scoring.
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	For R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and HS (DLM-Int), VAE must provide: • Evidence of analysis that supports the assumptions of testlet interchangeability (see evidence requested in element 3.1 above).
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), VAE must provide: • Evidence of the design and development of the item pools used to support multiple versions of the assessments, specifically:

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	○ Computer-adaptive in ASL (R/LA listening only, mathematics); ○ Computer-adaptive in Braille (R/LA, mathematics); ○ Computer-based fixed form in Braille (mathematics); ○ Paper in Braille (R/LA, mathematics); ○ Computer-adaptive in Spanish (mathematics); and ○ Paper in Spanish (mathematics). • Evidence that item pools for these above-listed additional computer adaptive versions can support the adaptive test design. For R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and HS (DLM-Int), VAE must provide: • Evidence of analysis that supports the assumptions of testlet interchangeability (see evidence requested in element 3.1 above).
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	For all components of its assessment system, VAE must provide: • Evidence that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their students' achievements are informed by alternate academic achievement standards and the possible consequences of participation in AA-AAAS. • Evidence that procedures are 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.
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs	For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), VAE must provide: • Evidence of guidance regarding selection of the Spanish version of the Smarter Balanced assessments for English learners, and evidence of procedures for communication of this guidance to districts, schools, teachers and parents.
5.3 – Accommodations	For the entire assessment system, VAE must provide: • Evidence of a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.
6.4 – Reporting	For the entire assessment system, VAE must provide: • Evidence of the availability of score reports in alternate formats.

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.

Contents

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

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS 9
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 9
2.2 – Item Development..... 10
2.3 – Test Administration 11
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)12
2.5 – Test Security 13
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 14

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 15
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 15
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 16
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure 17
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables..... 18

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER 19
4.1 – Reliability..... 19
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 20
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... 21
4.4 – Scoring 22
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 23
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment 24
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance..... 25

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS 26
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 26
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 28
5.3 – Accommodations..... 29
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations 30

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 31
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students 31
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 32
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 33
6.4 – Reporting..... 34

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.

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
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students 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.	Evaluate for all subjects Vermont Agency of Education Peer Review Submission 1.1 A Item 1 page 3 Board Minutes, August 17, 2010 7-0 vote	No additional evidence is required from Vermont.
Section 1.1 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required from Vermont.		

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards 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.	Evaluate for all three subjects See: 1.2 –F- Common Core Implementation Guide SBAC Technical Manual and 1.2 F for references to rigor for each set of standards for each subject area (pg. 1), and evidence stakeholder involvement (pgs. 26-32).	No additional evidence is required from Vermont.
Section 1.2 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required for Vermont.		

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.

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
1.3 – Required Assessments 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: • 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).	Evaluate for grade/subject combinations listed in left column Vermont Statutes Annotated Title 16 is the foundation for Vermont's Assessment and Accountability System and essentially empowers the State Board of Education to develop and implement rules that are necessary to qualify for Federal funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and as such, makes the ESEA rules Vermont's rules. Here is the key citation from Title 16:§ 144b. Federal education aid funds; administration (a) The state board of education, as sole state agency, may administer such federal funds as may be made available to the state under Public Law 89-10, known as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 as amended, and Public Law 107-110, known as the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. 1.3 A Vermont State Board of Education Rule 2500 – School Accountability System based on Student Achievement See section 2515 for rule requiring use of statewide achievement test scores 1.3 B Vermont State Board of Education-Education Quality Standards See Section 2120.5 for citations	Evidence submitted outlines state requirements for Federally compliant assessment system. Review of State education website verifies all required assessments are included in the Vermont system.
Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
_X_ No additional evidence is required for Vermont.		

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.

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

1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments
 	
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.
• 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):
  o 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;
  o 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.
	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column-SWD and EL
	1.3 A Vermont State Board of Education Rule 2500 – School Accountability System based on Student Achievement
	See rules 2540 and 2545 for requirements relevant to inclusion of all students
	
	1.3 B Vermont State Board of Education-Education Quality Standards
	See Section 2123.1 (page 16) for citations relevant to inclusion of all students
	
	See also, The Smarter Balanced Usability, Accessibility and Accommodations Guide, Pages 2 and 3, which note both the requirement for all students to participate in assessment and the concurrence between the Consortium's policies and federal rules and guidelines for Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners. This document was submitted for review by Smarter Balanced under a separate cover.
		No evidence documents explicit to the inclusion of students with disabilities in private 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.

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		
X_ The following additional evidence is needed: • Evidence which explicitly requires the inclusion of students with disabilities in private 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.

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
1.5 – Participation Data 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.	Prompts for Reviewers: --data disaggregated by student group: ELA/Math/Science --Shows students tested and students enrolled for each breakout --for end-of-course HS, procedures to ensure each student is tested and counted in participation rate along with data --includes grade level tests and AA-AAAS Concurrent with its annual EdFacts submission, the Vermont Agency of Education has posted an interactive Assessment Participation Report Viewer on its website. A screen shot from the Report Viewer is referenced below. 1.5 A Screen Shot of Interactive Participation Report Viewer 1.5 B Screen Shot from the Interactive Reporting Portal (Smarter Balanced Assessment by Grade) 1.5 C Screen Shot from the Assessment Reporting Database 1.5 D Assessment Reporting Database in Excel 1.5 E Online Report Showing One Disaggregation Option 1.3 B Vermont State Board of Education-Education Quality Standards	Data shows participation for all subgroups for all subjects. There appear to be no totals (even aggregated across grades) that indicate AA-AAAS participation.
Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
X The following additional evidence is needed: • Evidence that indicates participation including AA-AAAS.		

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.

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.1 – Test Design and Development The State's test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State's academic content standards, and includes: • 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **See SBAC and DLM Peer Review Notes**	Peers noted an on-line paper entitled "Making Good Use of Assessments: Interpreting and Using Scores" by Linda Darling Hammond and James Pellegrino (March, 2015), that could support this element. No additional evidence is required from Vermont.
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required for Vermont.		

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.2 – Item Development 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **See SBAC and DLM Peer Review Notes**	No additional evidence is required for Vermont.
Section 2.2 Summary Statement		
X__ No additional evidence is required for Vermont.		

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.3 – Test Administration The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State: • 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **See SBAC and DLM Peer Review Notes** **2.3.A, SY 2014-15_Vermont SB Tech Report (5-16-2016)** **2.3.B. VT-AOE Smarter Balanced Test Administration Resources** **1.2. F. Common Core Implementation Guide** **2.3. C VT-AOE Smarter Balanced Assessment Training Resources**	While the procedure for verifying that test administrators have completed the online test administration module was well developed for SBAC, reviewers did not see similar evidence from Vermont for DLM. Peer Reviewers noted that there is a need to develop a contingency plan to address possible technology challenges during the test administration of the on-line assessments.

Section 2.3 Summary Statement

__X__ The following additional evidence is needed:

- Evidence is needed regarding procedures for training all individuals responsible for administering DLM assessments.
- Evidence is needed to support a contingency plan to address possible technology challenges during the test administration of online assessments.

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

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
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration 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.	_____ policies and procedures apply to all grade-level and AA-AAAS in all subjects 2.4 A Principal Certification of Proper Test Administration 2.3 A SY2014-15_Vermont SB_Tech_Report_(5-16-2016) Vermont's assessment contract with the American Institutes for Research includes application of several state of the arts data forensic procedures. Please see section 2.7 of the Technical Report.	State evidence shows vendor 'real-time" monitoring of on-line testing anomaly. Evidence does not provide any report of SEA actually using these forensic capabilities State evidence relies upon school administrator affirmation of monitoring, so SEA staff monitoring program appears to be in place. Evidence does not appear to indicate any SEA quality assurance of LEA test monitoring function. How does SEA know that LEAs are adequately monitoring standardized test administration procedures.

Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY

X The following additional evidence is needed:

- Evidence that the State actually uses the vendor provided (AIR) data forensic reports to monitor test administration; OR
- Evidence that the State has a quality assurance plan to ensure the LEA administrators are adequately monitoring standardized test administration procedures on behalf of the State.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.5 – Test Security 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:	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS **See SBAC and DLM Peer Review Notes**	
• 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;	**2.3.A, SY 2014-15_Vermont SB Tech Report (5-16-2016)** **2.3.B. VT-AOE Smarter Balanced Test Administration Resources**	
• Detection of test irregularities;	**2.3.A, SY 2014-15_Vermont SB Tech Report (5-16-2016) Section 7**	
• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State's assessments;		
• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.	**2.3.A, SY 2014-15_Vermont SB Tech Report (5-16-2016) Section 2.2.1 Administrative Roles pg. 11-12, Section 2.4.4. pgs. 20-21** **Section 8.5 Quality Assurance in Test Scoring pg. 93**	Peer Reviewers are concerned that the state's process for investigating irregularities in DLM test administration is not clearly specified.

Section 2.5 Summary Statement

_X_ The following additional evidence is needed:

- The state's process for investigating irregularities in DLM test administration is not clearly specified among the documents provided. Evidence is needed that describes this process.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy 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:	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS **See SBAC and DLM Peer Review Notes**	
• To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results;	**2.3.A, SY 2014-15_Vermont SB Tech Report (5-16-2016) 2.4.1 and 2.4.2** **2.3.B. VT-AOE Smarter Balanced Test Administration Resources**	.
• To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;	**2.3.A, SY 2014-15_Vermont SB Tech Report (5-16-2016) 2.4.1 student privacy and confidentiality, pg. 18, hierarchy of control, password protection and secure browser, pg. 19.** **2.3.B. VT-AOE Smarter Balanced Test Administration Resources**	
• 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.	**2.3.A, SY 2014-15_Vermont SB Tech Report (5-16-2016) 2.4.1 pg. 19**	Peer Reviewers were not presented evidence of the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.

Section 2.6 Summary Statement

__X The following additional evidence is needed:

- Evidence is needed regarding the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.

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.

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content 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: • 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **See SBAC and DLM Peer Review Notes**	No additional evidence is required from Vermont.
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required from Vermont.		

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **See SBAC and DLM Peer Review Notes**	No additional evidence is required from Vermont.
Section 3.2 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required from Vermont.		

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **See SBAC and DLM Peer Review Notes**	No additional evidence is required from Vermont.
Section 3.3 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required from Vermont.		

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State's assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **See SBAC and DLM Peer Review Notes**	No additional evidence is required from Vermont.
Section 3.4 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required from Vermont.		

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.

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.1 – Reliability 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: • 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **See SBAC and DLM Peer Review Notes**	No additional evidence is required from Vermont.
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
_X_ No additional evidence is required from Vermont.		

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **See SBAC and DLM Peer Review Notes**	No additional evidence is required from Vermont.
Section 4.2 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required for Vermont.		

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **See SBAC and DLM Peer Review Notes**	No additional evidence is required from Vermont.
Section 4.3 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required for Vermont.		

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.4 – Scoring 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **SBAC and DLM Peer Review Notes** **2.3.A, SY 2014-15_Vermont SB Tech Report (5-16-2016) 6.7 pg. 68 (MI services and procedures for hand scoring)**	Peer Reviewers noted that some of the agreement ratings on pg. 72 for ELA items were low (under 60%). Peer Reviewers agreed that a plan for increasing the rate of agreement needs to be provided by the state.
Section 4.4 Summary Statement		
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed: Peer Reviewers agreed that a plan for increasing the rate of agreement for ELA test items needs to be provided by the state.		

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **See SBAC and DLM Peer Review Notes**	No additional evidence is required from Vermont.
Section 4.5 Summary Statement		
X___ No additional evidence is required from Vermont.		

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State: • 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **See SBAC and DLM Peer Review Notes**	No additional evidence is required from Vermont.

Section 4.6 Summary Statement
__X_ No additional evidence is required from Vermont.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance 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).	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **See SBAC and DLM Peer Review Notes** 4.7. A Vermont June 5, 2015 Newsletter (feedback survey link) 4.7. B 2016 Vermont Smarter Balance Advisory Group Invitation 4.7 C NEAC Vermont Advisory Committee Agenda, June 14, 2016	No additional evidence is required from Vermont. The Peer Reviewers noted that the state addressed ongoing maintenance in the evidence provided.

Section 4.7 Summary Statement
X___ No additional evidence is required from Vermont.

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.

