



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Chris Reykdal
State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
Mail stop: 47200 Old Capitol Building
PO Box 47200
Olympia, WA 98504

August 29, 2018

Dear Superintendent Reykdal:

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

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

External peer reviewers and Department staff evaluated OSPI's submission and found, based on the evidence received, that the components of your assessment system met many, but not all, of the statutory and regulatory requirements of section 1111(b)(1) and (3) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and our own analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (Smarter Balanced). **Substantially meets requirements of ESEA, as amended by NCLB and ESSA.**

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

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

- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in high school (Smarter Balanced). **Substantially meets requirements of ESEA, as amended by NCLB and ESSA.**

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 OSPI should be able to provide this additional information within one year.

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

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

Please note that the assessment requirements for ESEA, as amended by the NCLB, were in effect through the end of the 2016-2017 school year. The OSPI peer review was conducted under the requirements of this statute. Beginning in the 2017-2018 school year, the assessment requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, will apply to State assessments. Department staff internally reviewed Smarter Balanced for these new requirements and found no additional evidence would be needed beyond those identified in the enclosed document.

I also remind you that because OSPI requested additional time to submit the evidence requested for Washington Access to Instruction and Measurement, evidence for this assessment will need to be submitted in the next peer review.

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 Millicent Bentley-Memon of my staff at: OSS.Washington@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

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

Enclosures

cc: Deb Came, Director of Assessment

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

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	For all assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evidence that the State is monitoring for the use of appropriate accommodations, consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice and consistent with assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner.
6.4 – Reporting	For all assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evidence that reports are available in alternate formats upon request.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

March 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes-Resubmission



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

Note: Peer review notes provide the combined recommendations of the individual peers to the U.S. Department of Education (Department), based on the statute and regulations, 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.....	4
2.3 – Test Administration	5
2.5 – Test Security	<u>17</u>
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	<u>28</u>
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables.....	<u>39</u>
SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER	<u>410</u>
4.1 – Reliability.....	<u>410</u>
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	<u>511</u>
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	<u>612</u>
4.4 – Scoring	<u>713</u>
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	<u>814</u>
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance.....	<u>915</u>
SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS	<u>1016</u>
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	<u>1016</u>
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations.....	<u>1117</u>
SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING	<u>1319</u>
6.4 – Reporting.....	<u>1419</u>

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">2.1 – Test Design and Development</p> <p>See Smarter Balanced 2016 & 2018 Review</p>		
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• See smarter balanced 2018 review notes		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">2.2 – Item Development</p> <p>See Smarter Balanced 2016 & 2018 Review</p> <p>For the R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (WA-AIM), OSPI must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a technically sound process to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive processes, including higher-order thinking skills. • A description of outcomes and follow-up activities resulting from performance task item reviews. 		
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>see smarter balanced 2018 review notes</p>		

Section 2.3 Summary Statement

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Evidence of contingency plans to address potential technology issues during test administration (e.g. should go beyond the computer software to outline steps to be taken by personnel)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">2.5 – Test Security</p> <p>For the R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced) and the AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school, OSPI must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of documentation of test security incidents, disaggregated by type, that occurred in 2014–2015 along with follow-up/outcomes. 	<p>WA Dec2017 submission p.7-8</p> <p>WA074 – TSBP_Template, Test Security and Building Plan, to be completed by schools/building prior to testing</p> <p>WA071 – PIRG_03272017, Test Security Guidelines and procedures for incident reporting</p> <p>WA075 – Output, summary of 2015-16 test security incidents by category including the number of invalidations</p> <p>WA076 – T.I. Incident Log_Source File, full document used to create summary info in WA075</p>	<p>Peers were concerned by the number of students who received an accommodation or support that was not approved or did not receive an accommodation that they were supposed to as outlined by their plan. In WA075 and WA076, it appears that students are not getting accommodations according to their plans, and their scores are being reported anyway. This evidence is relevant to monitoring, Critical Element 5.4.</p>
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content See Smarter Balanced 2016 & 2018 Review</p> <p>For the WA-AIM R/LA and mathematics alternate assessments in grades 3-8 and HS, OSPI must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence including the results of the AA-AAAS alignment study to support evidence for the validity of the alternate assessments. • 		
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • see smarter balanced 2018 review notes 		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>For the WA-AIM R/LA and mathematics alternate assessments in grades 3-8 and HS, OSPI must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validity evidence indicating the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables. 		
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • n/a for this review, test evidence not submitted. 		

