



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Kevin Brown  
Interim Commissioner of Education  
Kentucky Department of Education  
300 Sower Blvd, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Frankfort, KY 40601

April 7, 2020

Dear Commissioner Brown:

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). I appreciate the efforts of the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in August 2019.

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

External peer reviewers and Department staff carefully evaluated KDE's submission and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that the components of your assessment system meet some, but not all, of the statutory and regulatory requirements of sections 1111(b)(1) and (2) 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 and language arts (R/LA) and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (K-PREP): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- R/LA and mathematics alternate assessments of alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in grades 3-8 (Alternate K-PREP R/LA and math): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- Science general assessment in grades 4 and 7 (KAS Science): **Partially meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- AA-AAAS for science in grades 4 and 7 (KAS Alternate Science): **Partially meets requirements of the ESEA.**

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

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.*

the condition on the State's 2020 Title I, Part A grant award. This condition will remain until the assessments in this review have been determined to meet all requirements. If the outcome of the re-review by peers indicates full approval, then the condition will be removed. If adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action. KDE must submit a plan within 30 days outlining when it will submit all required additional documentation for peer review. Upon submission of the plan, the Department will reach out to the KDE to determine a mutually agreeable schedule. Resubmission should occur once all necessary evidence is complete (rather than in multiple submissions). The Department notes that the State has shared plans to implement new assessments to replace the K-Prep and alternate K-Prep R/LA and mathematics assessments in 2020-21. The Department expects that KDE will submit evidence supporting these new assessments for peer review by no later than December 31, 2021.

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. In particular, OSERS will monitor progress against critical elements 5.1, 5.3, 5.4, 6.1 and 6.3. Insufficient progress to address such matters may lead OSERS to place a condition on KDE's federal fiscal year 2019 IDEA Part B grant award.

The specific list of items required for KDE to submit is enclosed with this letter. Within 30 days of receipt of this letter, KDE must provide to the Department a plan and timeline by which it will submit the additional documentation. Upon submission of the plan, the Department will reach out to the KDE to determine a mutually agreeable schedule. Resubmission should occur once all necessary evidence is complete (rather than in multiple submissions). If adequate progress is not made in providing this information, the Department may take additional action.

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

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

If you have any questions, please contact my staff at: [OESE.Assessment@ed.gov](mailto:OESE.Assessment@ed.gov).

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank T. Brogan  
Assistant Secretary for  
Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Jennifer Stafford, Director, Division of Assessment and Accountability Support

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

Critical Element	Evidence Needed
<p><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></p>	<p>For the Kentucky Performance Rating for Educational Progress (K-PREP) reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of the State’s grade-level academic content standards and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results.</li> <li>• 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 (i.e., higher-order thinking skills).</li> </ul> <p>For the Kentucky Academic Standards (KAS) Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards for the grade that is being assessed and includes:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results.</li> <li>○ Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of the State’s grade-level academic content standards and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results.</li> <li>○ 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 (i.e., higher-order thinking skills).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>For the Alternate K-PREP R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A rationale for each dimension (“Attainment Tasks” and “Transition Attainment Record”) in the Alternate K-PREP design, and to support how each dimension serves to meet the criteria for this critical element, evidence specifically that includes:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results.</li> <li>○ 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.</li> <li>○ 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).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Critical Element	Evidence Needed
<p><b>2.2 – Item Development</b></p>	<p>For the K-PREP R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of the areas of expertise of item reviewers used in the item development process for KDE general assessments, specifically subject area expertise, and backgrounds in educating students with disabilities and English learners (ELs), as applicable.</li> </ul> <p>For the KAS Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</li> </ul> <p>For the KAS Alternate Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b></p>	<p>For the KAS Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 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 (e.g., evidence of a process for selecting and conducting monitoring visits, evidence that monitoring occurred).</li> </ul> <p>For the KAS Alternate Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 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 (e.g., evidence of a process for selecting and conducting monitoring visits, evidence that monitoring occurred).</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Evidence Needed
<p><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b></p>	<p>For the K-PREP R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State’s academic assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 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), balance of content, and cognitive complexity.</li> <li>○ Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>For the KAS Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State’s academic assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards (e.g., evidence of a systemic process and timeline to address gaps and weaknesses identified in the alignment study).</li> </ul> <p>For the KAS Alternate Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State’s academic assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Documentation of adequate alignment to the State’s academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b></p>	<p>For the K-PREP R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards (e.g., cognitive labs, surveys or focus groups of students following test completion regarding thought processes during the test).</li> </ul> <p>For the Alternate K-PREP R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards (e.g., cognitive labs, surveys or focus groups of students following test completion regarding thought processes during the test).</li> </ul> <p>For the KAS Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards (e.g., cognitive labs, surveys or focus groups of students following test completion regarding thought processes during the test).</li> </ul> <p>For the KAS Alternate Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards (e.g., cognitive labs, surveys or focus groups of students following test completion regarding thought processes during the test).</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Evidence Needed
<b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b>	<p>For the KAS Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures (e.g., correlations of total test and subdomain scores, as well as intercorrelations among subdomain scores; and reports analyzing dimensionality and showing consistency with the structure of the standards).</li> </ul> <p>For the KAS Alternate Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See critical elements 3.1 and 3.2.</li> </ul>
<b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b>	<p>For the K-PREP R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</li> </ul> <p>For the Alternate K-PREP R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables (e.g., positive correlations with external measures and convergent and divergent relationships with measures other than test scores)</li> </ul> <p>For the KAS Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</li> </ul> <p>For the KAS Alternate Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables (e.g., positive correlations with external measures and convergent and divergent relationships with measures other than test scores).</li> </ul>
<b>4.1 – Reliability</b>	<p>For the Alternate K-PREP R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of estimates for overall test reliability, standard errors of measurement, and classification accuracy, and similar estimates for student subgroups (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity, student disability status, EL status) if subgroup data are reportable for this test.</li> </ul> <p>For the KAS Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of adequate test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population (e.g., explanation of low estimated reliabilities for total population and subgroups).</li> <li>Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable.</li> <li>Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results.</li> </ul> <p>For the KAS Alternate Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of adequate test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population (e.g., explanation of low estimates of reliability for total population, reliability evidence for subgroups).</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Evidence Needed
<p><b>4.2 – Fairness and accessibility</b></p>	<p>For the K-PREP R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in their design, development and analysis (e.g., plan to address differential item functioning (DIF) analyses of major subgroups).</li> </ul> <p>For the Alternate K-PREP R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in their design, development and analysis, including, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (e.g., evidence regarding the professional background of test item reviewers for bias and sensitivity reviews, DIF analyses of major subgroups).</li> </ul> <p>For the KAS Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in their design, development and analysis, including, to the extent practicable, using the principles of UDL (e.g., plan to address DIF analyses of major subgroups).</li> </ul> <p>For the KAS Alternate Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in their design, development and analysis, including, to the extent practicable, using the principles of UDL.</li> </ul>
<p><b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b></p>	<p>For the Alternate K-PREP R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of the conditional standard error of measure (CSEM) for each score on each test, or similar estimates, for each student subgroup that indicate that the tests provide adequately precise measurements across the full performance continuum.</li> </ul> <p>For the KAS Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of the CSEM for each score on each test, or similar estimates, for each student subgroup that indicate that the tests provide adequately precise measurements across the full performance continuum.</li> <li>Evidence related to sub-domain scores requested in critical element 4.1.</li> </ul> <p>For the KAS Alternate Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of the CSEM for each score on each test, or similar estimates that indicate that the tests provide adequately precise measurements across the full performance continuum (e.g., cumulative frequency distribution and appropriate performance information for students at the lowest end of the performance continuum).</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Evidence Needed
<p><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></p>	<p>For the K-PREP R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of improved inter-rater reliability for K-PREP writing test items.</li> </ul> <p>For the Alternate K-PREP R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the inter-rater agreement for the Transaction Attainment Record dimension of the test.</li> </ul> <p>For the KAS Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of standardized scoring procedures and protocols that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards (e.g., evidence of interrater reliability analyses, procedures for combining scores to create composite scores).</li> </ul> <p>For the KAS Alternate Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of standardized scoring procedures and protocols that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards (e.g., detail regarding participants, evidence of training, and inter-rater reliability).</li> </ul>
<p><b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</b></p>	<p>For the K-PREP R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the procedures used for linking and equating forms across years of test administration (e.g., how linking items were selected, how linking/equating data is used, how linking items represent test blueprints), and evidence of results of those procedures.</li> </ul> <p>For the Alternate K-PREP R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the procedures used for linking and equating forms across years of test administration (e.g., how linking items were selected, how linking/equating data is used, how linking items represent test blueprints), and evidence of results of those procedures.</li> </ul> <p>For the KAS Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the State administers multiple forms of academic assessments 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.</li> </ul> <p>For the KAS Alternate Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the procedures used for linking and equating forms across years of test administration (e.g., how linking items were selected, how linking/equating data is used, how linking items represent test blueprints), and evidence of results of those procedures.</li> </ul>
<p><b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b></p>	<p>For the KAS Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments.</li> <li>○ Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Critical Element	Evidence Needed
<p><b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing</b></p>	<p>For the KAS Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of a system for monitoring, 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, and</li> <li>• Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website.</li> </ul> <p>For the KAS Alternate Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of a system for monitoring, 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.</li> <li>• Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website.</li> </ul>
<p><b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b></p>	<p>For all assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of clear guidance for IEP teams and parents regarding the selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities.</li> </ul> <p>For the KAS Alternate Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ensures that parents of students assessed with an alternate assessments of alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) are informed that their child’s achievement will be measured based on alternate academic achievement standards.</li> <li>○ Does not preclude a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who takes an AA-AAAS from attempting to complete the requirements for a regular high school diploma.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners</b></p>	<p>For all assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of clear guidance for educators of ELs regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for ELs.</li> </ul>
<p><b>5.3 – Accommodations</b></p>	<p>For all assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has determined that the accommodations it provides: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student's need(s) to participate in the assessments.</li> <li>○ do not alter the construct being assessed.</li> <li>○ 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.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Evidence that the State has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence Needed</b>
<b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b>	<p>For the KAS Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL.</li> </ul> <p>For the KAS Alternate Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL.</li> </ul>
<b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</b>	<p>For the KAS Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of formal adoption of the academic achievement standards in science.</li> </ul> <p>For the KAS Alternate Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of formal adoption of the alternate academic achievement standards in science.</li> </ul>
<b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b>	<p>For the KAS Alternate Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise.</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Evidence Needed
<p><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b></p>	<p>For the K-PREP Alternate Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards are:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Aligned with the State’s challenging academic content standards for the grade in which a student is enrolled.</li> <li>○ Ensure that a student who meets the alternate academic achievement standards is on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment. The State educational agency should provide this evidence by December 15, 2020.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>For the KAS Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards and with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards such that a 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.</li> </ul> <p>For the KAS Alternate Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards are:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Aligned with the State’s challenging academic content standards for the grade in which a student is enrolled.</li> <li>○ Ensure that a student who meets the alternate academic achievement standards is on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment. The State educational agency should provide this evidence by December 15, 2020.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p>	<p>For K-PREP Alternate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that alternate formats of test score reports are available.</li> <li>• Evidence of test score interpretive guides for educators and parents.</li> </ul> <p>For the KAS Science and KAS Alternate Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 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.</li> <li>• Interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results.</li> <li>• Reports that are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian.</li> <li>• Evidence that the reports, upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>

# STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR [Kentucky]

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

August 2019 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

# STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

**Contents**

<b>SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS</b> .....	<b>3</b>
Critical Element 1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students .....	3
Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content Standards.....	4
Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments .....	7
Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments.....	9
Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments .....	11
<b>SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS</b> .....	<b>12</b>
Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	12
Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development.....	16
Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration.....	19
Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration .....	22
Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security.....	23
Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy .....	25
<b>SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY</b> .....	<b>27</b>
Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content.....	27
Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	29
Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure.....	32
Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables .....	35
<b>SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER</b> .....	<b>37</b>
Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability .....	37
Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility .....	40
Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	44
Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring.....	46
Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms .....	49
Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment.....	51
Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance .....	52
<b>SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS</b> .....	<b>54</b>
Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities .....	54
Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments.....	59
Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations.....	62
Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations .....	66
<b>SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING</b> .....	<b>69</b>
Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students .....	69
Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting.....	71
Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards.....	73
Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting.....	75
<b>SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS</b> .....	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>
Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments .....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State Assessments.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

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

**Critical Element 1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b><u>For academic content standards:</u></b>                      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 schools and public school students in the State.</p>	<p align="center"><u>    All Assessments    </u></p> <p>Kentucky statute defining development and implementation of content standards: <b>0_3 ALL_05 KRS 158_6453 Academic Standards and Assessments.pdf</b> (Section (2)(h) and (i) direct the state Board of Education to promulgate regulations and section (2) (j) directs the Kentucky Department of Education to implement the standards p. 4)</p> <p>Formal adoption of science standards by Kentucky Board of Education: <b>0_5 ALL_16 KBE Summary Minutes of June 2013 mtg.pdf</b> (Action Item XX.B.1 p20)</p> <p>Adopted Science Standards: <b>0_10 ALL_01 Kentucky Academic Standards Science.pdf</b></p>	<p>No evidence was requested for R/LA and mathematics general following previous review.</p> <p>Per 0_5_ALL_16 Kentucky adopted new science standards in June 2013.</p> <p>Evidence was provided of formal adoption of science standards.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b></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 of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

**Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content Standards**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b><u>For academic content standards:</u></b>                      The State’s challenging academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science are aligned with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>                    All Assessments                    </u></p> <p>Education Goals section in the Kentucky Academic Standards includes the requirement that schools “...develop their students’ abilities to ... apply core concepts and principles from mathematics, science, arts and humanities, social studies, English/language arts, health, mathematics, practical living, including, physical education, to situations they will encounter throughout their lives, and ... be measured on the proportion of students who make a successful transition to work, postsecondary education and the military.”</p> <p>During the move of KDE offices to a new building in late 2016, the records of participants (before 2010) in the development of content standards that were in effect in 2014-2015 were lost or destroyed.</p> <p><b>0_3 ALL_13 703 KAR 5_080 Administration Code Assessment Program.pdf</b> Section (2) (c – e) describe the legal requirements for content standards review panelists.</p> <p><b>0_10 ALL_01 Kentucky Academic Standards Science.pdf</b> (p.1)</p> <p>Kentucky adopted standards derived from the National Research Council’s Framework for K12 Science Education (Next Generation Science Standards) to ensure that the standards are challenging and aligned with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards: <b>0_10 ALL_01 Kentucky Academic Standards Science.pdf</b> (see page 137 of the standards document, which is page 5 of the pdf document)</p>	<p><b>All Assessments</b></p> <p>The evidence cited asserts what schools and students are expected to do vis-a-vis the state standards.</p> <p>Information asserts alignment with entrance requirements and relevance to career and technical education standards.</p> <p>However, more process information is needed relevant to establishing alignment, relevance, and benchmarking.</p> <p>Could not locate: <b>0_3 ALL_13 703 KAR 5_080 Administration Code Assessment Program.pdf</b> Section (2) (c – e), which the State indicates describes the legal requirements for content standards review panelists.</p> <p>The following samples of evidence would support meeting this critical element: external independent reviews of the State’s academic content standards by content experts; summaries of reviews by educators in the State; or other documentation to confirm that the State’s academic content standards adequately specify what students should know and be able to do are needed for ELA, mathematics, and science; and/or endorsements or certifications by the State’s network of institutions of higher education (IHEs), professional associations and/or the business community that the State’s academic content standards represent the knowledge and skills in the content area(s) under review necessary for students to succeed in college and the workforce.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p><b>R/LA and mathematics</b></p> <p>The State did not provide evidence addressing the requested descriptions of stakeholders involved in developing or adopting the standards, due to losing records in a move.</p> <p>0_3_All_13 described legal requirements for being panelists.</p> <p>According to the cycle outlined in the evidence there should be have been a review every 3 years. By that schedule the State should have a review in 2019 by the latest.</p> <p>A description of State stakeholders involved in the development and/or adoption process for the R/LA, mathematics, and science content standards that includes detail on subject-matter expertise, individuals representing English learners (ELs), and students with disabilities should be provided. It is unclear whether standards been reviewed since 2016.</p> <p><b>Science</b></p> <p>No evidence of a study to address college or career and technical review was provided. Also, peer reviewers would expect evidence of higher education participation in such evidence.</p> <p>The evidence does not provide a detailed description of the strategies the State used to ensure that its academic content standards adequately specify what students should know and be able to do.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
		The evidence does not provide documentation of the process used by the State to benchmark its academic content standards to nationally or internationally recognized academic content standards.
<b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detail regarding the strategies used to specify what students should know and can do, as well as <u>processes</u> used to establish alignment, relevance, and benchmarking of academic content standards to nationally or internationally recognized academic content standards.</li> <li>• Description of the legal requirements for content standards review panelists. The evidence provided, 0_3 ALL_13 703 KAR 5_080 Administration Code Assessment Program.pdf does not include this information, and Section (2) (c – e) that is referenced by the State could not be located.</li> <li>• External independent reviews of the State’s academic content standards (R/LA, mathematics, and science) by content experts or other documentation to confirm that the State’s academic content standards adequately specify what students should know and be able to do and/or</li> <li>• Endorsements or certifications by the State’s network of institutions of higher education (IHEs), professional associations, and/or the business community that the State’s academic content standards represent the knowledge and skills in the content area(s) under review necessary for students to succeed in college and the workforce and/or</li> <li>• Empirical studies indicating academic content standards are challenging.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

**Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments aligned with <b><u>grade-level academic achievement standards</u></b> or alternate academic achievement standards in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 9-12);</li> <li>• Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12).</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <p>The State’s <b><u>academic content assessments</u></b> must be the same assessments administered to all students in the tested grades, with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may take an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards.</li> <li>• A State may permit an LEA to administer a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in lieu of the State high school assessment if certain conditions are met.</li> <li>• A State that administers an end-of-course high school mathematics assessment may exempt an 8<sup>th</sup> grade student from the mathematics assessment typically administered in</li> </ul>	<p>Kentucky statute defining annual and alternate assessments: <b>0_3 ALL_05 KRS 158_6453 Academic Standards and Assessments.pdf</b> (Section 3 directs the Kentucky Board of Education to ...” be responsible for creating and implementing a balanced statewide assessment program that measures the students', schools', and districts' achievement of the goals set forth in KRS 158.645 and 158.6451, to ensure compliance with the federal Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015, Pub. L. No. 114-95, or its successor, and to ensure school accountability.”; Section 4(b) requires that the state assessments cover content including language, reading, English, mathematics and science. See p. 5)</p> <p>Kentucky Administrative rules specify the inclusion of all students: <b>0_3 ALL_12 703 KAR 5_070 Inclusion of Special Populations Dec 2016.pdf</b> (See SUMMARY OF THE STANDARDS FOR INCLUSION OF SPECIAL POPULATIONS p. 5)</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>___ KAS Alternate Assessment ___</b></p> <p>All students take the same assessment (KAS Alternate Assessment Science) except for, “A small percentage of students with disabilities shall participate in the Alternate Assessment Program. These students are generally those who have moderate to severe cognitive disabilities and represent approximately one (1) percent of the total student population.” who may take the alternate KAS Alternate Assessment Science if the IEP team deems that appropriate.</p> <p><b>1_3 ALT_01 Science PLDs.pdf</b></p>	<p>No evidence was requested for R/LA and mathematics following previous review.</p> <p>Staff determined that KDE provided statutory evidence that all required assessments are included in the State’s assessment system.</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

<p>eighth grade and allow the student to take the State end-of-course mathematics test instead.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Department may have approved the State, under the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority, to permit students in some LEAs to participate in a demonstration assessment system in lieu of participating in the State assessment.</li> </ul>	<p>Kentucky does not administer any of the other allowed exceptions.</p>	
<p><b>Section 1.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

**Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For students with disabilities, policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including those children with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system;</li> <li>• For ELs:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Policies state that all ELs must be included in all aspects of the content assessment system, unless the State has chosen the statutory option for recently arrived ELs under which such ELs are exempt from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment.</li> <li>○ If a State has developed native language assessments for ELs in R/LA, ELs must be assessed in R/LA 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</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>    All Assessments    </u></p> <p>Kentucky Administrative Rules define the inclusion policies: <b>0_3 ALL_12 703 KAR 5_070 Inclusion of Special Populations Dec 2016.pdf</b></p> <p>General Considerations: pp.4-8            Students with Disabilities: pp. 8-15            ELs: pp.16-22            Students with 504 plans: pp. 22-28            Students in alternative programs, state agency children and students receiving instruction in home or hospital settings: pp. 28-29</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>    KAS Alternate Assessment    </u></p> <p><b>0_3 ALL_12 703 KAR 5_070 Inclusion of Special Populations Dec 2016.pdf</b> pp. 30-35</p> <p>Kentucky does not use flexibility for Native American schools or programs.</p>	<p>No evidence was requested for R/LA and mathematics following previous review.</p> <p>Staff determined that KDE provided evidence of State policies that include all students in assessments.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

<p>language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If the State uses the flexibility for Native American language schools and programs: (1) the State provides the content assessment in the Native American language to all students in the school or program; (2) the State submits such content assessment for peer review as part of its State assessment system; and (3) the State continues to provide ELP assessments and services for ELs as required by law. The State must assess in English the students' achievement in R/LA in high school.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 1.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>x No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

**Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments**

(Note: this is a new requirement under ESSA, so it does not apply to standards and assessments adopted prior to the passage of ESSA (December 2015)).

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>If the State has developed or amended challenging <b>academic</b> standards and assessments, the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education).</li> <li>• Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas).</li> <li>• Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State.</li> <li>• Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents.</li> </ul>	<p align="center"><u>    All Assessments    </u></p> <p>Kentucky statute requires meaningful and timely consultation with the required entities: <b>0_3 ALL_05 KRS 158_6453 Academic Standards and Assessments.pdf</b> (Section 2; pp. 1-5)</p> <p>There were many meetings of the various groups. Some examples are:</p> <p>Board minutes <b>0_5 ALL_13 KBE Summary Minutes of April 2013 mtg.pdf</b> (pp.19-20)</p> <p>SCAAC minutes <b>0_6 ALL_02 SCAAC Meeting Summary Minutes March 19 2013.pdf</b> (p.3)</p> <p>NTAPAA agenda <b>0_6 ALL_02 SCAAC Meeting Summary Minutes March 19 2013.pdf</b> (pp.3-4)</p> <p><i>[Note: We believe that the evidence listed here is sufficient to document compliance with CE 1.5. However, sine this is a new requirement, we submitted minutes from additional meeting in which consultation with the required groups occurred. See 0_6 ALL_XX ... ]</i></p> <p>Kentucky does not have Indian tribes located in the state.</p>	<p>Kentucky adopted the Common Core and Next Generation Science standards prior to 2013. However, the State requires standards to be reconsidered every six years. Kentucky will need to demonstrate meaningful consultation in the next adoption of its reading, mathematics, and science standards.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

**Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to <b><u>the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards</u></b> for the grade that is being assessed and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of <b><u>the State’s grade-level academic content standards</u></b> and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results.</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <b><u>the State’s academic content standards</u></b>, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills).</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design and intended uses and interpretations of results.</li> </ul>	<p>KP: No alignment study was done. Alignment will be analyzed and evidence submitted in future Peer Reviews.</p> <p>See <b>02 KP_03 KY Align Draft Report5_13_19.pdf</b> (“Depth-of-Knowledge” section on page 10) for a description of KDE position of measuring DOK 1 in assessments. [NOTE: although this study was conducted for science, the DOK position applies across content areas.]</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>___ KAS Assessment Science ___</b></p> <p><b>0_2 KAS 01 2017-2018 K-PREP Technical Manual 2.0.pdf</b> Test Development (pp. 15-27) Science blueprint (p. 23)</p> <p>ALT: After review of the peer review feedback, Kentucky Department of Education met with its Alternate Assessment Advisory Board and decided to remove communication Dimensions A &amp; B from the alternate assessment. See: <b>2_1 ALT_01 2018-19 Overview and AT Part 1 p2.pdf</b> (slide 2).</p> <p>[Note that at the time of development, the assessments were known as “K-PREP”]</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>___ KAS Alternate Assessment ___</b></p> <p><b>2_1 ALT_01 Standard Selection Process.pdf</b> (p.12)</p>	<p><b>General Assessment – R/LA, Mathematics, Science</b></p> <p>The previously requested alignment study was not conducted.</p> <p>Evidence was provided in the technical manual only regarding the incorporation of DOK into the item writing process.</p> <p>02 KP_03 KY indicates the expectation students go beyond simple recall of information to reasoning and problem solving (p. 10). Thus, DOK level 1 items are expected to be rare. Evidence on depth of knowledge states that no more than 10% of items are rated at level 1, however it does not provide evidence on how this condition was determined. It is unclear whether this is true for all standards.</p> <p><b>0_2 KAS 01 2017-2018 K-PREP Technical Manual 2.0.pdf</b> (pp. 13-14) states the purpose of each test, however the paragraph regarding Science focuses on the standards rather than the assessment.</p> <p>The interpretations and uses are generally suggested but could be more explicit/clear.</p> <p>In the blueprints the percentage related to domain coverage is presented (and number of items for ER items/form) but generally the number of items is not provided, and proportion of item types, response formats, range of item difficulties and types of scoring procedures, as well as applicable time limits are unclear.</p> <p>Evidence of alignment in terms of depth and breadth regarding balance of content (knowledge, cognitive processes, cognitive complexity) is needed, as well as</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the student is enrolled and uses that determination for all reporting.</li> <li>• If the State administers a content assessment that includes portfolios, such assessment may be partially administered through a portfolio but may not be <i>entirely</i> administered through a portfolio.</li> </ul>	<p><b>2_1 ALT_02 Science content and bias training.pdf</b> (pp.17-21)</p> <p>KDE does not administer any assessments that are computer-adaptive or include portfolios.</p>	<p>evidence of inclusion of challenging content and complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills.</p> <p><b>General Science</b></p> <p>For science grades 4 and 7, no statement of purpose was included. The blueprints were not in sufficient detail, not addressing DOK nor DOK by domain combination (e.g., number of items at DOK 2 for physical science). The blueprints are at the domain level, rather than the content standards level.</p> <p>Blueprint is contained in the Technical Report at a high level, but does not describe the structure in terms of the number of items, item types, the proportion of item types, response formats, range of item difficulties, types of scoring procedures, and applicable time limits. Science blueprint covers grades 4 and 7 and does not address how coverage was determined.</p> <p>There is an independent alignment study of items to standards by HumRRO which found neither test reflected the full breadth of the content domain. The test specifications or test blueprints should 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 since the alignment study showed that dimensionality was not achieved.</p> <p><b>Alternate Assessment – R/LA, Mathematics, Science</b></p> <p>Evidence for this critical element does not meet the requirements.</p>
--	--	---