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
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 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: • 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;	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS **See SBAC and DLM Peer Review Notes** **5.1 A SBED 101 Assessments Training Winter 2016 (pg. 4, 7, 8, and 13)** **5.1 B SBAC and Special Populations** 1.2 –F- Common Core Implementation Guide 5.1. B **SBAC and Special Populations**	

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities; • 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.		Peer Reviewers were not presented evidence that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their students' achievements are informed by alternate academic achievement standards and the possible consequences of this. Peer Reviewers were not presented evidence that procedures are in place to ensure that the implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.

Section 5.1 Summary Statement

X The following additional evidence is needed:

- Peer Reviewers did not find evidence that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their students' achievements are informed by alternate academic achievement standards and the possible consequences of this. Evidence of this is needed for this critical element.
- Peer Reviewers were not presented evidence that procedures are 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. Evidence of this is needed for this critical element.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs 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: • 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS **See SBAC and DLM Peer Review Notes** **5.1 A SBED 101 Assessments Training Winter 2016** **5.2. A ELL Designated Supports**	No additional evidence is required from Vermont.

Section 5.2 Summary Statement
__X__ No additional evidence is required for Vermont.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.3 – Accommodations The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State: • 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS; **See SBAC and DLM Peer Review Notes** **5.2. A ELL Designated Supports** **5.1 A SBED 101 Assessments Training Winter 2016**	Peer Reviewers were not presented evidence of a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.

Section 5.3 Summary Statement

X___ The following additional evidence is needed:

- Evidence is needed regarding a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations 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: • 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS; **See SBAC and DLM Peer Review Notes** 1.2 –F- Common Core Implementation Guide	No additional evidence is required from Vermont. Peer Reviewers suggest that the state consider providing more detail regarding how they will monitor test administration in its districts and schools in addition to what has already been provided.
Section 5.4 Summary Statement		
X__ No additional evidence is required for Vermont.		

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.

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
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically: • 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **See SBAC and DLM Peer Review Notes**	No additional evidence is required from Vermont.

Section 6.1 Summary Statement
__X_ No additional evidence is required from Vermont.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **See SBAC and DLM Peer Review Notes**	No additional evidence is required from Vermont.
Section 6.2 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required from Vermont.		

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 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. 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **See SBAC and DLM Peer Review Notes**	No additional evidence is required from Vermont.
Section 6.3 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required from Vermont.		

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.

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

6.4 – Reporting
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:
• 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:
  o Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student's achievement;
  o Report the student's achievement in terms of the State's grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);
  o Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;
  o Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to
	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet
	
	See SBAC and DLM Peer Review Notes
	
	1.5 B Screen Shot from the Interactive Reporting Portal (Smarter Balanced Assessment by Grade)
	
	1.5C Screen Shot from the Assessment Reporting Data Base
	
	1.5 D Assessment Reporting Data Base in Excel
	
	2.3 A Vermont Smarter Balanced Assessments 2014-2015 Technical Report (pgs. 15, 16,17,74, and 75).
		.
		
		Peer Reviewers were not presented evidence of the availability of score reports in alternate formats.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand; • 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.		
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
_X_ The following additional evidence is needed: • Evidence of the availability of score reports in alternate formats needs to be provided.		

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

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

June, 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes Smarter Balanced Consortium Evidence

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.

Contents

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS 3
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 3
2.2 – Item Development..... 9
2.3 – Test Administration 11
2.5 – Test Security 14
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 16

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 18
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 18
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 21
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure 22
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables..... 24

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER 25
4.1 – Reliability..... 25
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 27
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... 28
4.4 – Scoring 29
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 30
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment 31
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance..... 33

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS 34
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 34
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 37
5.3 – Accommodations..... 38
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations..... 40

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 41
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students 41
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 42
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 43
6.4 – Reporting..... 44

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.

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.1 – Test Design and Development The State's test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State's academic content standards, and includes: • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **Index p. 2** **7 pp. 24-25**	Statements of purpose exist and are stated. One purpose statement relates to growth. Is there or will there be evidence to support that the SBAC summative test measures growth? Of note: There is no statement pertaining to the use of the SBAC test for teacher evaluation. The 5th purpose statement of the summative test is to gauge "how instruction can be improved…." Assessment results do not clearly indicate actions to improve instruction. Recommend either restating or deleting this purpose statement.
• 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;	**15a 15b** **17** **29**	In several places of Evidence 15a and 15b, the range of total items by claim on the test blueprints does not match the range implied by the sums of minimum and maximum numbers of items, respectively, by assessment targets. It is not clear if the range by claim is intended to be a tally of items or an additional constraint. Speaking is not included in the assessments for ELA. Re "measure the full range": In Evidence 17 p. 31, what makes for sufficiently good alignment is unclear. Evaluation of alignment study results is exacerbated

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		by the statement "low percentages of fully aligned and mostly aligned ratings do not necessarily reflect poor alignment." The peers recommend including a clear discussion and supporting tables demonstrating the SBAC summative assessments cover the full range of the CCSS standards. The evidence should display the full range of the CCSS standards and indicate which are covered by the SBAC summative assessments. Those standards not assessed should be noted with the reason for their exclusion stated. Although off grade level tests may be administered via the CAT system, the conditions under which off grade level items may be given is not clear. It is not clear to what extent students receiving a test event with off grade level items are receiving and/or being scored on a grade-level test event that complies with the blueprints. It is claimed that off grade level items are realigned to the on grade blueprint, but how this alignment was done and evaluated are not included among the evidence documents. The peers' understanding is that the decision of proficiency vs. non-proficiency is based only on on-grade level testing. The determination of other measures (levels I and IV, or student growth) may be impacted by the use of off grade level items and states must take this into account when using the assessments for accountability purposes.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• 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);	**Guidance p. 14** **15a 15b** **28 § 2.1-2.2**	The relative scarcity of DOK 3+ items in the assessments makes it difficult to conclude that they reflect "appropriate inclusion of challenging content" and requires "complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills)" There are notes specifying a minimum number of DOK 3+ items in the blueprints. However, from Evidence 28, it is unclear how DOK requirements are being implemented.
• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.	**Guidance** **Index** **8** **15a 15b** **27** **28** **29 p. 8** **30**	The discussion of custom item pools in sections Evidence 28, § 2.1 and 2.2 suggests that some students will receive a test with a different blueprint from other students. The current documentation lends itself to the interpretation that this might occur even for students not receiving accommodations. Evidence 29 page 8 identifies the inadequacy of the item pools in providing assessments to the full range of students. This issue needs to be addressed. In Evidence 27, the number of ELA items developed are short of the order, although the Index claims that deliveries exceeded orders. The rationale for the

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		orders listed in Evidence 27 is not explained. Specifically, how was the pool size and item demand determined? The ELA shortfalls in Evidence 27 are not explained in terms of impact on standards coverage. There needs to be an identification of the DOK of these orders and the shortfalls. Evidence 29 states that not all assessments follow blueprint constraints. Please provide the remediation and the assurance that this is not happening in operation with actual students. Appendix B of Evidence 29 demonstrates that many students taking the Spanish language and Braille versions of the SBAC assessments may be receiving assessments not aligned to the blueprints. It is unclear from Evidence 29 if the algorithm used in the simulation would accurately reflect (or accurately reflected) that used in operational testing. Evidence 30 demonstrates issues meeting constraints for the performance tasks. This needs to be addressed – specifically, how the misalignment was resolved. Evidence 8, p. 6 states that states may use their own delivery engines. The peers agree that states will need to provide evidence either that they are using the SBAC engine or that their chosen delivery engine functions the same as the SBAC engine and conforms to the SBAC blueprints for tests being delivered. If a non-SBAC engine does not conform, then it is incumbent upon the state using it to provide all evidence beyond item development for their program. That is, the program will need to be treated as an assessment other than SBAC (although using the

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.

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

Section 2.1 Summary Statement

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

2.1.1

a. Further justification for Purpose 4. Purpose 4 is related to measuring student growth. Where appropriate (e.g., in § 3), evidence should be provided supporting (1) growth interpretations of assessment results, and (2) specific uses of growth estimates.
b. Further justification for Purpose 5. Purpose 5 indicates that the assessment results will provide information about how instruction can be improved. This may be beyond the scope of a summative assessment system, since assessment results do not clearly indicate actions to improve instruction. Peers believe that this purpose should be restated or deleted. Alternatively, evidence can be provided where appropriate to support this interpretation / use of assessment results.

2.1.2

a. Clarification concerning whether the range of total items by claim identified in the test blueprints is intended to be a tally across assessment targets, or an additional constraint.
b. Documentation concerning the basis for exclusion of speaking in the ELA assessments.
c. Documentation concerning the Consortium's criterion for "sufficient alignment" (see Evidence 17 p. 31) and an explanation of how the results of the alignment study cited meets this definition. If sufficient alignment cannot be demonstrated, a remediation plan to achieve sufficient alignment.
d. A clear discussion and supporting tables demonstrating the SBAC summative assessments cover the full range of the CCSS standards. The evidence should display the full range of the CCSS standards and indicate which are covered by the SBAC summative assessments. Those standards not assessed should be noted with the reason for their exclusion stated.
e. Documentation supporting adherence to the grade level blueprint of assessments administered to students that include off grade level items.
f. Documentation that a suitable methodology was implemented for realigning off grade level items to on grade level content for use in administration of off grade level content.

2.1.3

a. Documentation supporting the claim that the DOK range of each assessment reflect "appropriate inclusion of challenging content" and requires "complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills)"
b. Clarification regarding how DOK requirements are being implemented, for both CAT and fixed forms.

2.1.4

a. Explanation of how the implementation of custom item pools described in § 2.1 and 2.2 of Evidence 28 cannot result in test events that are inconsistent with the test blueprints. If they can result in such test events, then a plan for how this will be remedied.
b. Documentation with plan addressing the inadequacy of the item pools in providing assessments to the full range of students, identified on p. 8 of Evidence 29.
c. An explanation of how DOK requirements are being implemented in the test delivery algorithm.
d. An explanation of the basis for the item counts in the orders listed in Evidence 27.
e. An explanation of the impact, if any, that the ELA shortfalls in Evidence 27 had / have on standards coverage.
f. Documentation that all assessments in operation now conform to blueprints.
g. Documentation regarding remediation of the issue that many students taking the Spanish language and Braille versions of the SBAC assessments may be

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
receiving forms or test events that do not conform to the blueprints. h. Documentation regarding remediation of the issue in meeting constraints for the performance tasks. i. Documentation that SBAC is appropriately guiding and supporting states in using the appropriate algorithm. Clarification that a state using a different algorithm cannot rely on evidence gathered through the SBAC algorithm.		
The following evidence is needed from individual member states: 2.1.2 a. A waiver to use SBAC due to the exclusion of speaking in the assessment. States should note: Educator evaluation is not a listed purpose of this assessment.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.2 – Item Development 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **7** **15a 15b** **53**	The documentation states revision based on the results of the cognitive labs, but does not specify what revisions were done or what changes were made to address issues identified (i.e. use of equation editor). There does not appear to be a specific statement about the mode of delivery for review of items. Since this is an electronic assessment, the items should have been reviewed on screen. The Consortium needs to specify the review mode in addition to the thorough documentation already provided. Page 3 of evidence 53 states that the ethnic make-up of the reviews reflects the diversity of the governing states, however the make-up of those states is not listed and the make-up of the math review panel is different form the ELA. While the peers are sensitive to the issues of recruitment, increased transparency would be helpful and support the positive outcome of the review. For example, listing the targets for ethnic make-up of panels and the efforts to recruit. If there were no targets for diversity, instead of claiming the panels matched the diversity of the governing states, simply state that this is the make-up based on the recruitment. The blueprints have a scarcity of items at DOK 3+. This leads the reviewers to question the level of inclusion of higher order skills.

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.

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

Section 2.2 Summary Statement

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

2.2

a. Documentation regarding how usability issues discovered during the cognitive labs (e.g., student difficulties using the equation editor) have been addressed.
b. Documentation showing that the mode of delivery during item review was the same as that for test administration – in other words, that reviewers reviewed items exactly as they would have been seen by students.
c. Documentation regarding the targets for ethnic make-up of panels and the efforts to recruit panels consistent with those targets or, if there were no targets for diversity, a statement to the effect.
d. Documentation as per Summary Statement 2.1.3.a.

