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PART I: OVERVIEW OF ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW

SUBMISSIONS DUE: DECEMBER 31, 2019
PURPOSE AND ROLE OF PEER REVIEW

- Support States in meeting statutory requirements under Title I
- Develop and implement valid and reliable coherent State assessment systems
- Document technical quality
- Apply assessment results in a manner consistent with professional standards
WHAT NEEDS TO BE PEER REVIEWED?

- General mathematics and reading/language arts for grades 3-8 and at least once in grades 9-12
- General science administered at least once in each of these grade spans: 3-5, 6-9, and 10-12
- AA-AAAS in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities for the grades described above
- (NEW) English language proficiency (ELP) assessments for all English leaners (ELs) grades K-12
- (NEW) Alternate ELP assessments (AELPA) for ELs with the most significant cognitive disabilities in grades K-12
WHAT NEEDS TO BE PEER REVIEWED?

(CONT.)

NEW ESSA FLEXIBILITIES

- If applicable, locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessments
- If applicable, the more advanced high school assessments used students who take the State’s high school math test in 8th grade
- If applicable, content assessments in a student’s native language for ELs
- If applicable, content assessments in a Native American language
NEW ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS UNDER ESSA

- Meaningful consultation in standards development
- Universal design for learning (UDL) in assessment design
- Equal benefits for students taking assessments with accommodations
- Alternate Academic Achievement Standards (AAAS) aligned with post-secondary education or employment
- Assessments may be partially delivered in the form of portfolios, projects, or extended performance tasks
  - May not be completely delivered in these forms
NEW IN ESSA: EQUAL BENEFITS FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES AND ELS

- Equal benefits for those students using allowable assessment accommodations. A State must ensure that the use of appropriate accommodations does not deny a student with a disability or an EL
  - (1) the opportunity to participate in the assessment; and
  - (2) any of the benefits from participation in the assessment that are afforded to students without disabilities or non-ELs.
- Example: The benefit of receiving a “college reportable” score from participation in a nationally recognized high school academic assessment used as a State assessment (34 CFR § 200.6(b)(3), (f)(2)(i)).
ADDITIONAL NEW REQUIREMENTS

- A State must conduct meaningful and timely consultation with stakeholders when developing the challenging academic standards and assessment systems and the English language proficiency (ELP) standards and assessment systems

- Only applies to standards and assessments adopted after the passage of ESSA (December 2015)
The Peer Review Process
UNDERSTANDING THE PROCESS

- Assessment peer review is conducted by external assessment experts, including nationally recognized assessment experts, State and local assessment directors, and educators.
- Each State is responsible for providing adequate and coherent documentation of the elements of its assessment system (including States participating in consortium-developed assessments) for peer review.
- Reviewer panels for each State will be anonymous, but the list of approved peer reviewers will be released to the public.
- Each reviewer will create a personal notes form based on reading the State materials; the review team will merge those notes in a final peer notes form to be provided to the State.
The Assistant Secretary will provide formal feedback to a State regarding whether or not the State has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all applicable ESEA statutory and regulatory requirements and will identify any additional evidence necessary to address the critical elements.

- Peer notes help inform States what additional evidence may be needed

- ED staff to review selected portions of state submission

- ED is specifically prohibited from approving State standards, test items
UNDERSTANDING THE PROCESS

WHAT IS REVIEWED?

- The assessment peer review process is:
  - Evidence-based – the peer review is, by nature, backward-looking in order to confirm the technical quality of the assessments based on full administration of the assessments
  - Focused on two primary aspects:
    - Documentation of the process used to develop and administer the assessments
    - Data to confirm the quality of the system (i.e., did the system operate as intended?)
Preparing Peer Review Evidence
RESOURCES AND MATERIALS NEEDED

Peer Review Guide
https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa/assessmentpeerreview.pdf

State Index Template and Evidence
NAVIGATING THE REVISED GUIDE

FRONT MATTER:
- Overview of ESSA Changes
- The Peer Review Process
- When Assessments Must Be Peer Reviewed
- Preparing the Submission
- Terminology

CRITICAL ELEMENTS
- Map of the Critical Elements
- Critical Elements Sections 1-7
CRITICAL ELEMENTS

SAME BASIC STRUCTURE FOR PEER REVIEW

II – CRITICAL ELEMENTS FOR STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW

1. Statewide system of standards & assessments
   - 1.1 State adoption of academic content standards/ELP Standards
   - 1.2 Challenging academic content/ELP standards
   - 1.3 Required assessments
   - 1.4 Policies for including all students in assessments
   - 1.5 Meaningful Consultation