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">4.1 – Reliability</p> <p>For the WA-AIM R/LA and mathematics alternate assessments in grades 3-8 and HS, OSPI must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of test reliability that account for the unique items administered to individual students on the test (e.g., a generalizability coefficient with an items within person design (<i>i:p</i>)). 		
<p>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>n/a for this review, test evidence not submitted.</p>		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility See Smarter Balanced 2016 & 2018 Review</p> <p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and HS (Smarter Balanced), OSPI must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of estimated reliability for students receiving accommodations using operational data. 		
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see smarter balanced 2018 review notes 		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p> <p>See Smarter Balanced 2016 & 2018 Review</p>		
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • see smarter balanced 2018 review notes 		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>See Smarter Balanced 2016 & 2018 Review For the WA-AIM R/LA and mathematics alternate assessments in grades 3-8 and HS, OSPI must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols. 		
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>WA-AIM n/a for this review, test evidence not submitted.</p>		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</p> <p>See Smarter Balanced 2016 & 2018 Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 		
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • see smarter balanced 2018 review 		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</p> <p>For the WA-AIM R/LA and mathematics alternate assessments in grades 3-8 and HS, OSPI must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its alternate assessments, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the alternate assessments in its assessment system. 		
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>WA-AIM n/a for this review, test evidence not submitted.</p>		

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
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs See Smarter Balanced 2016 & 2018 Review •		
Section 5.2 Summary Statement		
• see smarter balanced 2018 review		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</p> <p>For all general and alternate assessments in grades 3-8 and HS, OSPI must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that students receive appropriate accommodations, consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice and consistent with assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities; or another process for an English learner. • Evidence of the results of monitoring test administrations for special populations. 	<p>WA Dec2017 submission p.9-10</p> <p>WA012 – WA Guidelines on Tools, Supports, and Accommodations, provides guidelines for IEP teams to use in selecting accommodations</p> <p>WA077 – WA Monitoring Plan (Preliminary), plan for implementing monitoring of accommodations</p>	<p>This document was dated 2014-15. A more recent version was posted on October 3, 2016, so it appears the submitted document is out of date.</p> <p>No current monitoring of accommodations. Peers found WA077 to be vague. Monitoring will not begin until 2021. Peers found this to be unacceptable and felt the timeline should be accelerated. Evidence should include the sampling and monitoring strategies.</p> <p>As noted in other Critical Elements, WA075 and WA076 caused the peers to be concerned, particularly in regards to administrations with accommodations. The State could make use of the information in these documents to inform their monitoring and improve administration procedures.</p> <p>Results are not currently available since monitoring is in early planning stages.</p>

Section 5.4 Summary Statement

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Evidence that students receive appropriate accommodations, consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice and consistent with assessment accommodations identified by a student's IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities; or another process for an English learner.
- Evidence WA075 and WA076 suggests that some students are NOT receiving accommodations consistent with their plans.
- Current version of the document Washington Guidelines on Tools, Supports, and Accommodations.
- Evidence of the results of monitoring test administrations for special populations.
- Peers feel the timeline for the proposed monitoring plan should be accelerated and additional detail provided (e.g. sampling strategies, observation protocols, evidence of training, review of data from test delivery system related to accommodations received).

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
------------------	--	--

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">6.4 – Reporting</p> <p>For all OSPI general and alternate assessments in grades 3-8 and HS, OSPI must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that reports are available in alternate formats upon request; • Evidence that the State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration; and • Evidence that the AA-AAAS student score reports provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement and provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals 	<p>WA Dec2017 submission p.11-12</p> <p>WA078 Translated score report email, Spanish translation available for Spring 2018</p> <p>WA010 State requirement that reports be delivered by September 10</p> <p>WA080 Assessment Webinar, delivery schedule, beginning March 20, in 2017</p> <p>WA081 WAW Memo, hard copy reports scheduled to arrive in district September 7-9, 2016</p>	<p>To date, alternate formats (large print, Braille, translations) have been provided by LEAs rather than the state.</p> <p>Does the State monitor LEAs’ efforts related to alternate formats? No evidence of this provided. Peers felt that a better approach may be for the State to provide alternate formats rather than the LEAs. Peers felt that there is likely sufficient need to provide reports in languages other than Spanish. The State should consider the needs of the population to determine the other languages to include (e.g. provide translations in the top 3 languages).</p> <p>Most scores available within 3 weeks of test administration in online system. Scores are not “official” until August. No information about what is done between scores becoming available in the online system and scores becoming “official.”</p> <p>Paper reports delivered to LEAs at the beginning of next school year for distribution. Peers suggest that the State make all efforts to deliver official scores within the same school year, for the benefit of students, parents, and schools. While the peers understand that Family Reports may be reported approximately 3 weeks after testing, the peers feel that all parents should receive score reports in a timely manner.</p>

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students.		
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that reports are available in alternate formats upon request; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While the State has stated that LEAs are responsible for alternate formats, there was no evidence provided by the State that this is currently being done consistently and as needed for all LEAs. 		