The following evidence is needed from individual member states:

None.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.3 – Test Administration The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State: • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **11a p. 4 11b** **65a** **66** **67 p. 24** **68 pp. 36-41** **69b 69c 69d 69e** **77a 77b** **76**	The graphic on p. 4 of Evidence 11a is extremely helpful. Evidence 65a contains links that are important, however many are dead (the link to the collaboration site is not available to the reviewers). Since many documents are supplied as templates, the state will need to provide evidence that they are communicating clearly, effectively and accurately to its educators. These should include state-specific communications on the following issues: usability and accessibility guidelines, on-line test administration procedures, assessment technology requirements, test administrator manuals, and state specific procedures. These should include the content from the SBAC manuals as listed: on-line test administrator manual 67, usability accessibility and accommodations guide 68, UAA guidelines 11a 11b, state procedures manual 65a, test administrator users guide 66, paper pencil TAM 77a 77b, iPad guidelines 76, technology requirements training 69b, student interface training 69c, TA interface training modules 69d, ART training module 69e Evidence 67 p. 24: the thirty-minute timer mentioned in the first paragraph discussing the timeout, disagrees with the twenty-minute timer in the second paragraph. Please clarify. The definition of activity for the inactivity timer may be problematic since students can be clicking on the

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		screen every minute and still time out due to the definition. Typical computer activity conventions just require mouse movement, not specific activity. Evidence 68: The guidance provided for the read-aloud accommodation (table on pp. 36-41) appears to be challenging to implement or to adhere to during a live administration.
• 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;	**66**	If modifications are made to the SBAC systems, what process is in place to inform states of the changes? States need to provide evidence of their state training requirements.
• 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.	**65a** **66** **69** **70 p. 4**	Contingency plans need to give more details and clearer guidance on issues such as how to resume test administration in case of lost internet connectivity. SBAC needs to develop contingency guidelines and procedures to address a broad range of possible technology challenges during test administration, and submit these as evidence. The implementation readiness package was not ready based on the evidence provided. The package modules should have been ready beginning in spring 2015. Please provide evidence that the package is ready and the date when it was ready (Evidence 70 p. 4). Since states may use different administration vendors, each state should provide the customized contingency plans detailed for their state, and in alignment with SBAC's guidelines.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		States need to provide evidence that test administrators have procedures and access to helpdesk/troubleshooting support. States need to provide evidence that they have determined that schools meet the readiness guidelines prior to operational utilization.

Section 2.3 Summary Statement

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

2.3.1

a. A clarification to reconcile the disagreement, in Evidence 67 p. 24, between (1) the thirty-minute timer mentioned in the first paragraph discussing the timeout, and (2) the twenty-minute timer referenced in the second paragraph. Provision of the clarification to states.

2.3.2

a. Documentation of the communication plan (to states) when modifications are made to the SBAC systems.

2.3.3

a. Contingency plans addressing a broad range of technology challenges, providing more details and clearer guidance on issues such as how to resume test administration in case of lost internet connectivity.
b. Documentation that the Implementation Readiness Package has been fully developed and released, together with the release date.

The following evidence is needed from individual member states:

2.3.3

a. A contingency plan detailed for their state, and in alignment with SBAC's guidelines.
b. Documentation that test administrators have technology failure contingency procedures in place and access to helpdesk/troubleshooting support.
c. Documentation of school readiness for operational administration of technology-based assessments.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.5 – Test Security 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: • 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS **65a 65b** **66** **78**	The documents appear to defer much of the test security and irregularity detection to the states. However, peers felt that this critical element implied that SBAC should have its own programs of post hoc assessment for irregularities (data forensics) and ongoing test security monitoring including social media monitoring. Information in 65b should be communicated to states SBAC should maintain a security log overall to ensure security of the summative assessment system itself. States need to provide evidence of their security policies and procedures in accordance with the investigation and remediation procedures for SBAC.

Section 2.5 Summary Statement

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

2.5.1

a. Documentation that SBAC has in place security protocols and procedures to protect SBAC items and assessments.

2.5.2

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
a. Documentation that information in 65b is communicated to states. 2.5.4 Documentation of the implementation of the security logging and the remediation plan for incidents that may impact the validity of the assessment (including communications).		
The following evidence is needed from individual member states: 2.5 Documentation of state's security policies and procedures and the relationship of the state's policies and procedures to those of SBAC. In other words, a state's security policies and procedures should reference SBAC's policies and procedures and demonstrate coherence with these. It should be clear from all available documentation (regardless of source – SBAC or state) that all aspects of critical element 2.5 are addressed.		

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy 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:	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS	
• To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results;	**65a** **66** **134**	SBAC needs to provide evidence that they are monitoring test item exposure and drift to ensure integrity on an ongoing basis. States must provide evidence of this item with respect to administration and use.
• To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;	**133**	Please detail what is the low risk item stated in Evidence 133 and explain what is being done about this issue or why the issue is not being addressed. States must provide evidence of this item.
• 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.		For reporting outside the SBAC system, states need to provide evidence of compliance with this item.

Section 2.6 Summary Statement

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

2.6.1

a. Documentation of monitoring of test item exposure and drift done by SBAC to ensure integrity of the assessment system.

2.6.2

a. Further explanation of the low risk item in Evidence 133, including any actions being taken to address it or a reason why it is not being addressed.

The following evidence is needed from individual member states:

2.6.1

a. Documentation of compliance with this item with respect to "administration" and "use of test results."

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.6.2 a. All. 2.6.3 For states reporting outside of the SBAC system, documentation of compliance with this item.		

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.

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content 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: • 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;	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **Guidance** **7** **17** **104** **105** **124 pp. 86-89** **131**	Evidence 104 and 105 are the most direct evidence. How have the low ratings from 104 and 105 been addressed if at all? Evidence 124 achievement level feedback on pp. 86-89 suggests panels not understanding the standard setting process. How has this been addressed? The ELA shortfalls in evidence 27 are not explained in terms of impact on standards coverage. There needs to be an identification of the DOK of these orders and the shortfalls. Evidences 104 and 105 are the only alignment between standards and test items, however these studies do not encompass each grade level. Please provide evidence of alignment between operational tests at each grade level and the CCSS. Since the system allows student tests to include off grade level items, SBAC needs to report the rate at which it occurs and the impact on student scores as well as describe the implications for match to blueprints since presumably the blueprints were developed for on grade level test forms / events.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		SBAC needs to demonstrate adherence to the guidance regarding off grade level testing condition #2 on page 14. (Some reviewers felt the guidance means off grade level items cannot be used for any score purpose while others felt the guidance means off grade level items can be used in determining scores but not proficiency) Only on grade level items are used for score production and the on grade level items used cover the full range of the standards at that grade level. There is a lack of evidence demonstrating the CAT forms students are scored upon match the blueprints submitted as evidence. Please submit this evidence for operational tests instead of simulations with the plan for monitoring this process. To maintain a valid item bank, SBAC needs to monitor item exposure and run post hoc analyses to ensure the system has the same characteristics as designed and approved.
• 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.		N/A: State responsibility.

Section 3.1 Summary Statement

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

3.1.1

a. Documentation regarding how issues of low ratings in Evidence 104 have been addressed. Examples: Evidence 104, p. 18 shows SBAC has a low rating on

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
"high quality items and variety of item types." b. Documentation regarding how the low ratings on panelist comprehension of the standard setting process (Evidence 124, pp. 86-89), was addressed. c. Documentation regarding the ELA item shortfalls in Evidence 27 affected the item pool and how those shortfalls were addressed. d. Evidence of alignment between operational tests and the CCSS for those grade levels not covered in Evidence 104 and Evidence 105. (There must be evidence of alignment for every grade level.) e. Documentation regarding the rate at which off grade level testing occurs, the impact of off grade level testing on student scores, and the implications of off grade level testing for blueprint satisfaction of test events. f. Documentation demonstrating adherence to the Guidance regarding off grade level testing condition #2 on p. 14. (Some reviewers felt the Guidance means off grade level items cannot be used for any score purpose while others felt the Guidance means off grade level items can be used in determining scores but not proficiency.) g. Documentation that the operational CAT test event that students are scored on match the blueprints submitted as evidence. A plan for monitoring the process of evaluating match to blueprint for all test events administered. h. Documentation of plan for monitoring item exposure and conducting post hoc analyses to ensure the system has the same characteristics as designed and approved.		
The following evidence is needed from individual member states: 3.1.2 a. All.		

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **7** **25** **130b**	Cognitive labs are compelling and good evidence for this critical element. Documentation states that revisions were made based on the results of the cognitive labs, but does not specify what revisions were done or what changes were made to address issues identified (i.e. use of equation editor).

Section 3.2 Summary Statement

_x__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
3.2

a. Documentation as per 2.2.a

The following evidence is needed from individual member states:
None.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **7** **61** **130b** **130c**	The summary of evidence in Evidence 130b p. 8 is not compelling for meeting this critical element. DIF and biserial correlations calculated and used…good. Evidence 61 does not discriminate between interim and summative items. Please provide confirmation that this applies only to the summative items. Evidence 7 p. 166: Good evidence for unidimensionality but again not specific to summative vs other tests - please specify. Evidence 130c p. 5: Bias estimates are unacceptable for 3rd grade in ELA and some other grades. Also for Math claims 2 and 4. Please provide evidence the claim level classifications that are reported are not negatively impacted by the bias. Please provide model fit information based on operational assessment data instead of just pilot data. Please provide clarification that items removed from the dimensionality analysis were removed from the bank as well and not merely removed from the analysis. The item vector dimensionality study could have bene stronger if it included the possibility of more than two dimensions. Not clear if scaling at the claim level was considered.
Section 3.3 Summary Statement		
_x__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:		

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.3 a. Confirmation that Evidence 61 and Evidence 7 p. 166 apply to the summative items. b. Documentation that claim level classifications are not negatively impacted by large bias estimates in 3rd grade ELA, and for Math Claims 2 and 4. c. Model fit information based on operational assessment data. d. Confirmation that items removed from the dimensionality analysis were retired from further operational use.		
The following evidence is needed from individual member states: 3.3 a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.		

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State's assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **7 p. 443** **137** **139** **156**	In Evidence 7 there is no clear explanation of how SBAC lines up with PISA or NAEP even though they used embedded items. The purpose appeared to be to ground the standard setting but how they actually helped to inform the process isn't clear. It isn't clear how inclusion of these items helped to show that "assessment scores are related as expected with other variables." Evidence 7 p. 443: Not clear how the ACT benchmarks were projected on to the SBAC scale. Please clarify how this occurred and how this was used to provide the validity evidence relevant to this critical element. Evidence 139: The high pass rate for students who are failing the course does support this critical element. Evidence 137: Peers are not sure this is relevant to this critical element. The importance of the results was not presented.

Section 3.4 Summary Statement

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

3.4

a. Clarification of how inclusion of PISA and NAEP items in the standard setting, and how projection of ACT benchmarks onto the SBAC scale, helped to show that "assessment scores are related as expected with other variables."
b. Discussion of the high pass rates on the Smarter Balanced assessments for students failing the course in the Washington: Linking Course Grades to Smarter Balanced Cut Scores report, with respect to meeting this critical element.

The following evidence is needed from individual member states:

3.4

a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.

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.

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.1 – Reliability 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:	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **7 p. 472** **130c pp. 14, 17, 22-34, 36-41**	There needs to be additional information concerning which states were included in the calculations of reliability and categorical classification decisions. The calculations should include data from all states included in that round. Per follow-up communication, CT, MI, and NH were not included in these calculations. Per ED, this critical element implies a requirement for state-specific reliabilities. These state-specific reliabilities should be either in the submissions of the Consortium or the State.
• Test reliability of the State's assessments estimated for its student population;		130c: Total score reliabilities are acceptable. Claim reliabilities are low, but impact is likely marginal. Total score reliabilities are low in Decile 1 for grades 7 and 11 in mathematics (p. 14) and 11th grade LEP and IDEA (p. 17).
• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State's assessments;		130c: CSEMs high for the low end (pp. 36-41), especially in relation to typical ranges for achievement levels (007: p. 472). Frequently the CSEM is about a 1/3rd of a typical range. This could impact achievement level accuracy for students and may limit the utility of the assessments for measuring student growth.
• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results;		130c: Classification accuracy for distinguishing between level 2 and 3 is low for ELA grades 3-5 (pp. 22-34). Since level 3 is proficient, this has an impact on proficiency designations.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student's achievement.		Consistency estimates are not provided or addressed. The submission should include a statement or rationale for claiming that test procedure produces test forms meeting this requirement, especially in light of potential differences in results for different algorithms. There needs to be evidence that all of the data included in computing the reliability-related estimates are based on the same implementation of the same algorithm.