2. Assessment system operations
   - 2.1 Test design & development
   - 2.2 Item development
   - 2.3 Test administration
   - 2.4 Monitoring test admin.
   - 2.5 Test security
   - 2.6 Systems for protecting data integrity & privacy

3. Technical quality — validity
   - 3.1 Overall Validity, including validity based on content
   - 3.2 Validity based on cognitive processes
   - 3.3 Validity based on internal structure
   - 3.4 Validity based on relations to other variables

4. Technical quality — other
   - 4.1 Reliability
   - 4.2 Fairness & accessibility
   - 4.3 Full performance continuum
   - 4.4 Scoring
   - 4.5 Multiple assessment forms
   - 4.6 Multiple versions of an assessment
   - 4.7 Technical analyses & ongoing maintenance

5. Inclusion of all students
   - 5.1 Procedures for including SWDs
   - 5.2 Procedures for including EIs
   - 5.3 Accommodations
   - 5.4 Monitoring test admin. for special populations

6. Achievement standards & reporting
   - 6.1 Procedures for including SWDs
   - 6.2 Achievement standards setting
   - 6.3 Challenging & aligned achievement standards
   - 6.4 Reporting

7. Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments (if applicable)
   - 7.1 State procedures
   - 7.2 LEA procedures
   - 7.3 Comparability of selected assessment with State assessment

Key

- Critical elements primarily checked by Department staff (e.g., Critical Element 1.3)
- Critical elements likely addressed by coordinated evidence for all States administering the same assessments (e.g., Critical Element 2.1).
- Critical elements likely addressed with State-specific evidence (e.g., Critical Element 5.1).
### Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence to support this critical element for the State’s assessments includes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- For the State’s general academic content and ELP assessments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Relevance of State code or regulations, language from contract(s) for the State’s academic and ELP assessments, test coordinator or test administrator manuals, or other relevant documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Purposes of these assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Test blueprints that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Describe the structure of each academic content and ELP assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of a technically sound assessment, for example, in terms of the proportion of item types, response formats, range of item difficulties, types of test-taking conditions, and applicable time limits;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Align to either: (1) the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards or (or grade-band) ELP standards in terms of content (i.e., knowledge, cognitive process, cognitive skills, and affective attribute standards), and document how the test design is tailored to the specific knowledge and skills in the State’s ELP standards for each grade-level/grade-band;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Documentation that the test design is tailored to the specific knowledge and skills in: (1) the State’s academic content standards (e.g., includes extended response items that require demonstration of writing skills if the State’s English language arts academic content standards include writing) or (2) the State’s ELP standards (e.g., includes speaking, listening, reading, and writing skills and tasks found in the standards);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Documentation of the approaches the State uses to include challenging content and complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., items that assess higher-order thinking skills, such as item types appropriate to the content that require synthesizing and evaluating information and analytical text-based writing or multiple steps and student explanations of their work); for example, this could include test specifications or test blueprints that require a certain portion of the total score be based on item types that require complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills and the rationale for that design.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 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 a technically sound assessment, for example, in terms of the proportion of item types, response formats, range of item difficulties, types of test-taking conditions, and applicable time limits; |
- Processes to ensure that each academic 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.
CRITICAL ELEMENTS

RIGHT HAND TEXT UPDATED TO SPECIFY SPECIFIC ELP AND AELPA EXAMPLES

Examples of Evidence

Evidence to support this critical element for all of the assessments:

For the State’s general academic content and ELP assessments:

- Relevant sections of State code or regulations, legislation, or policy that states the purposes of these assessments and the intended interpretation and uses of results.

- The structure of each academic content assessment includes:
  - Alignment to either: (1) the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards or (2) the State’s grade-level (or grade-band) ELP standards, in terms of balance of content (i.e., knowledge and linguistic process; cognitive complexity); or (2) the State’s grade-level (or grade-band) ELP standards, in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and linguistic process; the full range of the State’s grade-level/grade-band standards and range of content; and documentation that the test design is tailored to the specific knowledge and linguistic skills in the State’s ELP standards, and reflects academic language complexity appropriate for each grade-level/grade-band.
  - Documentation that the test design is tailored to the specific knowledge and skills in: (1) the State’s academic content standards (e.g., includes extended response items that require demonstration of writing skills if the State’s reading/language arts academic content standards include writing) or (2) the State’s ELP standards (e.g., includes speaking, listening, reading, and writing skills and tasks found in the standards).
  - Documentation of the approaches the State uses to include challenging content and complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., items that assess higher-order thinking skills, such as item types appropriate to the content that require synthesizing and evaluating information and analytical text-based writing or multiple steps and student explanations of their work); for example, this could include test specifications or test blueprints that require a certain portion of the total score be based on item types that require complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills and the rationale for that design.
CONSORTIUM CONSIDERATIONS