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

		<p>The State provides evidence of progressions but does not address all of the standards nor provide a rationale of what is covered and what is not addressed.</p> <p>The State should provide a description of the breadth of (1) the grade-level academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure, such as an evidence-based rationale for the reduced breadth within each grade and/or comparison of intended content compared to grade-level academic content standards; the cognitive complexity of the AA-AAAS is appropriately challenging for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; description of how linkage to different content across grades/grade spans and vertical articulation of academic expectations for students is maintained.</p> <p>2_1_ALT_02 provides some information on the item development process for the Alt-Science.</p> <p>2_1 ALT_01 indicated the removal of Dimensions A and B from the Alternate K-PREP.</p> <p>Evidence of purpose and intended interpretations and uses is needed.</p> <p>The State should also provide test blueprints that describe the structure in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results</p> <p>The decision and process are reflected but the rationale unclear/needs to be more explicit.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>No evidence for the critical element was provided. The State must provide evidence of the following:</b></p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

The State's test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to **the depth and breadth of the State's academic content standards** for the grade that is being assessed 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 depth and breadth of **the State's grade-level academic content standards** and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results.
- 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 (i.e., higher-order thinking skills).

### **Examples of such evidence include:**

- Clear statements of purpose of the assessment, and interpretations and uses;
- Evidence that the test blueprints (e.g., often included in an independent alignment study) align to the full range of academic content standards, including the number of items on each form in each depth of knowledge (DOK) by subdomain combination (percent related to domain coverage is presented but generally the number of items is not provided), as well as the proportion of item types, response formats, range of item difficulties, types of scoring procedures, and applicable time limits;
- Evidence on how DOK is incorporated into test design. The range of DOK with respect to the test design and interpretations is unclear, as are the intended uses;
- A more extensive rationale for the exclusion of DOK level 1 questions from item development in R/LA and mathematics (K-PREP). Assessments need to show progress and growth for students with the full range of ability levels. DOK level 1 questions are required for this. There is a similar concern regarding DOK 3 items and higher performing students.

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

**Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess student achievement based on the <b><u>State’s academic content standards</u></b> in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</li> </ul>	<p>Evidence of the specific expertise of item reviewers was lost or destroyed during the 2016 KDE office move.</p> <p align="center">___ <b>KAS Assessment Science</b> ___</p> <p><b>0_2 KAS 01 2017-2018 K-PREP Technical Manual 2.0.pdf</b> Item Development (pp. 16 - 21)</p> <p align="center">_____ <b>KAS Alternate Assessment</b> _____</p> <p><b>2_2 ALT_01 AT Science Item Development Training.pdf</b></p> <p><b>2_2 ALT_02 Science Test Development Report.pdf</b></p>	<p><b>General Assessment – R/LA, Mathematics</b></p> <p><b>0_2 KAS 01</b> p. 20, Table 2.1 K-PREP Bias and Content Review Meeting Participation Summary provides position type (teacher, non-teacher educator, and general public) and special populations experiences (no, yes). The table also provides gender, ethnicity, educational attainment, and years teaching. Specific expertise of item reviewers was lost or destroyed during an office move.</p> <p>0_2 KAS 01, pp. 16-21 does not refer to science items, only to R/LA and mathematics.</p> <p>The State says they have a three year review process. The State could submit the plan for their upcoming or most recent review.</p> <p><b>General Assessment – Science</b></p> <p>The evidence provided general item development guidelines.</p> <p>Peer reviewers expected a description of the process to ensure that the item types (e.g., multiple choice, constructed response, performance tasks, and technology-enhanced items) are tailored for assessing the science standards, especially when the description of the unifying ideas was supposed to be multidimensional.</p> <p>It is unclear whether the State included individuals with content area expertise, experience as educators, and experience and expertise with students with disabilities, ELs, and other student populations in the State.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

		<p>No evidence was found that provided samples of item specifications that detail the content standards to be tested.</p> <p>The State could provide evidence of procedures to evaluate the quality of items and select items for operational use, including evidence of reviews of pilot and field test data.</p> <p>More details are needed about the content of the training writing and reviews, as well as relevant specifications.</p> <p>Although individuals with "special populations" background were included, it is unclear the degree to which individuals were specialists/had experience with ELs vs/and students with disabilities vs/and other student sub-populations.</p> <p><b>Alternate Assessment</b></p> <p>Item specifications are needed.</p> <p>More detail is needed regarding how accessibility and the appropriate range of cognitive complexity were ensured.</p> <p>No documentation is included of the process the State uses to ensure that the assessment items are accessible, cognitively challenging, and reflective of professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible.</p> <p>No samples of item specification that detail the science content were included.</p>
--	--	--

**Section 2.2 Summary Statement**

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

**The State must provide evidence of the following:**

**For general R/LA and mathematics:**

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

Evidence of the areas of expertise of item reviewers used in the development process for KDE general assessments, specifically including with which special populations the experts worked. Although individuals with "special populations" backgrounds were included, it is unclear the degree to which individuals were specialists/had experience with ELs vs students with disabilities vs other student sub-populations. The information on reviewers should be included in a matrix that indicates which background variables were represented in which reviews. This information can be provided for the most recent iteration of the three year cycle.

### **For general science:**

All evidence for the critical element needs to be provided. The section of the technical manual cited (pp. 16-21) refers exclusively to R/LA, mathematics, and writing.

### **For the alternate assessment:**

- Item specifications.
- More detail needed regarding how accessibility and appropriate range of cognitive complexity were ensured.

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

**Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>• Has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities;</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<p align="center"><u>    KAS Assessment Science    </u></p> <p><b>0_2 KAS 01 2017-2018 K-PREP Technical Manual 2.0.pdf</b> Test Administration (pp. 28 - 30)</p> <p>District/Building Assessment Coordinator Manual: <b>0_1 KAS K-PREP 2019 DAC BAC Manual.pdf</b></p> <p>Test Administrator Manuals: <b>0_1 KAS K-PREP 2019 TAM Grade 4.pdf</b> <b>0_1 KAS K-PREP 2019 TAM Grade 7.pdf</b></p> <p>Administrator Training: <b>2_3 ALL_01 Administration-Code-Training.pdf</b></p> <p align="center"><u>    KAS Alternate Assessment    </u></p> <p><b>2_3 ALT_01 2017-18 Combined Overview-Attainment Task Administration Guide FINAL.pdf</b></p> <p><b>2_3 ALT_02 2017-2018 Overview and AT Part 1-KDE TRG Final.pdf</b></p> <p><b>2_3 ALT_03 2017-2018 Overview and AT Part 2-KDE TRG Final.pdf</b></p>	<p>No evidence was requested for R/LA and mathematics general following previous review.</p> <p><b>General Science</b></p> <p>Tests appear to be paper-based rather than technology-based.</p> <p>Evidence supports procedures for test administration. The evidence that the policies and procedures are not clear in how information is communicated to all educators. No evidence was provided for training on how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities.</p> <p>No evidence was provided to illustrate communication, such as e-mails, websites, or listserv messages to inform relevant staff of the availability of documents for downloading or cover memos that accompany hard copies of the materials delivered to districts and schools.</p> <p>Documentation is needed of the State’s procedures to ensure that all test coordinators, test administrators, and other individuals involved in test administration receive training for each test administration, such as forms for sign-in sheets or screenshots of electronic forms for tracking attendance, assurance forms, or identification of individuals responsible for tracking attendance.</p> <p>District and Building Assessment Coordinators' Manual Test Administrator's Manual and Scripts includes accommodations information in a list.</p> <p>Evidence is needed that the State provides key documents regarding test administration to district and school test coordinators and administrators, such as e-mails, websites,</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

		<p>or listserv messages to inform relevant staff of the availability of documents for downloading or cover memos that accompany hard copies of the materials delivered to districts and schools.</p> <p>Evidence is needed of the State’s process for documenting modifications or disruptions of standardized test administration procedures (e.g., unapproved non-standard accommodations, electric power failures or hardware failures during technology-based testing), such as sample of incidences documented during the most recent year of test administration in the State.</p> <p>Evidence of schedules and agendas for training sessions is needed for different groups of individuals involved in test administration (e.g., district and school test coordinators, test administrators, school computer lab staff, accommodation providers).</p> <p>Documentation is needed of the State’s procedures to ensure that <u>all</u> test coordinators, test administrators, and other individuals involved in test administration receive training.</p> <p><b>Alternate Assessment – R/LA, Mathematics, Science</b></p> <p>Tests appear to be paper-based rather than technology-based.</p> <p>If portfolio or test items are scored by examiners, the State should provide training materials that include agendas, training presentations, and evidence of opportunities for scorer practice including rubrics, exemplars, and practice item response sets to ensure that staff involved in scoring these items are prepared to do so with fidelity.</p> <p>No evidence is included that educators have been consistently trained.</p>
--	--	---

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

### Section 2.3 Summary Statement

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

#### **For general and Alternate R/LA, mathematics, and science the State must provide:**

- Evidence for how the State communicates and provides key documents regarding test administration to district and school test coordinators and administrators, such as e-mails, websites, or listserv messages to inform relevant staff of the availability of documents for downloading or cover memos that accompany hard copies of the materials delivered to districts and schools.
- Evidence of the State's process for documenting modifications or disruptions of standardized test administration procedures (e.g., unapproved non-standard accommodations), such as a sample of incidences documented during the most recent year of test administration.
- Evidence of schedules for training sessions needed for different groups of individuals involved in test administration (e.g., district and school test coordinators, test administrators, school computer lab staff, accommodation providers), including agendas.
- Documentation of the State's procedures to ensure that all test coordinators, test administrators, and other individuals involved in test administration receive 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.

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

**Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. Monitoring of test administration should be demonstrated for all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS.</p>	<p align="center"><u>    </u> <b>KAS Assessment Science</b> <u>    </u></p> <p>KDE conduct on-site visits to districts and school during test windows. Form used during observation:  <b>2_4 ALL_01 2019 Kentucky Site Visits Survey Questions.pdf</b>  <i>[Note: references to online assessment do not apply to grade 4 &amp; 7 science assessments, which were paper and pencils tests.]</i></p> <p align="center"><u>    </u> <b>KAS Alternate Assessment</b> <u>    </u></p> <p><b>2_4 ALT_01 Alternate Assessment District Checklist.pdf</b></p> <p><b>2_4 ALT_02 District Monitoring Checklist Training.pdf</b></p>	<p>For KAS Science:</p> <p>KDE provided an observation form that it uses for onsite visits to districts and schools during test windows. This is a detailed form that includes a wide range of test administration questions and is specific about how the monitor should collect evidence. Department staff note that it would have been helpful to know how many visits are conducted and how visits are determined. The test administration training did not include this information.</p> <p>For KAS Alternate Science:</p> <p>In addition to its general test monitoring form, KDE uses an Alternate Assessment District Checklist to monitor test administration of the alternate assessment. Districts are to do one checklist for each teacher, looking at folders for all students the teacher is in charge of to see that all required materials are present. Test administration is also monitored for at least one student to verify that appropriate accommodations have been given. The SEA will randomly audit LEA monitoring documents.</p> <p>Department staff determined that the State needs to provide evidence that monitoring occurred, and evidence that the Site Visit Checklist includes alternate assessment.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u><b>x</b><u>  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>For KAS Science and Alternate Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 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 (e.g. evidence of a process for selecting and conducting monitoring visits, evidence that monitoring occurred).</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

**Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), 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;</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> <li>• Application of test security procedures to all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS.</li> </ul>	<p align="center"><u>          All Assessments          </u></p> <p><b>2_3 ALL_01 Administration-Code-Training.pdf</b> Non-Disclosure (slide 7) Test Security (slides 8-12) Monitoring (slides 13-14)</p> <p><b>2_5 ALL_05 Documented Incidences Issue Codes 1996-2015.pdf</b></p> <p><b>2_5 ALL_06 Allegation Reporting Overview.pdf</b></p> <p><b>2_5 ALL_01 Steps to Follow When a Testing Allegation or Irregularity Occurs.pdf</b></p> <p><b>2_6 KP_03 K-PREP Data Security.pdf</b></p> <p align="center"><u>          KAS Alternate Assessment          </u></p> <p><b>2_4 ALT_02 District Monitoring Checklist Training.pdf</b> (pp.5-7)</p> <p><b>2_5 ALT_01 KY Alternate Assessment Code of Ethics.pdf</b></p> <p><b>2_5 ALT_02 DAC Training.pdf</b> (p.18)</p> <p><b>2_5 ALT_03 Nondisclosure Form 2017-18.pdf</b></p> <p><b>2_6 KP_03 K-PREP Data Security.pdf</b></p>	<p><b>All</b></p> <p>No evidence was requested for R/LA and mathematics general following previous review.</p> <p>Documents collectively describe prevention and detection of assessment irregularities, and provide evidence of outcomes from the process. 2_6 KP 03 addresses investigation by Pearson.</p> <p>Evidence of remediation appears to be missing from the documents.</p> <p>Evidence is needed of results or reports of internal or independent monitoring, audit, or evaluation of the State’s test security policies, procedures and practices.</p> <p>A State security plan, or excerpts from the State’s assessment contracts or other materials that show expectations, rules and procedures for reducing security threats and risks and protecting test materials during item development, test construction, and materials is needed.</p> <p>Documented procedures for tracking the chain of custody of secure materials and for maintaining security is needed.</p> <p>More detail is needed regarding test security instructions for accommodations providers (e.g., readers, sign language interpreter).</p> <p>Evidence of procedures for investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities needed.</p> <p><b>Alternate Assessment – R/LA, Mathematics, Science</b></p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

		Peer reviewers were concerned to read that “Monitoring of test administration is not required”-2_5 ALT_02 DAC Training.pdf (p.18).
<b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence of results or reports of internal or independent monitoring, auditing, or evaluating of the State’s test security policies, procedures, and practices.</li><li>• A plan with a timeline for changing the policy of a different, lowered expectation for monitoring on the alternate assessment, compared to the general assessment. It is not appropriate that monitoring is optional, rather than required, on the alternate assessment.</li></ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

**Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results;</li> <li>• To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>          All Assessments          </u></p> <p><b>2_6 ALL_01 Data_Governance_Policy_v1.4.pdf</b></p> <p><b>2_6 ALL_02 DistrictGuidance_securityprivacy.pdf</b></p> <p><b>2_6 KP_03 K-PREP Data Security.pdf</b></p> <p><b>6_4 ALL_15 Sch Report Card Simpsonville EL.pdf</b> See footnote beginning on p.3 “An asterisk * indicates that information has been suppressed from view due to student data privacy requirements.”</p> <p><b>2_6 ALL_06 KDE Data Access, Collection and Use Policy.pdf</b></p>	<p>No evidence was submitted to address the concerns identified in the previous review.</p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information.</p> <p>The State provided no evidence of training requirements and materials for State staff, contractors and vendors, and others related to data integrity.</p> <p>Documentation was not provided that the above policies and procedures, as applicable, are clearly communicated to all relevant personnel (e.g., State staff, assessment, districts, and schools, assessment consortia, vendors and others, as applicable).</p> <p>2_6 ALL_06 indicates small cell data is suppressed. The minimum number is not indicated, nor is the potential for individuals to be identified because some cells have frequencies very close to the size of the entire population (i.e., very large cell sizes), potentially creating the same problem .</p> <p>The State provided information regarding data governance including critical roles, decision-making authority, responsibilities and associated activities, and accountability of individuals and groups that encounter enterprise data assets, as well as guidance intended to assist districts involved in building and using education data systems to develop policies related to data privacy, confidentiality, and security practices. The State also provided specific information to guide districts in developing contractual agreements with data integration and data sharing vendors Pearson's security plan.</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

### Section 2.6 Summary Statement

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Security plan protecting test response data and related materials during scoring and reporting.
- Rules and procedures for secure transfer of student-level assessment data.
- Policies and procedures to ensure that aggregate or de-identified data intended for public release do not inadvertently disclose any personally identifiable information needed (including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups).
- Training requirements and materials for State staff, contractors, and vendors, and others related to data integrity and appropriate handling of personally identifiable information.
- Documentation that the aforementioned policies and procedures, as applicable, are clearly communicated to all relevant personnel (e.g., State staff, assessment, districts, and schools, assessment consortia, vendors and others, as applicable).
- Evidence of rules and procedures for ensuring that data released by third parties (e.g., agency partners, vendors, external researchers) are reviewed for adherence to State Statistical Disclosure Limitation (SDL) standards and do not reveal personally identifiable information.

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY**

**Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. The State’s validity evidence includes evidence that:</p> <p><b><u>The State’s academic assessments</u></b> measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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), balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> <li>• Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards;</li> <li>• If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards and administers alternate assessments aligned with those standards, the assessments show adequate alignment to the State’s academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined</li> </ul>	<p>No alignment study was done. Alignment will be analyzed and evidence submitted in future Peer Reviews.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Reviews.  <u>    KAS Assessment Science    </u></p> <p><b>0_2 KAS 01 2017-2018 K-PREP Technical Manual 2.0.pdf</b> (pp.67-73)</p> <p><b>0_2 KAS 04 Science Grade 4 and 7 Ind Align Review.pdf</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>    KAS Alternate Assessment    </u></p> <p><b>2_1 ALT_01 Standard Selection Process.pdf</b> (p.12)</p> <p><b>1_3 ALT_01 Science PLDs.pdf</b></p>	<p><b>General Assessment – R/LA, Mathematics, Science</b></p> <p>The technical manual (0_2 KAS 01) on p. 71 describes the process used by the State to develop aligned items. This information is not as strong as an independent alignment review.</p> <p>No alignment study was conducted for R/LA or mathematics. The State indicated an alignment study will be conducted in the future and submitted for Peer Review.</p> <p>The State should provide a systematic process and timeline to address any gaps or weaknesses identified in the science alignment study.</p> <p>The independent alignment review was conducted for Grade 4 and Grade 7 science. At both grade levels, most criteria for alignment were met. For grade 4, neither of two forms met criteria for DOK adequacy, one form failed to meet criteria for range of adequacy, balance indices were not met for about half of dimensions across forms and neither form met multidimensional adequacy. For grade 7, only the dimension DCI on one form failed to meet the balance index, and neither form met multidimensional adequacy. The State should provide a plan for addressing these limitations.</p> <p><b>Alternate Assessment – R/LA, Mathematics, Science</b></p> <p>No evidence was requested following previous review.</p> <p>The documents provided address standard selection and PLDs for the Alternate KPREP in science. Neither</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

<p>in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>		<p>document is strong evidence of alignment nor content validity.</p> <p>Evidence submitted does not support this critical element.</p> <p>See relevant comments under 2.1 regarding blueprint and processes related to knowledge and skills.</p> <p>For the K-PREP R/LA and mathematics in grades 3-8 R/LA, mathematics, and science in high school, "No alignment study was done. Alignment will be analyzed and evidence submitted in future Peer Reviews." This needs a plan and timeline.</p> <p>Alignment studies are needed in all content areas.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>For all assessments, the State must provide:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of alignment (with the exception of general science – see note* below comment), including a report of results of an independent alignment study that is technically sound (i.e., appropriate method and process, appropriate units of analysis, clear criteria) and documents adequate alignment, specifically indicating that:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each assessment is aligned to its test blueprint; See relevant comments under CE 2.1 regarding a blueprint;</li> <li>• Each assessment is aligned to the full range of the State’s academic content standards;</li> <li>• The procedures the State follows ensure such alignment during test development;</li> <li>• The State implements a systematic process and timeline to address any gaps or weaknesses identified in the alignment studies.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>*For General science- an alignment study has been conducted. Evidence of the State acting on the results of the study needs to be provided for this critical element, consistent with the aforementioned requests for all assessments.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

**Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap: <b><u>the intended cognitive processes</u></b> appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>KP: See “Student Engagement During Testing” (p. 9) in <b>3_2 ALT_01 Standards Validation Report 2015-16.pdf</b> for teachers’ expert judgement of the science test’s requirements for complex demonstrations of knowledge and skills.</p> <p>ALT: See <b>4_2 ALT_01 Content (and Bias) Review Training.pdf</b> (pp. 6 &amp; 7): Item reviewer (expert judgement) instructions</p> <p align="center"><u>    <b>KAS Assessment Science</b>    </u></p> <p><b>0_2 KAS_11 HumRRO 2017 No 035 KDE Science Field Test Observation.pdf</b> (See Student Questions About the Test pp.5-6)</p> <p align="center"><u>    <b>KAS Alternate Assessment</b>    </u></p> <p>KDE ensures that the KAS Alternate Assessment measure the intended cognitive processes by training of item developers, annual standard-setting panelists and educators who make expert observational judgements:</p> <p><b>3_2 ALT_01 Science Content Standards Alignment and Bias Review Report.pdf</b> (p. 5)</p> <p><b>3_2 ALT_02 Science Standard Setting Report.pdf</b> (Question 6 on p. 4)</p> <p><b>6_3 ALT_01 ALTERNATE K-PREP Science Standard Setting Training.pdf</b> (Slide 23)</p>	<p><b>General Assessment – R/LA, Mathematics, Science</b></p> <p>3_2 ALT_01 Standards Validation Report 2015-16 <u>p.9</u> is referenced, although this document refers to the Alternate K-PREP and has four pages none of which covering cognitive processes.</p> <p>The evidence provided does not meet the requirements for this critical element. The evidence submitted is for Alternate Assessment standards setting which does not meet the evidence for this critical element.</p> <p>The focus of this study is on test administration and usability. The study actually states the purpose is “investigation of the administration” on p. 4. Peers expected a think-aloud lab or commensurate evidence. Validity based on cognitive processes is not addressed. For science, 0_2 KAS_11, the section on student questions about the test (pp. 5-6) does not address validity based on cognitive processes. This type of evidence is best collected through think aloud labs or item analysis protocols, or minimally through distractor analysis and recording of the time spent attending to each item.</p> <p>The HumRRO report addresses the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student Questions about the Test</li> <li>• Test Administrators’ Understanding of How to Administer the Test</li> <li>• Appropriateness of the Time Allotted for Testing</li> <li>• Student Confusion about Test Content</li> <li>• Student Confusion about Test Organization/Formatting</li> <li>• Student Engagement during Testing</li> </ul> <p>Student questions about the test address content, format,</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

		<p>and organization, not cognitive processes.</p> <p>Intent related to cognitive processes is to a limited degree reflected, however more direct evidence is needed that the intended cognitive processes are tapped (e.g., cognitive labs).</p> <p><b>Alternate Assessment – R/LA, Mathematics, and Science</b></p> <p>Documents addressing alignment, bias, and standard setting involve expert judgement of those characteristics. Expert judgement of cognitive processes is not included. This type of evidence is best collected through cognitive/think aloud labs or item analysis protocols, or minimally through distractor analysis and recording of the time spent attending to each item.</p> <p>Item reviewer (expert judgment) instructions are provided.</p> <p>The evidence provided illustrates standards setting and bias and sensitivity but not cognitive processes.</p> <p>The KY Alternate Assessment is based on the original KY content standards and not extensions of the content standards.</p> <p>For bias and standards alignment educators were trained to identify features of a mixture of DOK levels across the items with <b>no level 1</b> questions. It is unclear whether this is appropriate for students on alternate assessment.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>For all assessments, the State must provide:</b></p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

- Evidence that intended cognitive processes are being measured (e.g., cognitive labs [think aloud labs], surveys or focus groups of students following test completion regarding thought processes during the test). The evidence needs to show students are employing strategies and thinking during testing in the ways intended by the test design.

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



**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

		<p>for other student sub groups (e.g., for ELs, speakers of different home languages) is needed.</p> <p>Evidence that ancillary constructs needed for success on the assessments do not provide inappropriate barriers to measuring the achievement of all students (e.g., evidence from cognitive labs or documentation of item development procedures) are needed.</p> <p>See relevant comments in 3.1 and 3.2</p> <p>The subdomain scores show low error for a wide range of student abilities and the high correlations between subscores and the total score, along with moderate inter-subscore correlations reveal a pattern consistent with valid subdomain scores. Because internal consistency of subdomains in science are not provided, it is unknown whether the moderate correlations are a product of low reliability.</p> <p><b>Alternate Assessment – R/LA, Mathematics, Science</b></p> <p>Alternate K-PREP does not report subscales.</p> <p>No evidence was provided that meets this critical element.</p> <p>The state could provide validity evidence based on the internal structure of the assessments, such as analysis of response patterns for administered items (e.g., student responses indicating no attempts at answering questions or suggesting guessing) or reports of analyses that show the dimensionality of the assessment is consistent with the structure of the State’s: science content standards.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

**For General Science, the State must provide:**

- Correlations of total test and subdomain scores, as well as intercorrelations among subdomain scores.
- Reports of analyses of the internal structure and analyses of the dimensionality of the assessment showing consistency with the structure of the standards. This could be addressed by specifying which models were tested using confirmatory factor analysis in each content area.

**For the Alternate Assessments, the State must provide:**

- See relevant comments in CEs 3.1 and 3.2.

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.