Section 4.1 Summary Statement

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

4.1

a. A statement responding to areas of low reliability and low accuracy
b. (Either SBAC or the relevant state) Test reliability of the assessments estimated for each state separately and each subgroup within state (these estimates will also need to meet adequacy criteria)
c. Estimates of consistency of classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results (these estimates will also need to meet adequacy criteria)

The following evidence is needed from individual member states:

4.1

a. (Either SBAC or the relevant state) Test reliability of the assessments estimated for each state separately and each subgroup within state (these estimates will also need to meet adequacy criteria)
b. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **11a** **30** **126**	The evidence supports attention in design and development to ensure fairness and accessibility. Only simulation or field test data, showing no DIF or low DIF on the assessment. Peers agreed there should be ongoing tracking of DIF items that have been left in the pool. Accommodations are not tested; there are only lit reviews in Evidence 126. See notes on low IEP and LEP reliabilities. Evidence 11a is not prescriptive and does not provide data validating the use of the accommodations for certain students. Would like to see reliability estimates for students using accommodations, based on operational data.

Section 4.2 Summary Statement

_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
4.2

a. Documentation supporting ongoing tracking of DIF items left in the operational pool, to ensure that any negative impact they have on fairness and accessibility remains minimal.
b. Estimated reliability for students using accommodations, based on operational data.

The following evidence is needed from individual member states:
4.2

a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **Index pp. 76-77** **104** **130c pp. 33-35**	It is not clear how Evidence 104 addresses this critical element. Evidence 130c: The reported SEMs are large and CSEMs are especially high for certain deciles and grades. The bin analysis in Evidence #130c pp. 33-35 demonstrates a need for more representation at the low end of the scales. The need is very pronounced for mathematics. Comments on earlier critical elements addressing representation across the scale are relevant here as well. Index pp. 76-78 calls attention to lack of items at the low end, impacting the test's ability to test those students. SBAC should follow through on stated plans to enrich the item bank at the low end.

Section 4.3 Summary Statement

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

4.3

Documentation that Smarter Balanced has enriched the item bank such that the assessments can provide a more precise estimate of student performance for low-achieving students.

The following evidence is needed from individual member states:

4.3

a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.4 – Scoring 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **70**	Evidence 70: The scoring module was not ready, per this document. We would like evidence that the implementation readiness package was made available and the dates on which each module was released, especially the scoring module. We would like additional evidence of standardized scoring procedures and protocols, specifically with respect to the use of the same CAT algorithm across states. (Scoring and item selection for test forms are interdependent for CATs.)

Section 4.4 Summary Statement

_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
4.4
Evidence of established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols, specifically:

a. Documentation that the implementation readiness package was made available and the dates on which each module was released, especially the scoring module. A plan to ensure timely future delivery of materials and modules necessary for third party administration vendors.
b. Documentation of reliable and accurate scoring for alternate test forms (i.e. paper and pencil, paper braille).

The following evidence is needed from individual member states:
4.4

a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet	Simulation studies provided evidence regarding adherence to blueprint (and those simulations did not always produce conforming forms). Need evidence that operational forms always produce conforming forms for all students.

Section 4.5 Summary Statement

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

4.5

a. Documentation that the assessment system always produces blueprint conforming forms for all students who took an operational form or test event, regardless of format or accommodation.

The following evidence is needed from individual member states:

4.5

a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State: • 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **42** **49a 49b** **50** **51** **70** **130d** **143** **145** **169**	This critical element is largely redundant with the prior one, because of CAT. However, it is relevant to the paper-pencil version, Spanish version, ASL, and Braille versions. Noted systematic reviews for Spanish translations. Expected evidence of analogous reviews for ASL and Braille. We found no empirical evidence of this. For example, there was no analysis comparing descriptive statistics on students taking different versions, and discussion of results to address comparability. Some comparisons, for example adaptive Braille versus paper Braille versus CAT, are especially relevant. (We would expect to see this for operational data, now that it is available.) Has SBAC attended to comparability across devices empirically? Can it? (Is device information collected for test events?)

Section 4.6 Summary Statement

_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
4.6

a. Documentation that the Consortium followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments (i.e. evidence of systemic checking the ASL and Braille versions of items.)
b. Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results (i.e. evidence of comparability between standard Smarter Balanced assessments, ASL, Braille, Spanish, and other versions of the assessment using operational data).
c. Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results (i.e. evidence of comparability across the different devices allowed for standard Smarter Balanced assessments.)

The following evidence is needed from individual member states:
4.6

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.		

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance 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).	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **Index** **155**	Useful to have advisory groups for different student populations. Evidence 155: Many of the proposed analyses seem standard for a tech report. Index (pp. 97-98): Outline of the review cycle. Unclear to the Peers whether a complete 2014-2015 Technical Report exists. We would like a complete technical report for 2014-2015 or an explanation for why it is still in process. For States using SBAC: 4.7 is covered by the SBAC submission.

Section 4.7 Summary Statement

_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
4.7

a. To support that the Consortium has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, a complete technical report for the operational administration of the Smarter Balanced assessments in 2014-15.

The following evidence is needed from individual member states:
None.

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.

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
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 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:	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS **11a 11b** **97** **98** **128**	
• 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;		11a: SBAC should provide guidance when use of the SBAC test is not appropriate. This is not provided. (States also need to provide their specific guidance on this critical element for alternate assessment.)
• 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;		This critical element should be provided in the state-specific submission.
• 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;		126: This is met with respect to accommodations. See first bullet above.
• Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for		97 and 98: Evidence of this is provided. (States need to provide evidence that they have given appropriate guidance to their IEP teams.)

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
students with disabilities; • Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities; • Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic 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.		128: Evidence of this is provided. (States need to provide evidence that they have given appropriate guidance to their IEP teams.) This is provided. Evidence of these last three critical elements should come from the state-specific or alternative assessment submissions.

Section 5.1 Summary Statement

_X_ No additional evidence is required of SBAC

The following evidence is needed from individual member states:

5.1.1

a. States need to provide specific guidance associated with their AA-AAS.

5.1.2

a. All.

5.1.3

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
a. States need to provide specific guidance associated with their AA-AAS. 5.1.4 a. States need to provide evidence of specific guidance provided to IEP teams. 5.1.5 a. Documentation that the state adheres to the SBAC Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines, or state-specific evidence to address this part of the critical element. 5.1.6 a. All. 5.1.7 a. All. 5.1.8 a. All.		

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs 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: • 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS 11a 11b 97 98 126 128	Evidence 97: Guidance unclear and not helpful. Steps 3 and 4 do not help schools determine whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodations, and if so, which accommodations are appropriate. Evidence 128: Provided as evidence, but does not pertain to ELs Evidence 126: Provides a framework, but needs operationalization to meet this critical element

Section 5.2 Summary Statement

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

5.2

a. Documentation regarding how schools determine whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodations, and if so, which accommodations are appropriate.

The following evidence is needed from individual member states:

5.2

a. Documentation that the state adheres to the SBAC Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines, or state-specific evidence to address this part of the critical element.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.3 – Accommodations The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS; **11a 11b** **65a** **97** **98** **100a 100b** **126** **129**	
• 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;		If a state excludes some accommodation tools, then the State needs to provide a rationale that it is still meeting this critical element.
• 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;		Points (i) and (ii) are not shown. Claim (iii) is not made or stated. There is no comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations. (And a discussion relevant to comparability in light of findings.) Suggestion: Meeting with the appropriate advisory group with information relevant to this critical element and soliciting their advice re need for follow-up investigation.
• Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.		65a: Consortium has a process, p. 15, which depends on the State having a process. The State needs to provide their process for requesting and reviewing.

Section 5.3 Summary Statement

_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
5.3.3

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
a. Documentation that the Consortium 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. b. Documentation that the Consortium has determined that the accommodations it provides 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 (e.g., a comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations, and a discussion relevant to comparability in light of findings).		
The following evidence is needed from individual member states: 5.3.1 a. If the State does not adhere to the SBAC Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines, state-specific evidence to address this critical element. If a state excludes some accommodation tools, then the State needs to provide a rationale that it is still meeting this critical element. 5.3.2 a. If the State does not adhere to the SBAC Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines, state-specific evidence to address this critical element. If a state excludes some accommodation tools, then the State needs to provide a rationale that it is still meeting this critical element. 5.3.4 All.		

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations 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: • 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS; **96** **97** **98** **99** **126**	Monitoring compliance with accommodation policies and procedures: State responsibility Monitoring appropriateness of accommodation (that they are continuing to function as intended): Consortium responsibility

Section 5.4 Summary Statement

_X_ No additional evidence is required of SBAC

The following evidence is needed from individual member states:
5.4

a. Documentation of all aspects of this critical element as it relates to monitoring compliance with accommodation policies and procedures

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.

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
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically: • 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **49** **86** **95**	States are responsible for first two critical elements. Evidence 86: This critical element is met for SBAC.

Section 6.1 Summary Statement

_X_ No additional evidence is required of SBAC

The following evidence is needed from individual member states:

6.1.1

a. All.

6.1.2

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet	Evidence of a technically sound procedure has been provided. Please provide information re what the Consortium was targeting w/r/t panelist ethnicity distribution.
Section 6.2 Summary Statement		
_x__ No additional evidence is required of SBAC The following evidence is needed from individual member states: 6.2. a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.		

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards (1) 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. (2) 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **86** **106** **107**	The Consortium provided the evidence that could reasonably be expected of them at this early stage in the program. This critical element should be addressed more fully as the program develops – for example, through additional validity studies. This critical element is not relevant at the SBAC Consortium level. However, this needs to be addressed by states in their state-specific submission or through the submission of the alternate assessment consortium.

Section 6.3 Summary Statement

_X_ No additional evidence is required of SBAC

The following evidence is needed from individual member states:
6.3.

a. If a state is not using the Smarter Balanced Proprietary adaptive algorithm, state-specific evidence is needed to support this critical element using the process the state has chosen.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.4 – Reporting 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:	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet	
• 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;		Responsibility for meeting this critical element lies principally with the State.
• 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;		There is evidence that SBAC had a plan to develop a tool (with Amplify) for reporting. States need to produce evidence to meet this critical element.
• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: o Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student's achievement; o Report the student's achievement in terms of the State's grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors); o Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; o Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language		The SBAC reporting system appears to meet sub-bullets 1 and 2. However, the states not using the SBAC reporting tools need to provide evidence to meet sub-bullets 1 and 2. All states need to provide evidence showing that sub-bullets 3 and 4 are being met. In regards to sub-bullet 4, the SBAC system provides Spanish and Vietnamese reports upon request. All states need to provide evidence of report delivery.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
that parents can understand; • 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.		States must provide evidence for this critical element.

Section 6.4 Summary Statement

_X_ No additional evidence is required of SBAC

The following evidence is needed from individual member states:

6.4.1
- a. All.

6.4.2
- b. All.

6.4.3
- a. All documentation under this bullet and sub-bullets as it pertains to delivery of reports.

6.4.3.1
- a. All, if the state is not using the Smarter Balanced-hosted reporting system and the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium reporting system user guide.

6.4.3.2
- a. All, if the state is not using the Smarter Balanced-hosted reporting system and the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium reporting system user guide.

6.4.3.3
- a. All.

6.4.3.4
- a. All.

6.4.4
- a. All.