- Process used for academic assessment consortium will be applied to ELP assessment consortia (WIDA, ELPA21)

- “Common” evidence items for consortium
  - Reviewed by one panel of peers

- “State specific” items for each State
  - Reviewed by other peers, using notes from common evidence review

- Map to Critical Elements
  - Outlines which are most likely consortium specific
    - Note: this is a guide, may differ between consortia
CRITICAL ELEMENTS

A NOTE ABOUT THE SUGGESTED “SOURCES” FOR SUBMISSION FOR CONSORTIA AND STATES USING COMMON ASSESSMENTS

Exhibit 3: Evidence for Critical Elements that Likely Will Be Addressed by Submissions of Evidence that are State-Specific, Coordinated for States Administering the Same Assessments, or a Hybrid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Critical Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State-specific evidence</td>
<td>1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.4, 5.1, 5.2, 6.1, 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated evidence for States administering the same assessments</td>
<td>2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 6.2 and 6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid evidence</td>
<td>2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 5.3, 5.4 and 6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are suggestions, based on past experience in reviewing consortium assessments; other consortium or ‘common assessments’ may have different patterns of ‘who submits what’
We are in a Consortium. Do We Include Copies of the Evidence Submitted by the Consortium in Our State Specific Submission?

No. It is preferred that only one copy of common evidence be submitted by the consortium on behalf of the member States. Peers reviewing state-specific evidence for a State’s submission will only be looking at the subset of critical elements that apply to a State.
State Assessment Peer Review Seminar Meeting Materials

Plenary Session One: Updated Guide to State Assessment Peer Review
Presenters: Donald Peasley and Deborah Spitz, Office of State Support, U.S. Department of Education

- Session Slides
- Session Summary Notes
- Streaming Video

Session A-1 State Critical Elements: Test Operations and Maintenance
Panelists: Heather Peitler, John Olson, and June Zack
Moderator: Mario Muniz, Office of State Support, U.S. Department of Education

- Session Summary Notes
- Streaming Video

Session A-2 Best Practices in Assembling Peer Review Submissions
Panelists: Lou Fabrizio, Sharon Hall, Vince Verges, and Tammy Howard
Moderator: Elizabeth Witt, Office of State Support, U.S. Department of Education

- Session Summary Notes
Questions?
PART II: Submitting for Peer Review

- Using the Index Template
- Advice from Peer Reviewers
- Navigating MAX.gov
- Response and Resubmission
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USING THE INDEX TEMPLATE

Suggestions:

- Organize evidence by test and by sub-elements of each critical element.
- Label each item with a unique identifier and a name that explains its relevance.
- Provide explanatory notes in the third column; explain why you’ve included each item.
- Note whether a consortium is also providing evidence.
Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CE 2.6.1</td>
<td>ODE communicates to school districts about test security protocols through its Test Administration Manual (Evidence#OR1.3.1_2017_18_TAM, Pages 22-33, 104-111). ODE’s contract the American Institutes for Research (AIR) also contains requirements around how our vendor handles secure test data (Evidence#OR2.6.1.1_AIRContract; Section 7).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 2.6.2</td>
<td>ODE communicates to school districts about protocols for protecting student privacy and confidentiality through its Test Administration Manual (Evidence#OR1.3.1_2017_18_TAM, Page 26). In addition, ODE has communicated to school districts about the requirements under House Bill 2715 that prohibits school district employees or volunteers from posting, publishing, or otherwise making publicly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CE 2.6.1**
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-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results