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

**Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>KP: In developing standards and assessments, KDE chose to focus on college and career-readiness. As evidence, achievement standard-setting was tightly coupled to the ACT assessment. See <b>0_2 ALL_01 HumRRO 2013-007 Policy EOC and K-PREP Cut Scores.pdf</b> (pp. 7-10)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">___ <b>KAS Assessment Science</b> ___</p> <p><b>0_2 KAS 03 KY Science Standard Setting 2018 TechReport V1.2.pdf</b> (See Follow-up Review Meeting on pp. 26 – 29 for information from other variables used by panelists.)</p> <p>ALT: KDE has applied for a grant with a consortium of states to look at validity. Strengthening the Utility and Validity of Alternate Assessments aligned to Alternate Academic Achievement Standards to Improve Student Outcomes (SUVA).</p> <p><b>3_4 ALT_01 2016-2018_South Carolina Project Abstract SUVA.pdf</b> If that grant is not funded, KDE is looking into analyzing the relationship between alternate assessment scores and results from schools that are beginning to implement standard-based grading for student on IEPs as a validity indicator.</p>	<p><b>General Assessment – R/LA, Mathematics, Science</b></p> <p>0_2 ALL_01 presents results of a study linking K-PREP assessment scores in R/LA and mathematics to ACT scores. No correlations between scores from the two measures are provided. This type of evidence would provide simple support for validity based on relations with other variables.</p> <p>0_2 KAS 03 provided information on the relationship between K-PREP cut scores and students scoring at various proficiency levels in science. Correlations with other measures of science would be better evidence for addressing this CE 3.4.</p> <p>The State provided an analysis to college readiness.</p> <p>Evidence was not provided of positive relationships between science assessment results and external measures that assess similar constructs, such as NAEP and college-readiness assessments.</p> <p><b>Alternate Assessment – R/LA, Mathematics, Science</b></p> <p>3_4 ALT_01 is the abstract for a proposed grant project. The abstract does not explicitly address validity evidence based on relations with other variables. The backup plan to analyze the relationship between Alternate K-PREP scores and standard-based grades may be appropriate.</p> <p>Positive correlations with external measures that assess similar constructs are needed.</p> <p>Convergent and divergent relationships with measures other than test scores, such as performance criteria or post-secondary employment, could be provided.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

		<p>The State could provide results of any analyses between assessment results and variables related to test takers (e.g., instructional time on content aligned with grade-level content standards).</p> <p>Positive correlations with external measures and convergent and divergent relationships with measures other than test scores are needed. Examples could include correlations between proficiency on the high-school AA-AAAS and performance in post-secondary education, vocational training or competitive integrated employment.</p>
<b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>For the General R/LA and mathematics in grades 3-8, The State must provide evidence of the following:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Studies of correlations/ relationships between the General R/LA and math tests and other tests/measures of the same/similar constructs for all tested grades.</li> </ul> <p><b>For Science, The State must provide evidence of the following:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Correlation matrix including R/LA, mathematics, and science total scores, to confirm divergence among the three tests AND</li> <li>• Positive correlations with external measures that assess similar constructs needed AND/OR</li> <li>• Convergent and divergent relationships with measures other than test scores, such as performance criteria including college- and career-readiness (e.g., college-enrollment rates; success in related entry-level, college credit-bearing courses; post-secondary employment in jobs that pay living wages).</li> </ul> <p><b>For the alternate assessment in all three areas, The State must provide evidence of the following:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Correlation matrix including R/LA, mathematics, and science total scores, to confirm divergence among the three tests AND</li> <li>• Positive correlations with external measures and convergent and divergent relationships with measures other than test scores are needed AND/OR</li> <li>• Correlations between proficiency on the high-school AA-AAAS and performance in post-secondary education, vocational training, or competitive integrated employment.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER**

**Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. If the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, measures of reliability for the assessment overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of <b><u>a student’s academic achievement</u></b>.</li> </ul>	<p align="center"><u>    KAS Assessment Science    </u></p> <p><b>0_2 KAS 01 2017-2018 K-PREP Technical Manual 2.0.pdf</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reliability pp.59-65</li> </ul> <p><b>0_2 KAS 02 2017-2018 K-PREP Yearbook 2.0.pdf</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reliability Appendix M pp. 126 – 128</li> <li>• CSEM Appendix G pp. 32 – 38</li> <li>• Accuracy Appendix P pp. 152 – 154</li> </ul> <p align="center"><u>    KAS Alternate Assessment    </u></p> <p>ALT: See <b>4_1 ALT_01 2016 Reliability Report.pdf</b></p> <p>Classification Accuracy: <b>02 ALT_02 SuppTechReport_2016.pdf</b> (pp. 3-4)</p> <p><b>4_1 ALT_01 Science Reliability Report.pdf</b> (see Appendix A for reliability and Appendix B for overall SEM)</p> <p><b>4_1 ALT_02 Supplemental Analysis_2018.pdf</b> (Conditional Standard Error of Measurement and Classification Accuracy)</p> <p>KDE does not administer any computer-adaptive tests</p>	<p><b>General Assessment – R/LA, Mathematics, Science</b></p> <p>ACT QualityCore EOC R/LA, mathematics, and science has been discontinued.</p> <p>In 0_2 KAS 02 overall alphas are pretty low across grades and forms for high stakes decision making (alphas = .76 to .80). For Grade 7, operational set #1, alphas were far too low for Migrant (.59, n = 83) and for LEP (.57, n = 574). It would be good to know the reason (e.g., high reading load) and the steps the State will take to address lack on internal consistency. SEM is reported overall and by student group. CSEMS are variable and seem low enough near cut scores, particularly for proficiency. Accuracy was acceptable (&gt;80%) for dichotomous proficiency distinction across grades and forms.</p> <p>CSEMs are not reported by student group and were not reported for subdomain scores. Consistency and accuracy of estimates was not reported by student group.</p> <p>Internal consistency reliability estimate is the coefficient alpha. Coefficient alpha estimates for each overall test and by item type—multiple-choice and constructed response—are provided for each grade and subject in Appendix M of the Yearbook.</p> <p>Reliability estimates are provided the overall testing population as well as by gender, ethnicity, and other student breakout groups.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>In addition, coefficient alpha estimates are provided for each major subscale in R/LA and mathematics, not in science.</p> <p><b>Alternate Assessment – R/LA, Mathematics, Science</b></p> <p>Per 4_1 ALT_01, Overall alphas are pretty low across grades and forms for high stakes decision making (alphas = .77 to .85). SEM was reported for grade levels combined, which seems unusual since they likely have different items.</p> <p>Per 4_1 ALT_02 Alternate K-PREP science had acceptable internal consistency (alpha = .82) for fourth grade and marginal internal consistency (alpha = .77) for seventh grade. SEM was reported for the two grade levels combined, which seems unusual since they likely have different items.</p> <p>Per 02 ALT 02, classification accuracy was acceptable (&gt;80%) for dichotomous distinctions across grades for reading, writing, and mathematics. Also, CSEMS are variable and seem low enough near cut scores, particularly for proficiency in reading, writing, and mathematics.</p> <p>Per 4_1 ALT_02, classification accuracy was acceptable (&gt;80%) for dichotomous distinctions across grades for science. Also, CSEMS are variable and seem low enough near cut scores, particularly for science.</p> <p>None of the reliability information (i.e., evidence for CE 4.1) for the Alternate K-PREP was reported by subgroup.</p>
<b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>For General science, the State must provide:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explanation of generally low alphas for the total population for total scores, including a plan for addressing this concern.</li> <li>• Explanation of very low alphas for students from migrant and LEP groups, including a plan for addressing this concern.</li> <li>• Overall and CSEMs for subdomain scores for the total population and by student subgroup.</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates reported by student subgroup (as indicated in the critical element).</li> </ul> <p><b>For the Alternate in all content areas the State must provide:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explanation of generally low alphas for the total scores for the total population, including a plan for addressing this concern.</li> <li>• All reliability information (i.e., all parts of CE 4.1) reported by student subgroup.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

**Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><i>For all State academic assessments,</i> assessments should be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (see definition<sup>1</sup>).</p> <p><b>For academic content assessments,</b> the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in their design, development and analysis.</p>	<p>KP: Bias and Sensitivity reviews: <b>0_2 KP 01 2017-2018 K-PREP Technical Manual 2.0</b> (pp. 18-20) DIF Summaries: <b>0_2 KP 02 2017-2018 K-PREP Yearbook 2.0.pdf</b> (pp. 19-20)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">____ <b>KAS Assessment Science</b> ____</p> <p><b>0_2 KAS 01 2017-2018 K-PREP Technical Manual 2.0.pdf</b> Test Development Chapter (pp. 15 – 27) Reference to Universal Design at the top of page 17.</p> <p>ALT: <b>4_2 ALT_01 Content (and Bias) Review Training.pdf</b> <b>4_2 ALT_02 Content Standards Alignment and Bias Review Report.pdf</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">_____ <b>KAS Alternate Assessment</b> _____</p> <p><b>2_1 ALT_02 Science content and bias training.pdf</b> <b>3_2 ALT_01 Science Content Standards Alignment and Bias Review Report.pdf</b> (pp. 3-4)</p>	<p><b>General Assessment – R/LA, Mathematics, Science</b> No evidence was provided for principles of UDL in design. Other evidence not provided included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation describing approaches used in the design and development of the State’s assessments (e.g., principles of UDL, language simplification, accessibility tools and features embedded in test items or available as an accompaniment to the items.</li> <li>• Documentation of procedures for developing and reviewing items in alternative formats or substitute items and for ensuring these items conform with item specifications.</li> <li>• Documentation of routine bias and sensitivity training for item writers and reviewers.</li> </ul> <p>Evidence of UDL on page 17 is about accessibility of items and content development. No documentation of the use of the principles of UDL for developing and reviewing items in alternative formats or substitute items and for ensuring these items conform with item specifications were found and there is no documentation of routine bias and sensitivity training for item writers and reviewers.</p> <p>No study was found (e.g., differential item functioning (DIF) and differential test functioning (DTF) analyses) that identified possible bias or inconsistent interpretations of results across student groups.</p> <p>The Technical Manual (p. 20, Table 2.1) provides K-PREP Bias and Content Review Meeting Participation Summary</p>

<sup>1</sup> see page 28 of “*A State’s Guide to the U.S. Department of Education’s Assessment Peer Review Process*”, September 24, 2018 available at: [www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html](http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html)

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

		<p>provides position type (teacher, non-teacher educator, and general public) and special populations experiences (no, yes). The table also provides gender, ethnicity, educational attainment, and years teaching. Specific expertise of item reviewers was lost or destroyed during an office move.</p> <p>0_2 KP 02 indicated DIF analyses were conducted. No discussion is included of the process for addressing findings, such as with the 7 reading items that displayed substantial DIF.</p> <p><b>Alternate Assessment – R/LA, Mathematics, Science</b></p> <p>A cycle of review occurred for bias and sensitivity.</p> <p>No evidence of UDL design was provided.</p> <p>2_1 ALT_02 and 3_2 ALT_01 describe an appropriate science content and bias training for task reviewers. Neither document refers to universal design, nor to empirical examination of fairness such as DIF analyses, subgroup performance comparisons, or psychometric analyses disaggregated by group as mentioned in CE 4.1.</p> <p>"... the accessibility of items for all intended test takers is specified through guidelines of universal design. These guidelines include precautions of items' discriminating based on age, gender, ethnicity, disability, socioeconomic status, and English language proficiency.</p> <p>All guidelines are presented through training workshops and as documentation for use throughout the development of test content. Appendices A through O of this manual contain various materials used within the item development process, including presentations for workshops and item review checklists discussed in the next few sections..." (p. 15)</p>
--	--	--

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

		<p>Guidelines for accessibility and accessibility tools and features included in item specifications, description or examples of instructions provided to item writers are needed.</p> <p>Description of processes to evaluate items for bias during pilot and field testing is needed.</p> <p><b>KAS Alternate Assessment</b>          No documentation was found describing approaches used in the design and development of the assessment (e.g., principles of UDL, language simplification, accessibility tools).</p> <p>No results of bias reviews or frequency distributions of the tested population by disability category were found.</p> <p>The reviewers examined six sets of five items for each of the six content standards in each grade level 4, 7 and 11. This represents an item count of 30 items per grade for a total of 90 items per year.</p> <p>Results of bias reviews or, when feasible given the size of the tested student population, empirical analyses (e.g., DIF and DTF analyses by disability category) are needed.</p> <p>The number of participants with EL experience/familiarity vs/and students with disabilities is unclear.</p> <p>DIF Summaries: 0_2 KP 02 2017-2018 K-PREP Yearbook 2.0.pdf (pp. 19-20) should include additional subgroups (e.g., economically disadvantaged, students with disabilities, English learners).</p>
--	--	---

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

### Section 4.2 Summary Statement

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

#### **For general R/LA and mathematics, the State must provide:**

Evidence of the areas of expertise of item reviewers used in the development process for KDE general assessments, specifically including with which special populations the experts worked. Although individuals with "special populations" backgrounds were included, it is unclear the degree to which individuals were specialists/had experience with ELs vs students with disabilities vs other student sub-populations. The information on reviewers should be included in a matrix that indicates which background variables were represented in which reviews. This information can be provided for the most recent iteration of the three year cycle.