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

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

June 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes DLM Integrated Consortium Evidence

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

Contents

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

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

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

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

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

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

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.1 – Test Design and Development The State's test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State's academic content standards, and includes: • 1. Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet 7) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a) Chapter I: Introduction i) Introduction (p. 1) ii) Theory of Action (pp. 5-7) iii) Claims and Conceptual Areas (pp. 14-17) b) Chapter VII: Assessment Results i) Interpretation Resources (pp. 196-197) c) Chapter IX: Validity Studies i) Evidence Based on Consequences of Testing (pp. 243-252) d) Chapter III: Item and Test Development i) Development of the Essential Elements (pp. 38-41)	Peers noted that DLM is a new and innovative assessment that incorporates a DCM model that is not yet frequently used in large-scale assessments. As such we commend the consortium for the work they have begun on this assessment and hope to offer suggestions that will be helpful in the assessment's continued development and operation. Descriptions in the Technical Manual are very clearly stated for the purpose and intended uses for the target population. Connection to the Essential Elements was very clearly stated. The use studies indicate there is some confusion on the part of students with regards to the use of the score reports.
• 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;	8) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a) Chapter I: Introduction i) Claims and Conceptual Areas (pp. 14-17) ii) Essential Elements (pp. 17-20) iii) Dynamic Learning Maps Alternate Assessment System – Figure 5 (p. 12) iv) Dynamic Learning Maps Alternate Assessment System – Figure 6 (p. 13) v) Background (pp. 1-3) b) Chapter II: Map Development i) Critical Sources (p. 28) c) Chapter III: Item and Test Development	Tech manual included a good example of Grade 7 blueprint. Page 45 of the Technical Manual indicates that certain Essential Elements are excluded from the assessment in math because they are unable to be represented on the computer. This could be

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	i) Mathematics Testlets (p. 56) ii) Development of the Essential Elements (pp. 38-41) iii) Review of the Assessment Structure (pp. 37-38) iv) Test Blueprints (pp. 41-45) v) English Language Arts Reading Testlets (pp. 48-51) vi) Guiding Principles (p. 42-43) English Language Arts Writing Testlets (pp. 52-54) 9) FILE 08 Essential Elements ELA 10) FILE 09 Essential Elements Math 11) FILE 10 Blueprint ELA 12) FILE 11 Blueprint Math	problematic. Peers suggested that these EEs could be assessed by teacher administration rather than computer administration. Peers are not clear on the rationales for omitting certain EEs from the assessment and potential impact of these omissions on measuring the full range of content standards.
• 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);	13) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a) Chapter I: Introduction i) Theory of Action (pp. 5-8) b) Chapter III: Item and Test Development i) Items and Testlets (p. 46) ii) Review of Assessment Structure (pp. 37-38) iii) Essential Element Concept Maps for Testlet Development (pp. 61-65) c) Chapter IV: Test Administration i) Overview of Accessibility Supports (p. 131) 14) FILE 05 Test Administration Manual 2014-15	Peers noted that DLM node-based structure provides a visual display of the pathways that lead to higher order thinking skills. The DLM structure demonstrates how students are assessed on the component skills that build to the higher order thinking skills to which the assessment is aligned.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.	How the Assessment Systems Works (pp. 16-20) **Item Pool and Selection Procedures** 15) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 Chapter III: Item and Test Development a) Operational Assessment Items for 2014-2015 (pp. 103-108) b) Alternate Testlets for Students who are Blind or have Visual Impairments (pp. 60-61) c) The First Contact Survey (pp. 84-86) 16) Chapter IV: Test Administration a) Testlet Selection During Instructionally Embedded Assessment (pp. 115-118) 17) Testlet Assignment During the Spring Window (pp. 118-120)	The documentation describes testlet selection, rather than item selection. The bank has a total of 2,220 testlets across grades and content areas and Peers noted that this number of testlets may not be sufficient to support all of the grades and linkage levels of assessment without overexposure of testlets. Peers noted that the DCM model appears to support the test design and the testlet development from a theoretical perspective. A potential concern is whether the selection of the testlets and number of testlets administered is appropriate in practice, because of the dependence of the system on teacher input and their understanding of the overall assessment system. Teachers must be well trained and well-prepared for this task. Teachers could benefit from a feedback system that would help them develop the skills needed to operationalize this assessment. Peers expressed some concerns regarding assumptions regarding item fungibility and model fit. See sections 3.3 and 4.1 for a discussion of the evidence required to address this issue.

Section 2.1 Summary Statement

X___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: See comments above regarding item fungibility and item fit, further described in section 3.3 and 4.1.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.2 – Item Development 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet 1) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter I: Introduction i. Assessments (p. 20-21) b) Chapter III: Item and Test Development i. Items and Testlets (p. 46) ii. General Testlet Structure and Item Types (pp. 47-48) iii. Review of Assessment Structure (pp. 37-38) iv. Item Writing Process (pp. 70-71) v. Item Writing Resource Materials (p. 70) vi. Item Writer Characteristics (pp. 66-69) vii. Item Writer Training (pp. 69-70) viii. Essential Element Concept Maps for Testlet Development (pp. 61-65) ix. Alternate Testlets for Students who are Blind or Have Visual Impairments (pp. 60-61) x. Student Performance Within and Across Complexity Bands (pp. 87-89) xi. Overview of the Testlet Development Process (pp. 46-47) xii. Overview of the Review Process (pp. 76-77) xiii. Review Assignments and Training (pp. 77-78) xiv. Results of Reviews (p. 82) xv. Educator Survey (pp. 90-94) c) Chapter IV: Test Administration	Peers thought the item development process was clearly described and documented.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	i. Overview of Accessibility Supports (pp. 131-132) Chapter IX: Validity Studies i. Student Cognitive Labs (pp. 224) ii. External Alignment Study (pp. 215-221) 2) FILE 18 Supplemental Evidence Related to Test Development a) Planning a Testlet (pp. 9-10) Accessibility (pp. 11-15) 3) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter III: Item and Test Development i. Decisions and Criteria (p. 78-82) ii. Description of Field Tests (pp. 95-98) iii. Overview of the Testlet Development Process (pp. 46-47) iv. External Reviews (pp. 75-76) v. Field Testing (pp. 94-95) vi. Item Flagging Criteria (p. 99) vii. Operational Assessment Items for 2014- 15 (pp. 103-107) Item Data Review Decisions (pp. 78-82)	
Section 2.2 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.3 – Test Administration The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State: • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet 1) FILE 05 Test Administration Manual 2014-15 a) Checklist (pp. 9-12) b) Educator Portal User Guide for Test Administrators: Manage Student Data (pp. 90-117) c) Educator Portal User Guide for Test Administrators (pp. 78-150) d) KITE User Guide (pp. 150-158) e) Introduction to DLM Testlets: Computer-Delivered Testlets (pp. 23-39) f) Introduction to DLM Testlets: Teacher-Delivered Testlets (pp. 39-51) g) Other Allowable Practices (pp. 50-51) 2) FILE 02 Assessment Coordinator Manual 2014-15 a) Checklist (pp. 7-13) 3) FILE 03 Data Steward Manual 2014-15 a) Checklist (p. 8) 4) FILE 04 Technical Liaison Manual 2014-15 Checklist (pp. 6-7) **Communication** 5) FILE 17 Supplemental Evidence Related to Test Administration a) Sample state landing page from DLM website Test updates – Website and Email Example	Guidelines and procedures were clearly described and documented. These materials also included supplementary supports that students with additional disabilities (e.g., vision, hearing) would need to participate in the assessment. Peers noted that the extensive training modules and quizzes are available to support teachers in their acquisition of knowledge and skills to administer the assessment. Certification through successful completion of the training quizzes ensures a degree of standardization to administration. Peers noted that it will be important for states to have procedures that ensure that the administration protocols are properly implemented by teachers. Peers would have found it helpful to have access to the test administration training videos that were provided to teachers. This would have given peers additional insight into the operation and administration of the test. Peers would have found it helpful to see more example items to get a more detailed picture of the test. In addition, peers wonder if teachers have access to sufficient examples of test items (released items) to become appropriately familiar with the nature and focus of the assessment. The released testlets and testlet statistics would be helpful to teachers. The mention of released testlets is mentioned in the training modules, but there is no mention of the number of released testlets planned or how frequently they are intended for release. Peers suggested that DLM create a plan and timeline for testlet and associated testlet statistic release.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• 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;	**Administration with Accommodations** 6) FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-15 a) Six Steps to Customize DLM Accessibility Features for Students: Step 3- Discuss and Select Appropriate Accessibility Features and Supports (pp. 19-22) b) Six Steps to Customize DLM Accessibility Features for Students: Step 2- Learn about the Accessibility Features and Supports (pp. 15-18) 7) FILE 05 Test Administration Manual 2014-15 a) Accessibility Supports (pp. 33-36) Other Allowable Practices (pp. 37-38) **Training** 8) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter X: Training and Professional Development i) Training Content (pp. 257-260) ii) Facilitated Training and Self-Directed Training (pp. 256-257) iii) Completion of all modules (p. 260) iv) Training for Local Education Agency Staff (pp. 254-255) b) Chapter IV: Test Administration i) Formative Monitoring Techniques (p. 130) 9) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 - Appendices a) Appendix G.1 – Required Test Administration Training b) Appendix C.14 – Monitor Assessments Webinar	

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• 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.	10) FILE 16 Facilitator Guide for Required Test Administration Training 2014-15 a) Procedures for Delivering Facilitated Required Training, (p. 5) 11) FILE 02 Assessment Coordinator Manual 2014-15 a) Checklist (pp. 7-13) 12) FILE 03 Data Steward Manual 2014-15 a) Checklist (p. 8) 13) FILE 04 Technical Liaison Manual 2014-15 Checklist (pp. 6-7) **Technology Requirements** 14) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter IV: Test Administration i) The KITE System (pp. 112-114) b) Chapter X: Training and Professional Development i) Training Content (pp. 257-260) 15) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 - Appendices a) Appendix G.1–Required Test Administration Training 16) FILE 04 Technical Liaison Manual 2014-15 a) Educator Portal & KITE (pp. 9-12) b) Whitelist to Access Content (p. 8) 17) FILE 05 Test Administration Manual 2014-15 a) KITE User Guide: KITE Testing Devices	DLM provided extensive evidence for establishing and documenting procedures for training and administration of the assessment.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	(pp. 150) b) Before Beginning Assessments: Practice Activities and Released Testlets (pp.63-65) 18) FILE 02 Assessment Coordinator Manual 2014-15 KITE Testing Devices (p. 54) **Contingency plans for technology-based assessment administration** 19) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter IV: Test Administration i) KITE Client (Test Delivery Engine) (pp. 113-114) ii) Monitoring Assessment Administration (pp. 128-130) iii) Security in the KITE System (pp. 140-141) b) Chapter VII: Assessment Results i) Data Files (pp. 198-200) 20) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 - Appendices a) Appendix C.7-Incident Summaries 21) FILE 04 Technical Liaison Manual 2014-15 a) Checklist (pp. 6-7) b) Local Caching Server (p. 12) FILE 17 Supplemental Evidence Related to Test Administration	DLM has clearly documented the technology requirements of the assessment. The existence of contingency plans was also well-documented.
Section 2.3 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.

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
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration 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.	_____ policies and procedures apply to all grade-level and AA-AAAS in all subjects 1) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter IV: Test Administration i) Monitoring Assessment Administration (pp. 128-130) ii) Consortium Test Administration Observation Protocol (pp. 128-130) iii) Formative Monitoring Techniques (p. 130) iv) Monitoring Testlet Delivery (pp. 130-131) b) Chapter IX: Validity Studies i) Evaluation of Test Administration (pp. 230-236) 2) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 - Appendices a) Appendix C.12: DLM Test Administration Observation Research Protocol b) Appendix C.13: Guide to Test Administration Observations: Guidance for Local Observers: Guide for Local Observers c) Appendix C.14: Monitoring webinar for local staff **THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC MONITORING PROCEDURES IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.**	

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.

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
	Test administration monitoring 3) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter IX: Validity Studies i) Observations of Test Administration (pp. 230-234) b) Chapter IV: Test Administration i) Administration Errors (pp. 148-149) c) Chapter VII: Assessment Results i) Data Files (pp. 198-200) **THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE-SPECIFIC MONITORING RESULTS IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.**	
Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
n/a State Specific		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.5 – Test Security 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: • 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS **Evidence of Prevention of Irregularities** 1) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter III: Item and Test Development i) Overview of the Testlet Development Process (pp. 46-47) ii) Item Writer Training (pp. 69-70) iii) Item Writing Process (pp. 70-71) iv) Overview of Review Process (pp. 76-77) v) Reviewer Responsibilities (p. 78) b) Chapter IV: Test Administration i) Training and Certification (pp. 138-139) ii) Secure Test Content (p. 141) iii) Maintaining Security During Test Administration (pp. 139-140) iv) State Specific Policies and Practices (pp. 141-142) c) Chapter X: Training and Professional Development i) Test Security in the Dynamic Learning Maps Alternate Assessment (p. 258) 2) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 - Appendices Appendix B.3: Item Writer Security and Confidentiality Statement b) Appendix C.3 Sample State Summary Sheet 3) FILE 05 Test Administration Manual 2014-15	DLM provided manuals, webinars, and other resources to support test security issues and handling of irregularities. Plans for detection of irregularities are well documented, but monitoring by states will be critical in ensuring the maintenance of test security over time. The item/testlet pool is not very deep and also considering the heavy involvement of teachers magnifies the potential risk of item/testlet overexposure over time. Because teachers select the essential elements, there is a risk that teachers will select the same essential element repeatedly over time for which there may be a limited number of testlets available. It is unclear to what degree will this be monitored over time?

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.