**CE 2.6.2**
- To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence#OR1.3.1_2017_18_TAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence#OR2.6.1.1_AIRContract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence#OR1.3.1_2017_18_TAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence#OR2.6.2.1_HB2715</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence#OR2.6.2.2_ExecutiveNumberedMemo005-2015-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence#OR2.6.2.3_ODEPolicy_581-101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence#OR2.6.2.4_ODEPolicy_581-116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[See ELPA21 Consortium Submission for Supplemental Evidence and Notes]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Critical Element 5.3 — Accommodations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appropriate accommodations available for ELs</strong>&lt;br&gt;(General information regarding availability of appropriate accommodations on ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 and Alternate ACCESS for ELLs also submitted by WIDA on behalf of the consortium.)&lt;br&gt;- <strong>Evidence 1.4.d – DTC Manual Jan2019-1</strong>&lt;br&gt;  - pp. 117-119 (pdf pp. 124-126) – List of accommodations and accommodations resources for ACCESS for ELLs 2.0</td>
<td>Appropriate accommodations, as described in manuals for ACCESS for DTC training materials. Accommodations Suppl 2.0. Mexico's Accommodations online. Mexico uses WIDA's pre-existing accommodations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence 5.1.g – ACCESS-Accessibility-Accommodations-Supplement.pdf</strong>&lt;br&gt;  - Describes accessibility framework and lists all available accommodations for ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 and Alternate ACCESS for ELLs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence 5.1.a - NMPED Accommodations Manual - 2.2019.pdf</strong>&lt;br&gt;  - p. 3 (pdf p. 4) – Directs users to WIDA’s accommodations information for ACCESS for ELLs 2.0</td>
<td>After the post-administration received, NMPED is able to review accommodations used. NMPED accommodates changes over time for the ELLs. NMPED to compare IEP accommodations provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Has determined that accommodations are appropriate for meeting students’ needs; do not alter the construct being assessed; and allow meaningful interpretation of results.*

- **Evidence 5.1.g – ACCESS-Accessibility-Accommodations-Supplement.pdf**<br>  - p. 7 (pdf p. 9) – Describes the WIDA accessibility and accommodations framework |
- **Evidence 5.3.b – ACCESS Accommodations** | |
Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Monitoring of test administration should be demonstrated for all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS.</td>
<td>Effective procedures are in place to monitor test administration and employs a variety of methods to ensure standardized procedures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| RI Specific Evidence – All Tests: | RI has an observation protocol as well as a pre-visit protocol to review topics and questions to help ensure the school is ready for test administration that is used for all state assessments. Visit pre-selected schools and observe all aspects of test administration. Materials are stored, distributed and collected; actual and classroom observation is conducted, and classroom observation before, during, and after administration. Assessments, each LEA is visited at least once every 3 years. Schools to ensure elementary, middle, and high schools. If the LEA, schools are either randomly selected or selected based on such as: 
- Reported incidents from previous administration, 
- Self-selection (school requests a visit); and/or
- Whether they have not had any visits for any 3 years. |
| School Observation Resources |
| • RI 17: Test Coordinator Handbook - Appendix C: Test Administration Monitoring Visits, p. 29-31 |
| • RI 62: RI School Visit Initial Email Template |
| • RI 63: RI State Assessment Site Visit Checklist |
| • RI 64: Sample Completed Site Visit Checklist |
| • RI 65: School Visit Planning Spreadsheet |
| RICAS RI Specific Evidence: |
| • RI 23: RICAS Test Coordinator Manual, p. 2, 78 |
| • RI 68: RICAS Vendor Scope of Work, p. 28, 31 |
| DLM: See DLM evidence submitted by West Virginia. |
| SAT: See SAT evidence submitted by College Board. |
| The Principal’s Certification of Proper Test Administration document signed by principals to certify a properly administered test. Contractor monitors whether schools sign the PCTE test administration and monitors reports submitted by Rhode Island for follow-up with schools (RI 23). |
| The testing contractor monitors return shipments of all secure materials have been returned and investigated. In addition, Caveon Test Security will monitor on... |
Suggestions on Preparing Evidence for Submission
SUGGESTIONS ON PREPARING EVIDENCE

- Organize both procedural AND confirmatory evidence:
  - If providing training materials, there should also be evidence that training occurred OR is required (assurance forms, identification of individuals responsible for tracking attendance)
  - If providing evidence of a TAC discussion, don’t just provide an agenda, provide meeting notes to show what was actually discussed.
  - If providing a monitoring protocol, provide a sample letter to an LEA and a calendar of monitoring visits
SUGGESTIONS ON PREPARING EVIDENCE

▪ Use the index document to clearly direct peer reviewers to the documentation you want them to look at. Have a clear naming/numbering system, reference specific page numbers, and explain in the index WHY a document is relevant.

▪ States should consider consolidation of evidence documents.
  – (example on next slide)
SUGGESTIONS ON PREPARING EVIDENCE

- For example, submit ONE copy of a technical manual; and reference it as many times as necessary throughout the submission index with specific page/section references.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1-Test Design/Blueprints</td>
<td>File 10-Tech Manual, pp. 28-42 (Test Specifications)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2-Item Development</td>
<td>File 10-Tech Manual, pp. 51-64 (Item Review Procedures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3-Internal Structure</td>
<td>File 10-Tech Manual pp. 284-99 (Dimensionality Analysis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4-Relationships w/Other Variables</td>
<td>File 10-Tech Manual pp.347-351 (External Relationships)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1-Reliability</td>
<td>File 10-Tech Manual pp.369-394 (Reliability; Decision Consistency and Accuracy)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In a long document, direct the peer reviewers to exactly what you want them to see. It’s helpful when States highlight or flag specific passages within a PDF.