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

February 201 State Assessment Peer Review Notes

(resubmission of evidence based on 2016 Peer Review)



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

Contents

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS	3
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	<u>43</u>
2.2 – Item Development.....	<u>65</u>
2.3 – Test Administration	<u>76</u>
SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....	<u>87</u>
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	<u>97</u>
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	<u>119</u>
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	<u>1240</u>
SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER	<u>1344</u>
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	<u>1344</u>
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	<u>1442</u>
4.4 – Scoring	<u>1543</u>
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	<u>1644</u>
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	<u>1745</u>
5.3 – Accommodations.....	<u>1846</u>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Evidence #S023</i> – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Race to the Top Grant Proposal (pp. 45-46) Evidence #S025 – Smarter Balanced Mathematics Expanded Item Pools <i>Evidence #S026</i> – Pool Expansion Information Presentation Evidence #S027 – 2016-17 Expanded Pool Standards Alignment Evidence Packet #S010 – Blueprint Fidelity <i>Evidence Packet #S012</i> – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses <i>S013</i> 	<p>This requirement is met.</p> <p>Peers would have appreciated a clarification that when expanded pool items are used, that the relevant psychometric considerations are being addressed – e.g., that item parameters used are established for all grades spanned.</p> <p>Peers noted that several items span a relatively large grade range (roughly 20% in MA and 13% in R/LA span 3 or more grades). (Peer calculations based on S027). This seemed high.</p> <p>Peers commend SBAC for producing the gap analyses (S012). Peers believe that steps taken to bridge the gaps as described in S013 should resolve the issues.</p> <p>Peers ask that the program continue to monitor those grades/versions where blueprint fulfillment was less than 100%, as well as those where there had yet to be administrations.</p>
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</p> <p><u> </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Evidence that the Smarter Balanced test design aligns the assessments to the full depth and breadth for all the academic content standards in R/LA and mathematics at each grade level. B. Evidence that the item selection procedures for the computer adaptive test (CAT) online assessment adequately deliver tests that meet test design requirements for the intended depth of knowledge (DOK) of the assessments (also applies to evidence requested for element 2.2). C. 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. Provide, upon completion of the item development plans, evidence that 100% of test events for students receiving any version of the assessment conform to the test blueprints. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">2.2 – Item Development (stemming from 2016 review)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See evidence regarding DOK and item pools in element 2.1 above. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Evidence #15a</i> – Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment Blueprints for Mathematics <i>Evidence #15b – Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment Blueprints for ELA/L</i> <i>Evidence #S008</i> – Smarter Balanced Math Summative CAT and Interim Assessment Item Development Plan <i>Evidence #S009 – Smarter Balanced ELA Summative CAT and Interim Assessment Item Development Plan</i> <i>Evidence Packet #S010</i> – Smarter Balanced Blueprint Fidelity Study <i>Evidence Packet #S012 – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses</i> <i>Evidence #S013</i> – Gap Analysis and Development Plans <i>Evidence Packet #S014 – Member Managed Item Development Assignments</i> <i>Evidence #S029</i> – Summary of Smarter Balanced CAT Algorithm on Depth of Knowledge 	<p>The item selection procedures for the CAT should result in test events that, for every student and for all versions of the assessments, meet all blueprint constraints.</p> <p>See Comments on 2.1, bullets 2 and 4.</p>
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p> <p><u> </u>x The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See 2.1 B and C. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>(stemming from 2016 review-individual States may provide own evidence to address this item)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of contingency plans to address potential technology issues during test administration 	<p>No evidence provided.</p>	<p><u>Peers assume this evidence is provided by States using Smarter Balanced.</u></p>
<p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence from States using SBAC is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of contingency plans to address potential technology issues during test administration. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content (stemming from 2016 peer review)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence #S005 – Hawaii Smarter Balanced Technical Report, 2014-2015 (pp. 42-46) Evidence #S006 – South Dakota Technical Report 2014-2015 (pp. 44-49) Evidence Packet #S010 – Blueprint Fidelity Evidence Packet #012 – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses Evidence Packet #S010 – Blueprint Fidelity Evidence #S011 – Smarter Balanced Technical Report, 2015-2016 (pp. 6-6 through 6-9) Evidence Packet #S010 – Blueprint Fidelity Evidence #S030 – WestEd Alignment Study Proposal Evidence #S032 – WestEd Alignment Study Evidence #104 – Fordham Institute – Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation Assessments (p. 18) Evidence #S008 – Smarter Balanced Math Summative CAT and Interim Assessment Item 	<p>See Comments in 2.1.</p> <p>See Comments in 2.1, bullets 2 and 4. The evidence was provided but it does not support the claim that the CAT administered test forms matched the test blueprints in every case.</p> <p>This evidence has been provided. See Comment in 2.1, bullet 3.</p> <p>The WestEd alignment study (S032) assessed the extent to which each item in the noted grades matched its targeted CCSS standard. However, for DoK (cognitive complexity), the study did not assess the extent to which each item matched the cognitive complexity implied by its targeted standard. Rather, it documented experts’ judgments of the level of cognitive complexity at which the item appears to be assessing the standard. The study’s design can furnish appropriate evidence to support (or refute) a claim concerning the degree of content alignment between items and standards, but it cannot provide appropriate evidence for a claim about the match between the cognitive complexity of a test and the cognitive complexity of the standards to which the test is written.</p> <p>Peers felt that the study does not address the question “Does the item match the DoK of the standard?”</p> <p>The measures taken to improve alignment are entirely appropriate. However, evidence of <i>improved</i> alignment was not provided. Peers expected to see a before-after comparison.</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 the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of improved alignment of the tests, based upon the findings of the independent alignment study. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Plan <i>Evidence Packet #S010</i> – Blueprint Fidelity Evidence Packet #S012 – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses <i>Evidence #S013</i> – Gap Analysis and Development Plans Evidence Packet #S014 – Member-Managed Assignments <i>Evidence Packet #S015</i> – Member-Managed Item Development Training 	