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

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Communication Plan REMEDIATION **THIS PORTION OF THE CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.**	
Section 2.5 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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy 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: • 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;	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS **Security and Integrity of Test Materials** 1) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a) Chapter IV: Test Administration i) Security in the KITE System (pp. 140-141) ii) Data Security (p. 141) **THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE- SPECIFIC SYSTEMS IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.** **Security of Student Data** 2) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a) Chapter IV: Test Administration i) Security of the KITE System (pp. 140-141) ii) State-Specific Policies and Practices (pp. 141-142) Data Security (p. 141) 3) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 - Appendices a) Appendix C.4: PII Data Use Agreement b) Appendix C.5: DLM Consortium Procedures for Data Security Breaches c) Appendix C.6 State Breach Response Communication Plan **THE REVIEWER MAY FIND ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF STATE- SPECIFIC SYSTEMS IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.**	Documentation was provided to support integrity and privacy of data. Peers noted that data security is dependent on the proper operation of the KITE system.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• 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.	**PII Protection in Reporting** 4) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a) Chapter IV: Test Administration i) Data Security (p. 141) b) Chapter VII: Assessment Results i) Subgroup Performance (pp. 192-194) ii) Aggregated Reports (p. 196) **PLEASE SEE INDIVIDUAL STATE RESPONSES FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING STATE- SPECIFIC MEASURES TO PREVENT DISCLOSURE OF PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION IN AGGREGATED REPORTS.**	Guidelines were provided for the protection of personally identifiable data. Peers suggested that DLM describe their data store to ensure that any data for analysis by state users has appropriate protection for any PII that is contained within the system.
Section 2.6 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.

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content 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:	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **Validity Framework and Overall Evaluation** 1) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 2015 a. Chapter I: Introduction i. Theory of action (pp. 5-8) b. Chapter XI: Conclusion and Discussion i. Evaluation Summary (Tables 114 and 115, pp. 285-286) ii. Summary and Evaluation of Validity Evidence (pp. 270-287) iii. Evaluation Summary (Table 116, p. 287) iv. Future Research (pp. 290-291) v. Operational Assessment (pp. 288-289) Propositions for Score Interpretation and Use (p. 270)	
• 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	**Measurement of Academic Content Standards** 2) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 2015 a. Chapter I: Introduction i. Theory of Action (pp. 5-8) ii. System Components (pp. 10-21) iii. Claims and Conceptual Areas (pp. 14-17) iv. Essential Elements (pp. 17-19) b. Chapter II: Map Development	Initial evidence provided by DLM demonstrates acceptable alignment of the essential elements to the CCSS, as per the summary on page 5 of the external alignment study (File 15). . States should be aware that to the degree that state standards differ from CCSS, additional alignment studies may be needed at the state level. In addition, states need to be aware that some essential elements appear to have lower alignment than others (e.g., table 1, File 15, page 5), since this may have

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
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.	i. Learning Targets: CCSS and Essential Elements (pp. 26-27) c. Chapter III: Item and Test Development i. Development of Essential Elements (pp. 38-41) ii. Test Blueprints (pp. 41-46) iii. Essential Element Concept Maps for Testlet Development (pp. 61-65) iv. Overview of the Test Development Process (pp. 46-47) Item Writer Training (pp. 69-70) vi. External Reviews (pp. 75-83) d. Chapter IV: Test Administration Testlet Selection During Instructionally Embedded Assessment (pp. 115-118) **Evaluative Evidence** 3) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 2015 a. Chapter III: Item and Test Development i. Overview of the Review Process (pp. 76-77) ii. Decisions and Criteria (pp. 78-82) iii. Results of Review (p. 82) b. Chapter IX: Validity Studies i. Evaluation of blueprint coverage (pp. 221-223) c. Chapter XI: Conclusion Operational Assessment (p. 289) 18) Chapter IV: Test Administration a) Testlet Assignment During Spring Window (pp. 118-120)	alignment implications for an individual member state. DLM presented simulated data that was based on assumptions regarding item fungibility within linkage levels. The underlying scoring and patterns of mastery in student reports are based on these assumptions. However, evidence of model fit and item fit to these assumptions is needed to assess the impact on comparability of scores, adaptive routing decisions within and across essential elements, and estimates of classification consistency and accuracy. Peers could not locate evidence that supports the interchangeability of testlets. In the updated reliability statistics section of the February 2016 TAC notes (File23), the issues regarding the model and scoring assumptions were discussed. Peers also would like clarification regarding the adaptive routing pathways within and/or across EEs.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	4) FILE 12 External Review Report 2013-2014 5) FILE 13 External Review Report 2014-2015 6) FILE 15 External Alignment Study a. Overview of DLM Assessment System (pp. 8-9) b. Number of Essential Elements, Target Level Nodes, Linkage Levels, and Items Sampled in Study (Table 5, p. 16) c. Alignment Methodology - Panelists, Training, Reliability of Codes, and Quality Control Check (pp. 15-16) d. Appendix B: Panelist Evaluation Results e. Executive Summary (pp. 4-8) 7) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014- 2015 - Appendices Appendix H.1 – DLM Response to External Alignment Study	
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
_____X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: See comments above regarding evidence needed relative to model assumptions and fit.		

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet 1) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 2015 a. Chapter III: Item and Test Development i. Essential Element Concept Maps for Testlet Development (pp. 61-65) ii. Item Writer Training (pp. 69-70) iii. Overview of the Testlet Development Process (pp. 46-47) iv. Item Writing Process (pp. 70-71) v. Overview of Review Process (pp. 76-77) b. Chapter IX: Validity Studies i. Teacher Feedback (Table 101, p. 235) c. Chapter XI: Conclusion i. Accessibility (pp. 276-277) 2) FILE 18 Supplemental Evidence Related to Test Development a. Item Writing Handbook i. Planning a Testlet (pp. 9-19) Appendix A (p. 29) **Interaction with Testlet Content** 3) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 2015 a. Chapter IX: Validity Studies i. Student Cognitive Labs (pp. 221-228) Teacher Cognitive Labs (pp. 229-230) **Fidelity of Administration** 2) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 2015 a) Chapter X: Training and Professional	DLM provided adequate documentation that the assessment taps the appropriate cognitive processes (e.g., Technical manual pg 221-230).

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Development i. Completion of All Modules (p. 260) ii. Training Content (pp. 257-260) b) Chapter IV: Test Administration Educator Experience (Table 55, p. 151) ii. Resources and Materials (pp. 123-124) iii. Chapter IV: Test Administration ï Consortium Test Administration Observation Protocol (pp. 128-130) iv. Chapter IX: Validity Studies ï Observations of Test Administration (pp. 230-234) 3) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014- 2015 - Appendices Appendix C.12: Test Administration Observation Research Protocol **Accessibility** 6) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 2015 a. Chapter IV: Test Administration i. Accessibility (pp. 131-138) User Experience- Accessibility (pp. 155-158) • Test Administration Resources (Table 46, p. 124) • Practice Activities and Released Testlets (p. 126) • User Experience - Accessibility (Table 62, p. 158) 4) Chapter IX: Validity Studies a) Test Administrator Feedback Studies (Table 101, p. 235) 5) Chapter XI: Conclusion	

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	a) Accessibility (pp. 276- 277) 6) Chapter X: Training and Professional Development Module 3: Accessibility for All Students (pp. 258-259)	
Section 3.2 Summary Statement		
_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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **Scoring and reporting structures' consistency with sub-domain structures** 1) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 2015 a. Chapter I: Introduction i. Claims and Conceptual Areas (pp. 14-17) b. Chapter III: Item and Test Development i. Blueprint Development Process (pp. 43-46) ii. Essential Element Concept Maps for Test Development (pp. 61-65) iii. Student Performance Within and Across Complexity Bands (Table 24, p 88) c. Chapter V: Modeling i. Additional DLM Categorizations: Essential Elements and Linkage Levels (pp. 166-168) d. Chapter VII: Assessment Results i. Individual Reports (pp. 195-196) ii. Data Files (pp. 198-199) iii. Aggregated Reports (p. 196) e. Chapter II: Map Development i. Development Process (pp. 25-30) ii. Educator and Expert Review (p. 35) iii. Nodes Reflect the Products of Learning and Cognitive Growth (pp. 28-29) 6) Chapter IX: Validity Studies a) Vertical Articulation of Linkage Levels for each Essential Element	Internal structure is classically related to how well items are working together to measure the construct. Peers could not locate item-level data such as factor loadings or item-total correlations, or comparable node-level data. Even when overall reliability indices are satisfactory, it is still conceivable that certain items and/or nodes are not contributing to the reliability of the mastery classifications. The practical consequence of this is that students may take test items that do not contribute significant information on how they are performing relative to the underlying construct. This issue was raised by the TAC in the minutes from the January 2016 meeting. Peers understand that DLM uses an innovative model and suggested that DLM may wish to evaluate whether or how the DCM model can accommodate differences in item difficulty. Peers recommend that operational data be used to provide percentage correct item level data as in Table 24, pg. 88 of File06, for all grades and content areas. Peers also question why more analyses of operational data from the 2014-2015 operational assessment were not included in the submission. As additional operational data becomes available, DLM should do additional analyses to support validity based on internal structure of the assessment. The reliability simulations do not consider the issue of variation of difficulty of items and testlets within linkage levels. Reliability estimates based on assumptions of equal item difficulty represent upper limits. Follow-up analyses need to be conducted when more data become available so that simulation studies can be conducted based on item and testlet

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	(pp. 218-219) 7) Chapter XI: Conclusion a) Propositions for Score Interpretation and Use (p. 270) 2) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014- 2015-Appendices a. Appendix E.1: Individual Student Score Report Sample b. Appendix E.2: Aggregated Reports Sample 3) FILE 15 External Alignment Study Focus #3: Vertical Articulation of Linkage Levels (pp. 23-24) **Consistency of Measurement** 4) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a. Chapter VIII: Reliability Evidence Content-Area (Performance-Level) Reliability Evidence (pp. 208-209) ii. Essential-Element Reliability Evidence (pp. 210-211) Linkage-Level Reliability Evidence (pp. 212-214) **Differential Item Functioning (DIF)** 5) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a. Chapter IX: Validity Studies i. Evaluation of Item Level Bias (pp. 236-242) b. Chapter XI: Conclusion and Discussion Future Research (p. 290)	parameters. Peers noted that the student score reports contain a great deal of detailed information. The concern was raised that the current system may not have the level of reliability evidence to support this level of detail with confidence considering the intended inferences. DLM may wish to consider the comments above regarding model fit and item level data as they evaluate how to address the reporting issue. An estimate of classification consistency (and accuracy) is needed for each level within each EE, conditional on true mastery being at that level. Estimates based on the overall distribution of mastery in the simulated population will be high for extreme high or low linkage levels mainly because most simulated examinees are not close to these levels.

Section 3.3 Summary Statement

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: See comments above in the right-hand column.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State's assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **Score Relationship to Other Variables** 1) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-2015 a. Chapter III: Item and Test Development i. Student Performance Within and Across Complexity Bands (Table 24, p. 88) b. Chapter IX: Validity Studies Evidence based on Relationships to other Variables (Table 108, p. 243)	The DLM assessment is new and as a result there is limited evidence of validity based on relationships with other variables. State members of the DLM consortium may need to provide additional evidence to address this critical element.
Section 3.4 Summary Statement		
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence presented for this critical element was limited due to the newness of the assessment. DLM should present additional evidence with future submissions when that is available. DLM Consortium member states may also wish to provide evidence to address this critical element.		

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.