If you provide a report, like an alignment study, be prepared to show how you are addressing issues raised in that report. Peers appreciate a state acknowledging what it has learned and what it is trying to improve.

For a resubmission, focus on the evidence requested. Provide background context only as needed.
SUGGESTIONS ON PREPARING EVIDENCE

We advise States not to use links to online evidence but submit actual documents. Here’s why:

- Often links will take peer reviewers to a site that is password protected.
- Websites can be changed, leading to dead links or information that is different from what you intended.
- Too much information; it may be unclear to reviewers what part of a site you intend them to look at.

A link may be helpful for limited critical elements to demonstrate how you are communicating with the public. Use sparingly!
ADVICE FROM OUR PEER REVIEWERS

These are the most common suggestions from our peer reviewers:

1) Label evidence clearly and in a way that is easy to identify. For example, beginning each evidence name with a number allows it to be easily sorted.

2) More isn’t better! Focus on each part of the critical element, using the specific language of each part.

3) Explain your evidence using the third column in the index. Think about what you want your reviewers to understand.

4) Clearly differentiate evidence for different assessments.

5) Have staff review submission for clarity and completeness. Sometimes documents are left out or mislabeled, or the wrong page number is provided.
ADVICE FROM OUR PEER REVIEWERS

To sum up: organization counts!

Rule number 1: don’t annoy the peer reviewers. Respect their time.

Rule number 2: if peers can’t find the evidence, you may not get credit for it.

Rule number 3: consider applying to be a peer reviewer. You will get a much better understanding of the process.
Using MAX.gov
Direct URL to State Assessment Home Page in Max.gov = https://community.max.gov/x/Rg2WSg

Select State Assessment Systems Tab, then.

Select State Page from List.
• Under the “State Peer Review” page, there will be a page titled “State Peer Review Submission Index and Evidence Page Winter 2020”—access this page to upload index and evidence.
Another Easy Navigation Tool—Use the “tree” on the left side of page:

Select State Page from List..... Then select ‘sub-pages’
Assessment team staff have found that when uploading multiple files, **it may be advisable to select 10 files at a time and upload files in batches.** The MAX.GOV system provides a virus check of each file put in an upload queue.
Timelines and Resources
TIMELINE FOR THE 2019-20 PEER REVIEW

- Now: prepare your submission.
- Mid-November: look for an email with information about MAX registration and submission. Consider which 1-2 staff will need MAX access. Register in MAX!
- November-December 31: upload evidence and indices.
- Early January to March: peer review. ED may reach out to you about missing or unclear evidence.
- March-June: ED will prepare peer review results and send the SEA the decision letter and peer notes. Can discuss with SEA as needed.
- +30 days: SEA to respond with plan and timeline for collecting and resubmitting additional evidence (e.g. end of year 2020 or summer 2021).
THE DECISION LETTER

Your State will receive a letter from the Department along with any relevant sets of peer review notes.

- The table in the letter represents the official request for additional evidence.
- This table may not agree with all of the recommendations made in the peer notes. ED standardizes all of the decision letters so they are consistent with ESSA requirements and across States.
- Use the peer notes as constructive suggestions, but respond to the items in the table in the letter.
THE STATE’S RESPONSE

You will be asked to provide a PLAN and TIMELINE within 30 days.

▪ This is a request for how you plan to collect the evidence, NOT a request for the evidence itself.
▪ You may ask for a phone call discussion of the results. You may also ask for more time for the response.

We prefer that follow-up evidence come in together, not piecemeal.

▪ So, you should plan to submit evidence when all critical elements can be addressed.
▪ ED will typically hold a summer and winter peer review.
RESOURCES

▪ ED Standards and Assessment:
  https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html

▪ 2018 Assessment Seminar Materials and Video:

▪ Center on Standards and Assessment Implementation:
  https://www.csai-online.org/spotlight/peer-review-state-assessment-systems
  ▪ Critical Elements Analysis Chart
  ▪ Guidance for Supporting Assessment Peer Review Submissions
  ▪ Evidence Organizer
  ▪ Peer Review and State Assessment Administration: A Resource for State Assessment Directors
  ▪ Peer Review of State Assessment Systems Outcomes Report
Questions?