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p> <p><u> </u>x<u> </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See 2.1 B and C. Evidence of alignment of sample test forms for grades 3, 4, 6 and 7 in R/LA and mathematics, specifically with respect to cognitive complexity (DoK). Evidence of improved alignment of the tests, based upon the findings of the independent alignment study. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure (stemming from 2016 peer review-States may address this with State-level data)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that supports the internal structure of the Smarter Balanced assessments using operational data from the summative assessments (e.g., a correlational analysis of subscores and total scores). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Evidence #S004</i> - Assessing the Dimensionality of Smarter Balanced Summative Tests (pp. 2-4). 	<p>S004 provides the evidence requested.</p> <p>Recommendation: Peers recognize the challenge of assessing dimensionality using item scores in a CAT context; SBAC could contribute meaningfully to the literature on this topic by taking it on as a special research study.</p>
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> x </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>(stemming from 2016 peer review-States may address this with State-level data)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validity evidence that shows the Smarter Balanced assessment scores are related as expected with other variables for all student groups (e.g., comparison of subscore relationships within content areas to those across content areas; a confirmatory factor analysis of math & R/LA together; or other analyses that demonstrate positive correlations between assessment results and external measures that assess similar constructs). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence #S004 – Assessing the Dimensionality of Smarter Balanced Summative Test (pp. 2-5) Evidence #S005 – Hawaii Smarter Balanced Technical Report, 2014-2015 (pp. 48-50) Evidence #S006 – South Dakota Technical Report, 2014-2015 (pp. 53-55) Evidence #S007 – Dimensionality of the SBAC: An argument for its validity Evidence #S031 – South Dakota BOR Policy 	<p>Peers appreciated the concurrent validity studies for high school R/LA and Math (S005 and S006). We believe that these studies help establish external validity evidence for the program.</p> <p>However, no evidence of validity based on relationships with other variables was provided for Grades 3-8 Math and R/LA.</p> <p>Please provide the results of a study or studies addressing this CE, such as correlations between SBAC scores and grades or correlations between SBAC adjacent grade scores.</p>
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>x<u> </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validity evidence that shows the Smarter Balanced assessment scores are related as expected with other variables for all student groups for Grades 3-8 R/LA and Math. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility (stemming from 2016 peer review-States may address this with State-level data)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of estimated reliability for students receiving accommodations using operational data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Evidence #S011 – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Draft 2015-16 Technical Report</u>, Chapter 2 <i>Index</i> 	<p>Estimated reliabilities for the tests administered to these students are in the Index in Tables 11.1 and 11.2. Peers note that a few of the coefficients are low enough to raise concerns.</p> <p>It would be helpful in evaluating Tables 11.1 and 11.2 to know the source(s) of the data.</p> <p>Peers request a clarification about how item development plans (S013) specifically address the pool factors that are related to the low reliabilities for special versions of the test.</p> <p>Peers are also concerned by the statement in the Index “Students with lower scores have lower reliability than those with higher scores.” (p. 57). We were not sure that it was accurate.</p>
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peers request a clarification about how item development plans (S013) specifically address the pool factors that are related to the low reliabilities for special versions of the test. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p> <p>(stemming from 2016 peer review)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See evidence regarding DOK and item pools in element 2.1 above. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Evidence #015a</i> – Final Blueprint for Mathematics Summative Assessment <i>Evidence #015b</i> – Final Blueprint for ELA/L Summative Assessment <i>Evidence Packet #S010</i> – Smarter Balanced Blueprint Fidelity Study <i>Evidence #S011</i> – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Technical Report, 2015-2016 <i>Evidence Packet #S012</i> – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses 	<p>See Comments for 2.1.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>x<u> </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See 2.1 B and C. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>(stemming from 2016 peer review-States may address this with State-level evidence)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 that the State has monitored the quality and reliability of performance task scoring conducted during its test administration for the Smarter Balanced tests. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence #065a – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium: State Procedures Manual, 2014 Evidence #S001 – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium: Member Procedures Manual, 2016 <p style="text-align: center;">No evidence cited.</p>	<p>Peers appreciate the new guidance provided by the Consortium (S001). We believe the evidence requested was provided.</p> <p>Peers’ understanding is that this evidence is to be provided by States using Smarter Balanced.</p>
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence from States using SBAC is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the State has monitored the quality and reliability of performance task scoring conducted during its test administration for the Smarter Balanced tests. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment (stemming from 2016 peer review)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the design and development of the item pools used to support multiple versions of the assessments, specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ computer-adaptive in ASL (R/LA listening only, Math); ○ computer-adaptive in Braille (R/LA, math); ○ computer-based fixed form in Braille (math); ○ paper in Braille (R/LA, Math); ○ computer-adaptive in Spanish (math); and ○ paper in Spanish (math). • Evidence that item pools for these above-listed additional computer adaptive versions can support the adaptive test design. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Evidence #011a</i> – Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines • Evidence #143 – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium: Signing Guidelines • <i>Evidence Packet #S010</i> – Blueprint Fidelity Studies • Evidence #144 – Unified English Braille Implementation Guide • <i>Evidence #146</i> – Theory of Test Translation Error • Evidence #S011 – Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment Technical Report, 2015-2016 • <i>Evidence Packet #S012</i> – Smarter Balanced Gap Analyses • Evidence #S013 – Gap Analysis and Development Plans • <i>Evidence #S016</i> – Literature Review of Testing Accommodations and Accessibility Tools for Students with Disabilities • Evidence #S017 – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Style Guide • <i>Evidence #S018</i> – Tri-Lin Proposal Response to Smarter Balanced RFP 13 • Evidence #S019 – Grade 8 Mathematics Item Specifications Claim 1 Target A 	<p>See Comments in 2.1 and 4.2.</p>
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>_x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Comments in 2.1 B and C, and 4.2. 		