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.1 – Reliability 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: • Test reliability of the State's assessments estimated for its student population;	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet 1) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a) Chapter V: Modeling i) Linkage Level Model with Fungible Item Parameters (pp. 169-170) b) Chapter VII: Assessment Results i) Score Reports (pp. 195-198) c) Chapter VIII: Reliability i) Content-Area (Performance-Level) Reliability Evidence (pp. 208-209) ii) Essential Element Reliability Evidence (pp. 210-211) Linkage Level Reliability Evidence (pp. 212-214)	As previously noted, the reliability simulations do not consider the issue of variation of difficulty across testlets. DLM will also need to consider whether assumptions made about item fungibility are valid. Follow-up empirical analyses need to be conducted with additional operational results. The reliability evidence presented by DLM is not clearly related to the decisions that are going to be made about students based on the student reports. Peers need to know the consistency with which students are classified at or above a given linkage level. This aligns with reporting the highest level mastered on the student reports. DLM should provide supplementary analyses that address the consistency and accuracy of the highest level of mastery of the linkage levels within the essential elements. Peers were concerned about the possibility of underreporting the data and analyses necessary to demonstrate content area and EE reliability. Peers recommend that student reports include more reliability data to help parents and teachers better interpret the assessment results. Peers noted that the reliability evidence from the simulation studies provided an initial estimate of reliabilities, but additional analyses based on operational are desirable as evidence of reliability of the assessment. Peers also noted that the simulations do not appear to have considered the impact of variation in item difficulty has on reliability. Peers suggested that DLM consider reporting the distribution of student performance on

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• 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.	**Overall and Conditional Standard Error of Measurement** e. FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 i. Chapter VIII: Reliability ï Background Information on Reliability Methods (pp. 201-214) ii. Chapter XI: Conclusion Future Research (pp. 290-291) **Achievement Levels** 4) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a. Chapter VIII: Reliability Content-Area (Performance-Level) Reliability Evidence (pp. 208-209) **Computer-Adaptive Tests** 8) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 9) a. Chapter VIII: Reliability Linkage Level Reliability Evidence (pp. 212-214)	which the simulation is based. DLM has provided promising reliability statistics, but these may be insufficient for demonstrating that the assessment provides reliable results for the range of uses of the assessment. See also the Peers' comment about reliability and model fit in section 3.1. Because DLM is based on a DCM model, the evidence did not include traditional measures of SEM. Peers recommended, however, that DLM provide additional information on the achievement level classification accuracy as aggregated across all simulated students. DLM states on page 212 of File06 that Kappa values above .6 indicate substantial agreement between simulated and estimated linkage-level mastery status. However, page 213 of File06, table 82, indicates that nearly one-third of the linkage levels have a Kappa statistic less than the target value of .6. DLM should provide classification accuracy information based on one linkage level for each student. More evidence is required to meet this critical element. The evidence provided does not appear to relate to the linkage levels. Reliability estimates in the DLM system are dependent on teacher input and potential override of system recommendations. While the system appears to be well-designed, the evidence that this has been carried out reliably needs further support. Peers commend DLM's use of simulations in this area. More specifics and details need to be reported 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.

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **Accessibility** 1) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a) Chapter III: Item and Test Development i. Essential Element Concept Maps for Testlet Development (pp. 61-65) ii. Items and Testlets (pp. 46-61) iii. Introduction (pp. 37) iv. Item Writing Process (pp. 70-71) v. The First Contact Survey (pp. 84-85) vi. Item Writing Resource Materials (p. 70) vii. Essential Element Concept Maps for Testlet Development (pp. 61-65) viii. Review Criteria (pp. 79-82) b) Chapter IV: Test Administration i. Overview of Accessibility Supports (pp. 131-136) ii. Testlet Assignment During the Spring Window (pp. 118-120) c) Chapter IX: Validity Studies i. Student Cognitive Labs (pp. 224-228) Observations of Test Administration (pp. 230-234) a) FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-15 i) Step 2 – Learn about the	Peers noted that evidence of item level fairness and accessibility review appeared to be complete, including DIF analyses. In addition, DLM used two different cognitive labs to address fairness and accessibility (one study was student-focused and the other teacher-focused). The assessment design reflected consideration of accessibility and fairness issues. Teachers are given latitude and flexibility to address accessibility issues, and are required to pass a certification quiz to ensure consistency and fairness in administration. Students are given opportunity to practice prior to the administration of the assessment. Peers noted and agreed that the type of disability could not be considered as part of the eligibility criteria for the assessment. Page 258 of the technical manual discussed the Personal Needs and Preference Profile, which is an important aspect of how the fairness is addressed in the assessment implementation.

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.

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **Adequately Precise Estimate Across the Continuum** v. FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 ï Chapter III: Items and Test Development ï The First Contact Survey (pp. 84-85) ï Chapter IV: Test Administration ï Linkage Level Selection and Adaptive Delivery (pp. 114-120) ï Chapter V: Modeling ï Linkage Level Model with Fungible Item Parameters (pp. 169-170) ï DLM Scoring: Mastery Status Assignment (p. 170) ï Chapter VII: Assessment Results ï Student Performance (pp. 190-194) ï Linkage Level Mastery (p. 194) ï Chapter VIII: Reliability Evidence ï Content-Area (Performance-Level) Reliability Evidence (pp. 208-209) Essential-Element	Peers noted that Table 78 on page 195 of File06 indicated that a significant percentage of students had no evidence of mastery on some essential elements. This may simply be a reflection of the characteristics of the student population. Peers commend the overall design of the DLM system appears to represent the full range of performance.
Section 4.3 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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.4 – Scoring 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **Standardized Scoring Procedures** 7) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter III: Item and Testlet Development i. General Testlet Structure and Item Types (pp. 47-48) ii. English Language Arts Writing Testlets (pp. 52- 55) b) Chapter V: Modeling i. Psychometric Background Information (pp. 159-160) ii. Linkage Level Model with Fungible Item Parameters (pp. 169-170) iii. DLM Scoring: Mastery Status Assignment (p. 170) c) Chapter VI: Standard Setting i. Results (pp. 180-185) d) Chapter VII: Assessment Results i. Score Reports (pp. 195- 198) ii. Quality Control Procedures for Data Files and Score Reports (pp. 199-200) iii. Data Files (pp. 198-200) e) Chapter VIII: Reliability Evidence Content-Area (Performance-Level) Reliability Evidence (pp 208-209) 2) Essential-Element Reliability Evidence (pp. 210-211) 3) Linkage-Level Reliability Evidence (pp. 212-213) f) Chapter X: Training and Professional Development i) Modules 4-7 (pp. 259-260)	Peers noted that the DCM model appears appropriate for this type of assessment. Peers noted that most scoring is automated. Peers noted that writing scores appear to be derived in part from test administrators observing and rating the writing process and products through the use of checklists. Peers were unable to locate evidence of writing scoring reliability statistics that are typically generated as a result of such a process. Peers noted that the scoring of the writing assessment is unclear; more information is needed on the R-script (how it was developed, the pilot population on which it was originally calibrated, the need for any scoring guide, etc.) and whether the scoring model was recalibrated once operational data were available. More information is needed on what scoring at the 'option level' versus scoring at the 'item level' means.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	5) FILE 05 Test Administration Manual 2014-15 a) Teacher Administered Testlets (pp. 39-51) 6) FILE 17 Supplemental Evidence Related to Test Administration Writing FAQ	

Section 4.4 Summary Statement

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: More information and evidence regarding the scoring of writing and other open-ended items is needed.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **Assessment Forms Represent Academic Content Standards** 8) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter III: Item and Test Development ï Operational Assessment Items for 2014-2015 (pp. 103-107) b) Chapter IV: Test Administration ï Instructionally Embedded Assessments (p. 109) ï Testlet Selection During Instructionally Embedded Assessment (pp. 115-118) ï Spring Assessments (p.109) ï Testlet Assignment During the Spring Window (pp. 118-119) ï Administration Errors (pp. 148-149) ï Monitoring Testlet Delivery (pp. 130-131) 9) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 – Appendices Appendix C.7 Incident Summaries 2014-2015 **Assessment Forms Yield Consistent Score Interpretations** 8) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter III: Item and Test Development ï Operational Assessment Items for 2014-15 (pp. 103-107) ï Item Flagging Criteria (p. 99)	DLM makes an underlying assumption about the fungibility of item parameters. If that assumption is not valid, then comparability of test forms may be impacted. Peers noted that the instructionally embedded testlet bank is separate from the spring testlet bank. DLM may need to consider conducting simulation studies to explore the comparability of the difficulty of testlets in the two testlet banks.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	ï Essential Element Concept Maps for Testlet Development (pp. 61-65) ï Item Writing Process (pp. 70-71) ï Field Testing (pp. 94-103) b) Chapter V: Modeling Linkage Level Model with Fungible Item Parameters (pp. 169-170)	
Section 4.5 Summary Statement		
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: See comments in the right-hand column.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State: • 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **Comparable Interpretation of Results** 14) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a) Chapter III: Item and Test Development i) Alternate Testlets for Students who are Blind or Have Visual Impairments (pp. 60-61) ii) Item Writing Process (pp. 70-71) iii) Item Writing Resource Materials (pp. 70) Essential Element Concept Maps for Testlet Development (pp. 61-65) **Documented Evidence of Comparability** 2) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a. Chapter III: Item and Test Development i. Item Flagging Criteria (pp. 99) ii. Operational Assessment Items for 2014-2015 (pp. 103-108) b. Chapter IV: Test Administration i. Overview of Accessibility Supports (pp. 131) ii. Practice Activities and Released Testlets (pp. 126-127) iii. Additional Allowable Practices (pp. 136-138) c. Chapter V: Modeling Linkage Level Model with Fungible Item Parameters	DLM has documented the design and development process that in theory supports comparable interpretations of results. However, the possible variability of difficulty of testlets calls into question the comparability of the meaning and interpretation of assessment results.

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.

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance 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).	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **Monitoring, Maintaining, and Improving Quality of Assessment** 1) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter III: Item and Test Development i. Item Writing (pp. 65-75) ii. Item Flagging Criteria (p. 99) iii. Item Data Review Decisions (pp. 99-100) b) Chapter IV: Test Administration i. Forensic Analysis Plans (pp. 142-143) ii. Adaptive Delivery (pp. 143- 147) c) Chapter IX: Validity Studies i. Evidence Based on Internal Structure (pp. 236-242) d) Chapter XI: Conclusion and Discussion i. Future Research (pp. 290-291) ii. Table 114: Dynamic Learning Maps Alternate Assessment Propositions and Sources of Related Evidence for 2014-15 (p. 285) iii. Table 115: Evidence Sources Cited in Previous Table (pp. 286-287) 2) FILE 15 External Alignment Study FILE 20 Scoring Reporting and Analysis 4) FILE 23 TAC Materials 5) FILE 14 Standard Setting Technical Report 2015 a) Appendix B: Rationale for	DLM has a highly qualified TAC that is consulted regularly about assessment and measurement issues. Peers noted that on page 3 of the TAC meeting minutes (January 2016) that there are recommendations for modeling/review of simulation study plans and the need to review model assumptions and fit issues. Peers supported this process for addressing classification uncertainty addressing issues of model fit and more specific calibrations of nodes with regard to reliability estimates, routing algorithms, and mastery inferences. Peers recommended that DLM prioritize and work with states to determine a plan and timeline for conducting forensic analyses to ensure that issues identified are followed-up on an ongoing basis.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Determining Mastery and Developing Profiles (pp. 58-59) 6) FILE 15 External Alignment Study a) Focus 3: Vertical Articulation of Linkage Levels (pp. 23-24) b) Focus 4: Learning Map Nodes within a Linkage Level and Assessment Items (pp. 24-30) 7) FILE 22 Scope of Work	

Section 4.7 Summary Statement
_X__ No additional evidence is required. See suggestions above for recommendations regarding ongoing maintenance of the assessment.

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

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
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 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: • 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;	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS State evidence State evidence **Guidelines for choice of assessment** 3) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a. Chapter X: Training and Professional Development Accessibility for All Students (pp. 258-259) 2) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 - Appendices a) Appendix C.16: Dynamic Learning Maps Participation Guidelines b) Appendix G.1: Required Test Administration Training	

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• 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;	**Information on Supports and Accommodations** 5) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a. Chapter IV: Test Administration i. Accessibility (pp. 131-137) b. Chapter X: Training and Professional Development i. Accessibility for All Students (pp. 258-259) 6) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 - Appendices a. Appendix G.1: Required Test Administration Training 7) FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-2015 a. Step 2: Learn about the DLM Accessibility Features: What Does DLM Provide? (pp. 15-18) **Guidance on Selection of Accommodations** 19) FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-2015 a) Accessibility by Design: Customization for Each Student (pp. 11-12) b) Step 3 – Discuss and Select Appropriate Accessibility Features and Supports: Considerations for Individual Education Plan (IEP) Teams (pp. 19-22) c) Step 6 – Evaluate the Accessibility Features Used After the Assessment (p. 30) 20) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter X: Training and Professional Development i) Accessibility for All Students (pp. 258-259)	Peers noted that DLM provides adequate and appropriate guidelines and supports to states regarding selection of appropriate accommodations, participation in the appropriate assessment, etc. However, it is incumbent upon the states to have sound plans to operationalize and monitor these guidelines and supports.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	21) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 Appendices a) Appendix G.1: Required Test Administration Training 22) FILE 05 Test Administration Manual 2014-15 a) Complete Access (Personal Needs and Preferences(PNP)) Profile (p. 96) b) Before Beginning Assessments: Evaluate and Choose Accessibility Supports (PNP Settings) (p. 61) c) Prepare for Next Year: Evaluate Accessibility Supports (PNP Setting) (p. 77)	
• 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;	**Disability Categories for Alternate Assessment** 2) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 - Appendices a) Appendix C.16: Dynamic Learning Maps Participation Guidelines	
• 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	State Evidence **Promote Access to the General Curriculum** 4) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
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.	a. Chapter IV: Test Administration i. Instructionally Embedded Assessments (p. 109) b. Chapter X: Training and Professional Development i. Professional Development Participation and Evaluation (pp. 261-267) ii. Instructional Professional Development (pp. 260-261) iii. Overview of the Dynamic Learning Maps Alternate Assessment System (pp. 257-258) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 - Appendices	