#### **For all assessments, the State must provide:**

- Empirical evidence that documents the fairness of the tests (e.g., differential item functioning [DIF] analyses of major subgroups).
- Guidelines for accessibility and accessibility tools and features included in item specifications, including descriptions or examples of instructions provided to item writers, and much more information about how UDL is incorporated into test design and item writing.
- Description of processes to evaluate items for bias during pilot and field testing.
- Analyses of major subgroups (e.g., by ethnicity, SES, language status, disability status) needed, including for example mean scores by subgroup and explanations for any group differences.
- Although some DIF analyses are provided for the general assessment (in 0\_2 KAS 02 2017-2018 K-PREP Yearbook 2.0.pdf p. 20), DIF analyses are needed for both general and alternate assessments that show whether particular items (e.g., essays, performance tasks, or items requiring specific knowledge or skills) function differently for other student sub groups (e.g., for ELs, speakers of different home languages). Information is needed on how DIF analyses are interpreted and the steps that are taken with items discovered to function differentially.

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

**Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for <b>academic assessments</b>, including performance for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p align="center"><u>    KAS Assessment Science    </u></p> <p><b>0_2 KAS 01 2017-2018 K-PREP Technical Manual 2.0.pdf</b> (Scaled Scores pp.49 - 53)</p> <p><b>0_2 KAS 02 2017-2018 K-PREP Yearbook 2.0.pdf</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix G pp. 32 – 38</li> <li>• Appendix L pp. 115 – 116</li> <li>•</li> </ul> <p>ALT: CSEM: <b>02 ALT_02 SuppTechReport_2016.pdf</b> (pp. 1-2)</p> <p align="center"><u>    KAS Alternate Assessment    </u></p> <p>The Conditional Standard Error of Measurement and Classification Accuracy statistics indicate that the KAS Alternate Assessment is adequately precise across the full performance continuum and at the PLD cut scores.</p> <p><b>4_1 ALT_02 Supplemental Analysis_2018.pdf</b></p>	<p><b>General Assessment – R/LA, Mathematics, Science</b></p> <p>ACT QualityCore EOC R/LA, mathematics, and science has been discontinued.</p> <p>In 0_2 KAS 02 CSEMS are variable and seem low enough near cut scores, particularly for proficiency.</p> <p>CSEMs are not reported by student group and were not reported for subdomain scores.</p> <p><b>Alternate Assessment – R/LA, Mathematics, Science</b></p> <p>Per 02 ALT 02 CSEMs are variable and seem low enough near cut scores, particularly for proficiency in reading, writing, and mathematics.</p> <p>Per 4_1 ALT_02 CSEMs are variable and seem low enough near cut scores, particularly for science.</p> <p>CSEMs are not reported by student group.</p> <p>This evidence does not provide explanation for students performing at the lower performance levels.</p> <p>Other evidence that could be provided for this critical element include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For students at the lowest end of the performance continuum (e.g., pre-symbolic language users or students with no consistent communicative competencies), evidence that the assessment system provides appropriate performance information;</li> <li>• A cumulative frequency distribution or histogram of student scores for each grade and subject on the most recent assessment.</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

		<p>Raw score to scale score information was provided, including SEM by grade, domain, subdomain (Appendix H), Score frequency distributions by grade and domain (Appendix I) and subdomain (Appendix J), and Performance level rates by grade and domain (Appendix L).</p> <p>CSEM and Classification Accuracy by grade and domain are provided.</p> <p>Cumulative frequency distribution or histogram of student scores for each grade and subject is needed.</p> <p>For students at the lowest end of the performance continuum (e.g., pre-symbolic language users or students with no consistent communicative competencies), evidence that the assessment system provides appropriate performance information is needed.</p> <p>CSEM and Classification accuracy by grade and domain provided for Alt R/LA and mathematics 02 ALT 02 SuppTechReport 2016.pdf (pp. 1-2)</p>
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>For all assessments, the State must provide:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CSEMs by student group.</li> <li>• CSEMs by subdomains for tests that have subdomains (i.e., general).</li> </ul> <p><b>For the science alternate assessment, the State must provide:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cumulative frequency distribution or histogram of student scores for each grade and subject.</li> <li>• For students at the lowest end of the performance continuum (e.g., pre-symbolic language users or students with no consistent communicative competencies), evidence that the assessment system provides appropriate performance information.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s <b><u>academic achievement standards</u></b>.</p>	<p>KP:            Scoring procedures: <b>0_2 KP 01 2017-2018 K-PREP Technical Manual 2.0.pdf</b> (pp. 74 - 78)            Inter-rater Reliability: <b>0_2 KP 02 2017-2018 K-PREP Yearbook 2.0.pdf</b> (p. 143)</p> <p align="center"><u>    KAS Assessment Science    </u></p> <p><b>0_2 KAS 01 2017-2018 K-PREP Technical Manual 2.0.pdf</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scoring Guides p. 21</li> <li>• Performance Scoring pp.74 – 77</li> <li>• Quality Control pp. 79 - 82</li> </ul> <p>ALT:  <b>4_4 ALT_01 TAR Administration Guide.pdf</b>            Rater qualification test (Raters must pass before operations scoring): <b>4_4 ALT_02 TAR Quiz 2015-16 final.pdf</b></p> <p><b>0_2 ALL_01 HumRRO 2018 No 085 K-PREP 2018 Third-Party Checking Report.pdf</b></p> <p align="center"><u>    KAS Alternate Assessment    </u></p> <p>Scoring reliability ensured by annual rater training and qualifying rater quiz.</p> <p><b>4_4 ALT_01 2018-19 Overview and AT Part 1.pdf</b>            (slide 4)</p>	<p><b>General Assessment – R/LA, Mathematics, Science</b></p> <p>It is unclear how the interrater agreement was conducted. The evidence should include evidence that the scoring of constructed-response items and includes adequate procedures and criteria for ensuring and documenting inter-rater reliability (e.g., clear scoring rubrics, adequate training for and qualifying of raters, evaluation of inter-rater reliability, and documentation of quality control procedures) and results of inter-rater reliability of scores on constructed-response items.</p> <p>0_2 KP 01 indicates scoring procedures for K-PREP are appropriate. Inter-rater reliability for on-demand writing is almost 100% for perfect plus adjacent agreement, per 0_2 KP 02.</p> <p>Clarity is needed regarding procedures for combining scores to produce any composite scores that are reported and used, and the rationale for these procedures.</p> <p><b>Alternate Assessment – R/LA, Mathematics, Science</b></p> <p>The scoring procedures are not clear. Need documentation of inter-rater reliability (e.g., clear scoring rubrics, adequate training for and qualifying of raters, evaluation of inter-rater reliability, and documentation of quality control procedures) and results of inter-rater reliability of scores on constructed-response items.</p> <p>No documentation is provided that the State has rules for invalidating test results when necessary (e.g., non-attempt, cheating, unauthorized accommodation or modification) and appropriate procedures for</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

		<p>implementing these rules (e.g., operations manual for the State’s assessment and accountability systems, test coordinator manuals and test administrator manuals, or technical reports for the assessments).</p> <p>4_4 ALT_02 is a quiz that must be passed by raters to score the Alternate K-PREP.</p> <p>Documents provided do not include evidence of rater agreement or reliability in scoring Alternate K-PREP tasks.</p> <p>Evidence was not provided that the scoring of constructed-response items/performance tasks includes adequate procedures and criteria for ensuring and documenting inter-rater reliability.</p> <p>More detail is needed regarding participants, evidence of training, and inter-rater reliability.</p>
--	--	---

**Section 4.4 Summary Statement**

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

**For the general R/LA in grades 3-8, the State must provide:**

- Evidence of improved inter-rater reliability for general writing test items. Specifically, details regarding how agreement (perfect, adjacent, etc.) was calculated.

**For the general Science, the State must provide:**

- Evidence of the results of inter-rater reliability analyses of constructed response items, possibly in the same format as the table that was provided for writing, again with details regarding how agreement (perfect, adjacent, etc.) was calculated.
- Clarity regarding procedures for combining scores to produce any composite scores that are reported and used, as well as the rationale for these procedures.

**For the Alternate Assessment in all content areas, the State must provide:**

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

- More detail regarding participants, evidence of training, and inter-rater reliability.
- Procedures for invalidating scores whenever necessary (e.g., non-attempts, cheating, unauthorized accommodation or modification).
- Evidence of the results of inter-rater reliability analyses of constructed response items, possibly in the same format as the table that was provided for writing, again with details regarding how agreement (perfect, adjacent, etc.) was calculated.

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>If the State administers multiple forms of <b>academic assessments</b> within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s <b>academic content standards</b> and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p>KP: Equating procedures: <b>0_2 KP 01 2017-2018 K-PREP Technical Manual 2.0.pdf</b> (pp. 54 - 58)</p> <p>Equating results: <b>0_2 ALL_02 HumRRO 2018 No 085 K-PREP 2018 Third-Party Checking Report.pdf</b>  <u>    KAS Assessment Science    </u></p> <p><b>0_2 KAS 01 2017-2018 K-PREP Technical Manual 2.0.pdf</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Equating pp. 54 – 58</li> </ul> <p>ALT: <b>4_5 ALT_01 2016 Comparability Report.pdf</b></p> <p><u>    KAS Alternate Assessment    </u></p> <p>The first year for science to be reported in accountability was 2017-18. For 2018-19, the alternate assessment underwent a change of removing performance dimensions, and changes to the participation guidelines ultimately requiring new standard setting for 2018-19. Moving forward, comparability across years will be by linked items in each form and relatively stable percentages and cut scores for each performance level.</p> <p><b>4_4 ALT_01 2018-19 Overview and AT Part 1.pdf</b> (see slide 2 for confirmation of the change in assessment requiring new standard setting.)</p>	<p><b>General Assessment – R/LA, Mathematics, Science</b></p> <p><b>KAS Assessment Science</b> The evidence submitted for this critical element is not related to science. Equating was for reading and mathematics only.</p> <p>0_2 KP 01 describes process of equating forms using linking items in R/LA and mathematics. Items were selected based on item type (i.e., multiple choice and short answer) and coverage of domains of each content area.</p> <p>0_2 ALL_02 described HumRRO checking Pearson’s equating process and finding no errors, again in R/LA and mathematics.</p> <p>0_2 KAS 01 is the same document as 0_2 KP 01.</p> <p>Linking and equating information is not provided for science.</p> <p>Description of equating procedures, as well as method used to establish linkages and on the accuracy of equating functions are provided.</p> <p>More information is needed regarding comparability of Braille forms.</p> <p><b>Alternate Assessment – R/LA, Mathematics, Science</b></p> <p>Cut score comparisons were provided for years 14-15 and 15-16. More recent data is not provided.</p> <p>Evidence for this critical element is not sufficient.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

		<p>Alternate K-PREP was changed in 2018-2019 and evidence addressing CE 4.5 is deferred to future years. A plan and schedule are needed.</p> <p>Documentation of year-to-year equating procedures and results needed moving forward for Alternate.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>For the general assessment in R/LA and mathematics, the State must provide:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the procedures used for linking and equating forms across years of test administration (e.g., how linking items were selected, how linking/equating data is used, how linking items represent test blueprints).</li> <li>• Evidence of results of the linking/equating procedures. For the general assessment, the HumRRO report indicates Pearson’s process contained no errors; we did not receive results of that process.</li> <li>• More information regarding comparability of Braille forms.</li> </ul> <p><b>For general science, the State must provide:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full evidence for CE 4.5 for Science. Other documents on the general assessment appear to reference only R/LA and mathematics.</li> </ul> <p><b>For the alternate assessment in all content areas, the State must provide:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of year-to-year equating procedures, as well as the results of those analyses, moving forward.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

**Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>If the State administers any of its assessments in multiple versions within a subject area (e.g., online versus paper-based delivery; <b><u>or a native language version of the academic content assessment</u></b>), grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<p align="center"><u>    </u> <b>KAS Assessment Science</b> <u>    </u></p> <p><b>0_2 KAS 01 2017-2018 K-PREP Technical Manual 2.0.pdf</b> Braille and Large Print Test Materials p. 27</p> <p align="center"><u>    </u> <b>KAS Alternate Assessment</b> <u>    </u></p> <p>NA</p>	<p>No evidence was requested for R/LA and mathematics general following previous review. Ideally the requested information for science would also be available and provided for R/LA and mathematics.</p> <p><b>General Assessment –Science</b></p> <p>0_2 KAS 01 indicated (p. 27) items that were not appropriate for Braille were removed, reducing the maximum number of points. It is unclear whether this resulted in comparable scores between versions of the test.</p> <p>"For Braille test forms, though, it is often the case that some items are not appropriate for translation into Braille. In these situations, items are either replaced with items that can be translated into Braille or they are simply not counted toward examinees' test scores who use the Braille form. For K-PREP, items that were not appropriate for Braille were removed from inclusion in the Braille examinees' test scores, thus reducing the maximum number of test points for Braille examinees." (p. 27)</p> <p>Evidence of comparability was not provided for Braille forms nor for large print test materials.</p> <p>The evidence does not support this critical element.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>X<u>  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>For general science, the State must provide:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More information regarding the process and the criteria for item identification for inclusion vs. removal.</li> <li>Empirical evidence of the comparability of Braille forms.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

**Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has a system for monitoring, 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), and</li> <li>Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website.</li> </ul>	<p align="center"><u>                    All Assessments                    </u></p> <p>TAC: <b>0_3 ALL_06 KRS 158_6454 National Technical Advisory Panel on Assessment and Accountability.pdf</b></p> <p>SCASS: <b>4_7 ALL_01 KRS 158_6452 School Curriculum Assessment and Accountability Council.pdf</b></p> <p align="center"><u>                    KAS Alternate Assessment                    </u></p> <p><b>3_2 ALT_01 Science Content Standards Alignment and Bias Review Report.pdf</b> (p. 2 Plan for Review)</p> <p><b>3_2 ALT_02 Science Standard Setting Report.pdf</b></p>	<p>No evidence was requested for R/LA and mathematics general following previous review.</p> <p><b>All</b></p> <p>Documents collectively describe required backgrounds of persons who will be part of various reviews (bias, alignment, standard setting, assessment and accountability council, TAC).</p> <p>Missing are details of a system of quality control, including technically sound criteria and a plan for making the results public.</p> <p>Evidence that could support this critical element includes plans for future analyses to provide evidence of validity, reliability, and fairness; for independent studies of alignment and comparability, as appropriate; and for requirements for technical reports for the assessments and the content of such reports applicable to each administration of the assessment.</p> <p><b>Alternate</b></p> <p>Documentation is needed of regular internal and external technical review of components of the State’s assessment system, such as State Board of Education minutes, minutes from TAC meetings, and documentation of roles and responsibilities of TAC members.</p> <p>Plan or outline of a deliberate cycle for reviewing and updating State's standards and assessments is needed.</p> <p>Procedures to ensure the inclusion of all students with disabilities is needed.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

		<p>Regarding <b>0_3 ALL_12 703 KAR 5_070 Inclusion of Special Populations Dec 2016.pdf</b>, more detailed findings are needed to support the results. It appears that the results focus more on accessibility--e.g., formatting, vocabulary/language--than alignment to the standards, including breadth and depth.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>No evidence for the critical element was provided. The State must provide evidence of the following:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of a system for monitoring, 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), and</li> <li>• Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples of such evidence include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of regular internal and external technical review of components of the State’s assessment system, such as State Board of Education minutes, minutes from TAC meetings, and documentation of roles and responsibilities of TAC members;</li> <li>• State’s assessment contract that specifies the State’s expectations for analyses to provide evidence of validity, reliability, and fairness; for independent studies of alignment and comparability;</li> <li>• Plan or outline of a deliberate cycle for reviewing and updating State's standards and assessments;</li> <li>• Evidence the State has made information about the technical quality of the assessment system publicly available (e.g., on the State website).</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS**

**Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system. Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, the placement team under Section 504, or the individual or team designated by a district to make that decision under Title II of the ADA, as applicable, based on each student’s individual abilities and needs.</p> <p>If a State adopts alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and administers an alternate assessment aligned with those standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(1)(E) and (b)(2)(D), respectively, the State must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish guidelines for determining whether to assess a student with an AA-AAAS, including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A State definition of “students with the most significant cognitive disabilities” that addresses factors related to cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Provide information for IEP Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</li> </ul>	<p>ALL: Kentucky state rules (KARs) include specific information about including students with disabilities.</p> <p><b>0_3 ALL_12 703 KAR 5_070 Inclusion of Special Populations Dec 2016.pdf</b> <b>pp 6-7:</b> Explanations of assessment options and guidelines for determining best options for individual students. <b>pp 9-15</b> Use of Assistive Technology (accommodations)</p> <p>Part 4 of the Administration Manual outlines how these rules are to be implemented: <b>0_1 ALL_01 K-PREP 2015 DAC BAC Manual Final.pdf</b> Promoting access to general curriculum: <b>5_1 ALL_03 IEP Guidance Document pp 2 8-9 33.pdf</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">_____ <b>All Assessments</b> _____</p> <p><b>0_3 ALL_12 703 KAR 5_070 Inclusion of Special Populations Dec 2016.pdf</b> pp. 4 - 15</p> <p style="text-align: center;">_____ <b>KAS Alternate Assessment</b> _____</p> <p><b>0_3 ALL_12 703 KAR 5_070 Inclusion of Special Populations Dec 2016.pdf</b> pp. 30-35</p> <p><b>5_1 ALT_01 KDE Alternative Diploma vs ESSA State Defined Alternate Diploma Cooperative and District Training.pdf</b> (slides 4 &amp; 18)</p> <p><b>5_1 ALT_02 Parent_Guide_to_Alternate_K-Prep p12.pdf</b> (p.12)</p>	<p>For Critical Elements 5.1 through 5.4: It would be helpful to have a single document that addresses accessibility features and accommodations for students with IEPs, 504 plans, and PSPs related to EL needs. Many examples of such manuals are available, sometimes call Participation Guidelines; one example is the CCSSO Accessibility Manual. Having this information available in a central document would likely improve coherence and completeness of this information.</p> <p>Shyyan, V., Thurlow, M., Christensen, L., Lazarus, S., Paul, J., and Touchette, B. (2016). CCSSO accessibility manual: How to select, administer, and evaluate use of accessibility supports for instruction and assessment of all students. Washington, DC: CCSSO.</p> <p>There is a lack of coherence to this information, which is spread across numerous documents. It is difficult to tell whether procedures were uniformly applied, and it is difficult to know where (for example) a teacher entering the system would obtain this information.</p> <p><b>All</b></p> <p>The listing of accommodations is contained in the documents; no evidence is included of how IEP teams make the decisions, nor how the training occurred.</p> <p>There are still missing pieces of evidence for this critical element.</p> <p>The evidence provides information on specific accommodations.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provides a clear explanation of the differences between assessments aligned with grade-level academic achievement standards and those aligned with alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student's education resulting from taking an AA-AAAS, such as how participation in such assessments may delay or otherwise affect the student from completing the requirements for a regular high school diploma;</li> <li>• Ensure that parents of students assessed with an AA-AAAS are informed that their child's achievement will be measured based on alternate academic achievement standards;</li> <li>• Not preclude a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who takes an AA-AAAS from attempting to complete the requirements for a regular high school diploma; and</li> <li>• Promote, consistent with requirements under the IDEA, the involvement and progress of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in the general education curriculum that is based on the State's academic content standards</li> </ul>	<p><b>5_1 ALT_03 AccommodationsDetermination2016.pdf</b></p> <p><b>5_1 ALT_04 2018 Alternate Assessment Participation Guidelines Record Review Document.pdf</b> (pp. 7-12)</p>	<p>No evidence was provided to demonstrate information for IEP Teams, training materials for IEP Teams to make assessment decisions about students with disabilities.</p> <p>0_3 All_12 provides limited explanation of the differences among assessment options. It is unclear whether this information is intended for parents. It would be difficult for parents to fully understand the assessments based on the provided information. The document also provides lists and descriptions of available accommodations. Some of these descriptions include individual characteristics that would warrant consideration of the accommodations (e.g., scribe p. 26, calculator p. 26); others do not (reader p. 25, extended time p. 27).</p> <p>Accessibility tools and features are not addressed.</p> <p>Information for IEP Teams and IEP templates for children with disabilities in tested grades is needed.</p> <p>Training materials are needed, as applicable, for IEP Teams placement teams, or individuals or teams designated by a district to make assessment decisions about students with disabilities.</p> <p>Participation guidelines are needed for IEP teams to apply in determining, on a case-by-case basis, which students with the most significant cognitive disabilities will be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p><b>Alternate Assessment – R/LA, Mathematics, Science</b></p> <p>No specific evidence to support this critical element was provided.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>for the grade in which the student is enrolled; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop, disseminate information on, and promote the use of appropriate accommodations to ensure that a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who does not take an AA-AAAS participates in academic instruction and assessments for the grade in which the student is enrolled.</li> <li>The State has in place and monitors implementation of guidelines for IEP teams to apply in determining, on a case-by-case basis, which students with the most significant cognitive disabilities will be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, if applicable. Such guidelines must be developed in accordance with 34 CFR § 200.6(d).<sup>2</sup></li> </ul>		<p>5_1 ALT_01 indicates (slide 3) “Recipients of an Alternative High School Diploma will participate in alternate assessments. Slide 4 indicates (in the notes, rather than on the slide) students participating in the alternate assessment can also receive a high school diploma “if they complete the general course of study requirements.” The slide indicates the ARC must determine the cognitive ability and adaptive behavior of a student must prevent completion of a general course of study. This reads as a contradiction: if AA-AAAS only occurs when circumstances make the general track impossible, it is not possible for a student to have AA-AAAS and general degrees.</p> <p>5_1 ALT_02 is a parent-friendly guide to the AA-AAAS. The guide indicates (p. 11) “the ARC must determine the student would not be able to complete the general education course of study and earn a regular high school diploma and would therefore complete an alternate course of study to receive an Alternative High School Diploma.”</p> <p>5_1 ALT 03 is a global checklist of accommodation eligibility. It does not address the individualization of accommodations based on student characteristics.</p> <p>5_1 ALT 04 provides a global checklist of accommodation eligibility.</p> <p>There is no detail of procedures to ensure that the State’s implementation of AA-AAAS for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.</p>

<sup>2</sup> See the full regulation at 34 CFR § 200.6(d) (online at [https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=07e168e9e7a6c5931b4549cc15547ee9&mc=true&node=se34.1.200\\_16&rgn=div8](https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=07e168e9e7a6c5931b4549cc15547ee9&mc=true&node=se34.1.200_16&rgn=div8))

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  </u>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>No evidence for the critical element was provided. The State must provide evidence of the following:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system. Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, the placement team under Section 504, or the individual or team designated by a district to make that decision under Title II of the ADA, as applicable, based on each student’s individual abilities and needs.</li> <li>• Establish guidelines for determining whether to assess a student with an AA-AAAS, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A State definition of “students with the most significant cognitive disabilities” that addresses factors related to cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Provide information for IEP Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provides a clear explanation of the differences between assessments aligned with grade-level academic achievement standards and those aligned with alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student's education resulting from taking an AA-AAAS, such as how participation in such assessments may delay or otherwise affect the student from completing the requirements for a regular high school diploma;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Ensure that parents of students assessed with an AA-AAAS are informed that their child’s achievement will be measured based on alternate academic achievement standards;</li> <li>• Not preclude a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who takes an AA-AAAS from attempting to complete the requirements for a regular high school diploma; and</li> <li>• Promote, consistent with requirements under the IDEA, the involvement and progress of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in the general education curriculum that is based on the State’s academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled; and</li> <li>• Develop, disseminate information on, and promote the use of appropriate accommodations to ensure that a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who does not take an AA-AAAS participates in academic instruction and assessments for the grade in which the student is enrolled.</li> <li>• The State has in place and monitors implementation of guidelines for IEP teams to apply in determining, on a case-by-case basis, which students with the most significant cognitive disabilities will be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, if applicable. Such guidelines must be developed in accordance with 34 CFR § 200.6(d).<sup>3</sup></li> </ul> <p><b>Examples of such evidence include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information for IEP Teams and IEP templates for children with disabilities in tested grades;</li> </ul>		

<sup>3</sup> See the full regulation at 34 CFR § 200.6(d) (online at [https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=07e168e9e7a6c5931b4549cc15547ee9&mc=true&node=se34.1.200\\_16&rgn=div8](https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=07e168e9e7a6c5931b4549cc15547ee9&mc=true&node=se34.1.200_16&rgn=div8))

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training materials, as applicable, for IEP Teams placement teams, or individuals or teams designated by a district to make assessment decisions about students with disabilities;</li> <li>• Accommodations manual providing additional specific for making individualized selections;</li> <li>• Participation guidelines for IEP teams to apply in determining, on a case-by-case basis, which students with the most significant cognitive disabilities will be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards.</li> </ul> <p><b>Peers did not find the previously requested information:</b></p> <p>Clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade level academic achievement standards and assessments based on AA-AAAS;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• Information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities;</li> <li>• Selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;</li> <li>• Procedures to ensure that the State’s implementation of AA-AAAS for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.</li> </ul>	