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 the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs (stemming from 2016 peer review-States may address this with State-level evidence)</p> <p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #11a – Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines (p. 11; pp. 32-33) • Evidence #68 – Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Implementation Guide • Evidence #69h – Accessibility and Accommodations Training Module (Slide 59) • Evidence #99 – Resources and Practices Comparison Crosswalk (p. 4) • Evidence #127 – ISAAP Training Module Screenshot • Evidence #S002 – UAAG Survey • Evidence #S003 – Including All Students in Assessments Digital Library Module • Evidence #S020 – Template Letter for Parents of English Learners 	<p>The SBAC response shows where to locate evidence of the guidance in the original submission, and evidence of communication of this guidance to school personnel. Provision of #S020 shows evidence of communication of this guidance to parents.</p> <p><u>The Peers understand that provision of greater specificity beyond the guidance provided by SBAC is a State level responsibility for any State using SBAC.</u></p>
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</p> <p><u> </u>x<u> </u> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p> <p><u> </u>x<u> </u> The following additional evidence from States using SBAC is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of guidance regarding selection of the Spanish version of the Smarter Balanced assessments for English learners at a level of specificity such that an educator can apply the decision for an individual student. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">5.3 – Accommodations (stemming from 2016 peer review-States may address this with State-level evidence)</p> <p>Evidence of a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</p>		<p>SBAC did not provide evidence for this request.</p> <p><u>Peers’ understanding is that States using Smarter Balanced are to provide this evidence.</u></p>
<p>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required of SBAC</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence from States using SBAC is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of 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 the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.