Section 5.1 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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs 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: • 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;	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS **Determining Appropriateness of Accommodation** 4) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter VII: Assessment Results ï Results – Student Participation (pp. 180-190) 5) FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-15 a) Six Steps to Customize DLM Accessibility Features for Students (pp. 13-30) **Information on Supports and Accommodations** 3) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter IV: Test Administration i. Accessibility (pp. 131-138) b) Chapter X: Training and Professional Development i. Accessibility for All Students (pp. 258-259) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 - Appendices a) Appendix G.1 Required Test Administration Training • FILE 05 Test Administration Manual 2014-15 ï CD Testlets/Accessibility Supports/Language Translation (pp. 33-36) ï TA Testlets/Accessibility Supports/Language Translations (p.	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.	49) • FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-15 **Guidance on Selection of Accommodations** 7) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter IV: Test Administration i) Accessibility (pp. 131-138) b) Chapter X: Training and Professional Development i) Accessibility for All Students (pp. 258-259) 8) FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-2015 a) Step 2: Learn about the DLM Accessibility Features: What Does DLM Provide? (pp. 15-18) b) Step 6: Evaluate the Accessibility Features Used After the Assessment (p. 30) 9) FILE 05 Test Administration Manual 2014-15 a) KITE User Guide/Change An Accessibility Support During Testing (pp. 150-158) b) Before Beginning Assessments/Evaluate and Choose Accessibility Supports (pp. 56-61)	

Section 5.2 Summary Statement
_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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.3 – Accommodations The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State: • 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);	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS; **Evidence of appropriate accommodation availability** 7) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter IV: Test Administration ï Accessibility (pp. 131-138) b) Chapter X: Training and Professional Development ï Training Content/Module 6 & Module 7 (p. 260) 8) FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-15 a) Accessibility by Design: Customization for each Student (pp. 11-12) b) Step 2: Learn about the DLM Accessibility Features: What Does DLM Provide? (pp. 15-18) 9) FILE 05 Test Administration Manual 2014-2015 Allowable Practices (pp. 53-54) **Evidence of appropriate accommodations for English learners** 10) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter IV: Test Administration ï Testlet Information Pages (pp. 125-126) b) Chapter VII: Assessment Results Student Participation (pp. 188-190) 2) FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-15 a. Step 2: Learn about the DLM Accessibility	Peers noted that DLM provides adequate and appropriate guidelines and supports to states regarding accommodations. However, it is incumbent upon the states to have sound plans to implement and monitor these guidelines and supports.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• 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;	Features: Category 3- Supports provided outside the DLM System (pp. 17-18) 3) FILE 05 Test Administration Manual 2014-15 Introduction to DLM Testlets - Computer-Delivered Testlets: Accessibility Supports, Language Translation (pp. 36) **Appropriateness and effectiveness of accommodations** 5) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a. Chapter IV: Test Administration i. Implementation Evidence - Accessibility (pp. 155-158) ii. User Experience with Assessment Administration and KITE Experience (pp. 149-155) iii. Accessibility/Overview of Accessibility Supports (pp. 155-158) iv. Additional Allowable Practices (pp. 136-138) v. Category 2: Supports Requiring Additional Materials (pp. 133-134) b. Chapter IX: Validity Studies i. Opportunity to Learn (pp. 223-224) ii. Observations of Test Administrations (pp. 230-234) c. Chapter XI: Conclusion and Discussion i. Accessibility (pp. 276-277) Future Research (pp. 290-291) ii. FILE 05 Test Administration Manual 2014-15 ï Kite User Guide/Change an Accessibility	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
• Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.	Support During Testing (p. 158) ï Spring Operational Assessments/Key Steps (p. 56) ï KITE User Guide/Access Practice Activities and Released Testlets (pp. 150-152) iii. FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-15 ï Step 6: Evaluate the Accessibility Features Used After the Assessment (p. 30) FILE 21 First Contact: A Census Report State Evidence	

Section 5.3 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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations 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: • Consistent with the State's policies for accommodations;	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS; **Accommodations and participation decisions are consistent with state policy** 3) FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-2015 a) Accessibility by Design: Customization for each Student (pp. 11-12) b) Step 2: Learn about the DLM Accessibility Features: What Does DLM Provide? (pp. 15-18) 4) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014-15 - Appendices a) Appendix C.16: Dynamic Learning Maps Participations Guidelines	
• Appropriate for addressing a student's disability or language needs for each assessment administered;	**Appropriateness of accommodations and participation decisions for addressing student needs** 7) FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-2015 a) Accessibility by Design: Customization for each Student (pp. 11-12) b) Step 2: Learn about the DLM Accessibility Features: What Does DLM Provide? (pp. 15-18)	
• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;	**Consistent with accommodations during instruction and/or practice** 4) FILE 01 Accessibility Manual 2014-2015 a) Accessibility by Design: Customization for each Student (pp. 11-12)	

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	b) Step 3: Discuss and Select Appropriate Accessibility Features and Supports: Considerations for IEP Teams (pp. 19-22) 5) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter IV: Test Administration i) Implementation Evidence from 2014-2015 Test Administration (pp. 143-158) b) Chapter XI: Conclusion and Discussion i) Future Research (pp. 290-291)	
• 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;	**Consistent with accommodations identified by team** 3) FILE 02 Assessment Coordinator Manual 2014-15 a) Access Reports and Data Extracts: View a Data Extract (pp. 44-46)	
• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.	**Administered with fidelity to procedures** 7) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a) Chapter IV: Test Administration i) Consortium Test Administration Observation Protocol (pp. 128-130) Chapter IX: Validity Studies i) Observations of Test Administration (pp. 230-234)	

Section 5.4 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.

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
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically: • 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet State Evidence	

Section 6.1 Summary Statement
_N/A__ No additional evidence is required – state evidence to be provided.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **Technically Sound Method** 2) FILE 14 Standard Setting Tech Report a) Chapter 2: Standard Setting Methods i) Rationale and general approach (pp. 19-20) ii) Profile selection (pp. 20- 24) iii) Evaluation Procedures (pp. 26-27) b) Chapter 3: Standard Setting Panel Meeting Participation i) Panel Facilitator Training (p. 31) c) Chapter 4: Standard Setting Panel Meeting Procedures i) Procedures (pp. 37-40) ii) Advanced Panelist Training (pp.32-33) iii) On-site Panelist Training (33-34) iv) Table 9 (p.33) v) Independent Evaluations of Panel-Recommended Cut Points (pp. 40-41) d) Chapter 5: Results i) Statistical adjustment (pp. 50-54) ii) Final results (p. 54) iii) Evaluations (pp.42-49) Appendix C: Sample Profile (pp. 60-64) f) Appendix G: Panel Training Materials (pp.139-163) g) Appendix B: Rationale for Determining Mastery and Developing Profiles(pp. 62- 63) 4) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	a. Chapter VIII: Reliability Evidence Content-Area (Performance-Level) Reliability Evidence (pp. 208-210) **Panelist experience and expertise** f. FILE 14 Standard Setting Tech Report i. Chapter 3: Standard Setting Panel Meeting Preparation ï Panelist Recruitment (p.28) ï Selection of Panel Participants (p. 28) ï Panelist Characteristics (pp.29-31) ii. Appendix E: Standard Setting Panelist Recruitment Letter and Survey (pp. 66-70) iii. Table 18, item #8 (p. 48) Appendix L: TAC Resolution, commentary #6-7 (p. 98)	

Section 6.2 Summary Statement
_X__ No additional evidence is required.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 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. 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.	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **Challenging Alternate Academic Achievement Standards** 3) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 ï Chapter I: Introduction ï Essential Elements (pp. 17-19) ï Chapter II: Map Development ï Learning Targets: CCSS and Essential Elements (pp. 26-27) ï Chapter III: Item and Test Development ï Development of the Essential Elements (pp. 38-41) 4) FILE 15 External Alignment Study ï Focus 3: Vertical Articulation of Linkage Levels (pp. 23-24) 5) FILE 18 Supplemental Evidence Related to Test Development Edvantia Stakeholder Survey Summary (pp. 63-67) 4) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014-15 a. Chapter VI: Standard Setting i. Standard Setting Approach: Rationale and Overview (pp. 171-172) ii. Grade Level/Content Performance Level Descriptors (pp. 185- 187) Policy Performance Level Descriptors (pp. 173) **Differentiated content across grades** 1) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a. Chapter I: Introduction i. Learning Map Models (pp 10-13)	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	b. Chapter II: Map Development i. Learning Targets: CCSS and Essential Elements (pp. 26-27) c. Chapter VI: Standard Setting Grade Level/Content Performance Level Descriptors (pp. 185- 187)	
Section 6.3 Summary Statement		
_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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
6.4 – Reporting 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: • 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;	Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet **Reporting Results** 6) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a) Chapter VI: Standard Setting i. Policy Performance Level Descriptors (p. 173) b) Chapter VII: Assessment Results i. Data Files (pp. 198-200) c) Chapter XI: Conclusion i. Operational Assessment (pp. 288-290) 7) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014- 15 – Appendices – Appendix E.7: Guide to Scores and Reports	
• 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;	**Assessment results reported to support appropriate uses of results** 3) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a) Chapter V: Modeling i) Linkage Level Model with Fungible Item Parameters (pp. 169- 170) Chapter VII: Assessment Results i) Score Reports (pp. 195- 198) vi. Chapter IX: Validity Studies ï DLM Score Report Design and Use (pp. 244-245) ï Report Use for Planning Instruction (pp. 250- 252) 6) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014- 15-	Peers were unable to locate itemized (e.g., testlet, EE, or conceptual area) score analyses at the state and district level. Peers suggested that state- and district-level summaries include frequency information on which EEs were assessed and which were mastered. This information would be useful for state and district management of the program and in helping to drive pattern analyses and overall decisions impacting instruction.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Appendices a) Appendix E.2: Aggregated Reports Sample b) Appendix E.1: Individual Student Score Report Sample	
	Interpretive Guides 4) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a) Chapter VII: Assessment Results i. Interpretation Resources (pp. 196-197) 5) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014- 15 - Appendices Appendix E.3: Parent Interpretive Guide 3) Appendix E.9: Parent Letter Teacher Version 4) Appendix E.10: Parent Letter Superintendent Version 5) Appendix E.4: Teacher Interpretive Guide 6) Appendix E.5: Scoring and Reporting Guide for Administrators 7) FILE 20 Scoring, Reporting, and Analyses	Peers noted that DLM has made a concerted effort to produce materials to support interpretation and effective use of the assessment results by teachers and parents. It is incumbent upon states to implement the use of the materials and resources within their schools and districts.
• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: ○ 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,	**Delivery of Student Reports** 10) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a) Chapter VIII: Reliability Evidence ï Reliability Evidence (pp. 201-214) b) Chapter IX: Validity Studies ï DLM Score Report Design and Use (pp. 244-245) c) Chapter VII: Assessment Results ï Interpretation Resources (pp. 196-198)	Peers noted that the individual student score reports do not appear to include any mention of estimates of uncertainty regarding mastery classification or potential measurement error associated with student scores. Reports should include this information to meet the requirements of the critical element and APA standards. Consideration of measurement error may impact the level of detail that is able to be supported on the score reports, based on the types of inferences intended to be made from the assessment data.

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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; ○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand; • 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.	d) Chapter XI: Conclusion ï Proposition 1 (pp. 271- 280) 11) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014- 15- Appendices Appendix E.3: Parent Interpretive Guide **Process and Timeline** 11) FILE 06 Technical Manual 2014- 15 a) Chapter VII: Assessment Results ï Score Reports (pp. 195- 198) b) Chapter XI: Conclusion ï Operational Phase (pp. 288-290) 12) FILE 07 Technical Manual 2014- 15- Appendices a) Appendix E.6: File Structure Data Dictionary	Peers were unable to locate evidence of score reports in alternate formats. States may need to request reports in alternate formats if those are required under the circumstances.

Section 6.4 Summary Statement
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: See comment above regarding inclusion of estimates of uncertainty on student score reports.

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