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

**Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all ELs in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s academic content assessments and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed with a linguistic accommodation(s);</li> <li>• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for ELs;</li> <li>• Assistance regarding selection of appropriate linguistic accommodations for ELs, including to the extent practicable, assessments in the language most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what those students know and can do to determine the students’ mastery of skills in academic content areas until the students have achieved English language proficiency.</li> </ul>	<p>ALL:            Kentucky state rules (KARs) include specific information about including students with disabilities.  <b>0_3 ALL_12 703 KAR 5_070 Inclusion of Special Populations Dec 2016.pdf</b>  <b>pp 16:</b> Explanations of assessment options and guidelines for determining best options for individual students.  <b>pp 17-20</b> Use of Assistive Technology (accommodations)            Part 4 of the Administration Manual outlines how these rules are to be implemented:  <b>0_1 ALL_01 K-PREP 2015 DAC BAC Manual Final.pdf</b>            [Note that this information was included in the original submission. We may not have been clear about how it related to the CE.]</p> <p style="text-align: center;">_____ <b>All Assessments</b> _____</p> <p><b>0_3 ALL_12 703 KAR 5_070 Inclusion of Special Populations Dec 2016.pdf</b> pp. 16 - 22</p> <p style="text-align: center;">_____ <b>KAS Alternate Assessment</b> _____</p> <p><b>5_2 ALT_01 IEP_Guidance_Document.pdf</b> (p. 41)</p>	<p><b>All</b></p> <p>Purpose, standards for inclusion, conditions for accommodations, etc. were provided; however there was insufficient information regarding inclusion of ELs and procedures to determine eligibility, accessibility, or accommodations appropriate for students who are ELs. Evidence with EL linguistic specificity is needed.</p> <p>Accommodations manuals or other key documents that provide information on linguistic accommodations for ELs are needed. Such information could be included in the Test Administration Manuals or other key documents that provide information on available accessibility tools and features that support ELs.</p> <p>Information regarding what types of accommodations may be most appropriate for students with various levels of proficiency in their first language are needed.</p> <p>This critical element is about ELs. Evidence is not about linguistic accommodations. It is unclear how assistance regarding the selection of appropriate accommodations for ELs is provided. Information in key documents must indicate all accommodation decisions be based on individual student needs and provides suggestions regarding what types of accommodations may be most appropriate for students with various levels of proficiency in their first language and English.</p> <p><b>General Assessment – R/LA, Mathematics, Science</b></p> <p>0_3 All_12 provides limited information for determining whether an EL should be assessed with a linguistic</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
		<p>accommodation (p. 16), as well as on identifying ELs (pp. 20-22). It is unclear whether this information is intended for parents. It would be difficult for parents to fully understand the assessments based on the provided information. The document also provides lists and descriptions of available accommodations; there is no description of the student characteristics that would necessitate various accommodations, other than deferring to the Program Services Plan (PSP).</p> <p>Accessibility tools and features are not addressed.</p> <p><b>Alternate Assessment – R/LA, Mathematics, Science</b></p> <p>5_2_ALT_01 provides general guiding questions for an EL’s learning needs (p. 41).</p> <p>The evidence provided does not meet the critical element.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>No evidence for the critical element was provided. The State must provide evidence of the following:</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all ELs in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s academic content assessments and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed with a linguistic accommodation(s);</li> <li>• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for ELs;</li> </ul> <p>Assistance regarding selection of appropriate linguistic accommodations for ELs, including to the extent practicable, assessments in the language most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what those students know and can do to determine the students’ mastery of skills in academic content areas until the students have achieved English language proficiency.</p> <p><b>Examples of such evidence include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information needed regarding inclusion of ELs and procedures to determine eligibility, accessibility, or accommodations appropriate for students who are ELs;</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accommodations manuals or other key documents that provide information on linguistic accommodations for ELs;</li> <li>• Test administration manuals or other key documents that provide information on available accessibility tools and features;</li> <li>• Information regarding what types of accommodations may be most appropriate for students with various levels of proficiency in their first language are needed.</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

**Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and ELs, including ELs with disabilities. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations, such as, interoperability with, and ability to use, assistive technology, are available to measure the <b>academic achievement</b> of students with disabilities.</li> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs;</li> <li>• Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) 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;</li> <li>• Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> <li>• Ensures that accommodations for</li> </ul>	<p>Kentucky state rules (KARs) include specific information about including students with disabilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <b>0_3 ALL_12 703 KAR 5_070 Inclusion of Special Populations Dec 2016.pdf</b></li> <li>§ <b>pp 6-7:</b> Explanations of assessment options and guidelines for guidelines for determining best options for individual students.</li> <li>§ <b>pp 9-15</b> Use of Assistive Technology (accommodations);</li> <li>• And ELs:</li> <li>§ <b>pp 16:</b> Explanations of assessment options and guidelines for guidelines for determining best options for individual students.</li> <li>§ <b>pp 17-20</b> Use of Assistive Technology (accommodations)</li> <li>o Part 4 of the Administration Manual outlines how these rules are to be implemented:</li> <li>o <b>0_1 ALL_01 K-PREP 2015 DAC BAC Manual Final.pdf</b></li> <li>• KDE relies on the process for approving accommodations (Consultation with educators with expertise in Kentucky schools and districts) to develop the list of approved accommodations.</li> <li>• Example of form used to apply for exceptions to the approved accommodations list:</li> </ul> <p><b>5.3 ALL_01</b>  <b>Application to Request Unapproved Calculator.pdf</b></p> <p align="center">_____All Assessments_____</p> <p><b>0_3 ALL_12 703 KAR 5_070 Inclusion of Special Populations Dec 2016.pdf</b>  Accommodations for:</p>	<p>General information about inclusion is provided, however, more specific policies that demonstrate that all students who participate in an assessment with allowable accommodations receive the same benefits as students who participate without those accommodations are needed.</p> <p>Lists of accommodations available for children with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504 and Title II of the ADA, and ELs, that are appropriate and effective for addressing barrier(s) faced by individual students are needed. Such accommodations must be appropriate for the assessment mode and types of available accommodations in the accommodations manual, test coordinators’ manual, or test administrators’ manual.</p> <p>Documentation that describes the interoperability with, and ability to use, assistive technology devices consistent with nationally recognized accessibility standards to measure the academic achievement of students with disabilities is needed.</p> <p>Documentation that scores for students based on assessments administered with allowable accommodations allow for valid inferences is needed.</p> <p>Evidence that the State has a process to review and approve special requests for assessment accommodations beyond those routinely allowed is needed.</p> <p>No evidence was provided that the accommodations are appropriate and effective.</p> <p><b>General Assessment – R/LA, Mathematics, Science</b></p> <p>0_3 All_12 provides a general philosophy of accommodations selections (i.e., individualized, connected</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>all required assessments do not deny students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally pp.4-8</li> <li>• Students with disabilities pp. 8-15</li> <li>• ELs pp.16-22</li> </ul> <p align="center"><u>          <b>KAS Alternate Assessment</b>          </u></p> <p><b>5_1 ALT_03 AccommodationsDetermination2016.pdf</b></p> <p><b>5_2 ALT_01 IEP_Guidance_Document.pdf</b> (pp. 41 &amp; 48)</p> <p><b>5_3 ALT_01 Comparison of IEP, 504, IHP and EAP School Plans (ADA).pdf</b></p> <p><b>5_3 ALT_02 703 KAR 5070 Dec 2016 (page 4).pdf</b></p> <p><b>5_3 ALT_03 Application to Request Unapproved Calculator.pdf</b></p>	<p>to instruction, documented in IEP, 504, or PSP plans), and lists and descriptions of available accommodations. These accommodations are for students with disabilities and/or for ELs. Some of these descriptions include individual characteristics that would warrant consideration of the accommodations (e.g., scribe p. 26, calculator p. 26); others do not (reader p. 25, extended time p. 27).</p> <p>The documents do not describe any data-based evidence (i.e., research or evaluation) of the effectiveness of accommodations once used. Such evidence is necessary to show accommodations have been appropriate, preserve the construct, and allow meaningful interpretations. Such evidence could include reliability coefficients disaggregated by accommodations use, validity coefficients disaggregated by accommodations use, or results of differential boost studies.</p> <p>Other than the application to use an unapproved calculator (5_3 All_01), it is unclear how the State would individually review exceptional accommodations requests.</p> <p>Assurance is not provided that accommodations do not deny students the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.</p> <p><b>Alternate Assessment – R/LA, Mathematics, Science</b></p> <p>There is no evidence of a training provided to those who will make the decisions regarding the need for a unique accommodation.</p> <p>No guidance is provided on linguistic accommodations for ELSCD.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
		<p>5_3 ALT_02 provides a general philosophy of accommodations selections for the alternate assessment (i.e., individualized, connected to instruction, documented in IEP, 504, or PSP plans), and lists and descriptions of available accommodations. Some of these descriptions include individual characteristics that would warrant consideration of the accommodations (e.g., scribe p. 33, calculator p. 33); others do not (manipulatives p. 32, scribe p. 34).</p> <p>5_1 ALT 03 is a global checklist of accommodation eligibility. It does not address the individualization of accommodations based on student characteristics.</p> <p>5_2_ALT_01 provides general guiding questions for an EL’s learning needs (p. 41) and for writing annual measurable goals (p. 48).</p> <p>The documents do not describe any data-based evidence (i.e., research or evaluation) of the effectiveness of accommodations once used. Such evidence is necessary to show accommodations have been appropriate, preserve the construct, and allow meaningful interpretations. Such evidence could include reliability coefficients disaggregated by accommodations use, validity coefficients disaggregated by accommodations use, or results of differential boost studies.</p> <p>Other than the application to use an unapproved calculator (5_3 ALT_03), it is unclear how the State would individually review exceptional or special accommodations requests.</p> <p>Assurance is not provided that accommodations do not deny students the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>No evidence for the critical element was provided. The State must provide evidence of the following:</b></p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and ELs, including ELs with disabilities. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations, such as, interoperability with, and ability to use, assistive technology, are available to measure the <b><u>academic achievement</u></b> of students with disabilities.</li> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs;</li> <li>• Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) 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;</li> <li>• Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> <li>• Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples of such evidence, for all assessments including the alternate, include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More specific policies that demonstrate that all students who participate in an assessment with allowable accommodations receive the same benefits as students who participate without those accommodations (e.g., all students participating in a nationally recognized high school test receive the same type of “college reportable score”);</li> <li>• Lists of accommodations available for children with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504 and Title II of the ADA, and ELs that are appropriate and effective for addressing barrier(s) faced by individual students and <u>appropriate for the assessment mode types of available accommodations</u> in an accommodations manual, test coordinators manual or test administrators manual;</li> <li>• Documentation that describes the interoperability with, and ability to use, assistive technology devices consistent with nationally recognized accessibility standards to measure the academic achievement of students with disabilities;</li> <li>• Empirical documentation that scores for students based on assessments administered with allowable accommodations allow for valid inferences;</li> <li>• Evidence that the State has a process to review and approve requests for assessment accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

**Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures;</li> <li>• Monitored for administrations of all required academic content assessments and AA-AAAS.</li> </ul>	<p align="center">_____ <b>All Assessments</b> _____</p> <p><b>0_1 KAS K-PREP 2019 DAC BAC Manual.pdf</b></p> <p><b>5_4 ALL_01 IDEA_Compliance_Record_Review_Document.pdf</b></p> <p><b>2_4 ALL_01 2019 Kentucky Site Visits Survey Questions.pdf</b></p> <p align="center">_____ <b>KAS Alternate Assessment</b> _____</p> <p><b>2_4 ALT_01 Alternate Assessment District Checklist.pdf</b></p> <p><b>2_4 ALT_02 District Monitoring Checklist Training.pdf</b></p>	<p><b>All</b></p> <p>The State must provide evidence that accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice are consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA.</p> <p>No evidence was requested for R/LA and mathematics general following previous review.</p> <p>2_4 ALL_01 (pp. 3-4) includes survey questions for districts about accommodations use.</p> <p>It is unclear whether any individual monitoring of accommodations use is conducted, thus it is unclear whether accommodations use is consistent with state policies. Whether the accommodations used are appropriate is a matter of construct preservation, noted as missing in CE 5.3. Documents do not address whether individual accommodations are consistent with instructional accommodations nor with student plans (IEP, 504, PSP). Fidelity of accommodations administration was not addressed.</p> <p>Some relevant information is presented, however, more specific description of procedures the State uses to monitor that accommodations selected for students with disabilities is needed.</p> <p>Description of procedures the State uses to monitor that students with disabilities are placed by IEP Teams, placement teams, or individuals or teams designated by a district to make assessment decisions about students with disabilities or ELs in the appropriate assessment is needed</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
		<p>The State’s written procedures for monitoring the use of accommodations during test administration, such as information provided to districts; instructions and protocols for State, district and school staff; and schedules for monitoring are needed.</p> <p>A summary of results of monitoring for the most recent year of test administration in the State is needed. The level of fidelity of administration unclear.</p> <p>Without sufficient detail, it is difficult to determine degree of consistency with state policies, with accommodations provided to students during instruction, etc.</p> <p><b>Alternate Assessment – R/LA, Mathematics, Science</b> The State must provide evidence that accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice are consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA.</p> <p>2_4 ALT_02 includes slides from a training for observers of the Alternate K-PREP. Each teacher is to be observed at least once. Accommodations are mentioned in the notes of slide 9, and are not mentioned on the actual slide nor anywhere else in the document.</p> <p>As with the K-PREP, for Alternate K-PREP it is unclear whether any individual monitoring of accommodations use is conducted, thus it is unclear whether accommodations use is consistent with state policies. Whether the accommodations used are appropriate is a matter of construct preservation, noted as missing in CE 5.3. Documents do not address whether individual accommodations are consistent with instructional accommodations nor with student plans (IEP, 504, PSP). Fidelity of accommodations administration was not addressed.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>No evidence for the critical element was provided. The State must provide evidence of the following:</b></p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures;</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples of such evidence include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More specific description of procedures the State uses to monitor that accommodations selected for students with disabilities;</li> <li>• Description of procedures the State uses to monitor that students with disabilities are placed by IEP Teams, placement teams, or individuals or teams designated by a district to make assessment decisions about students with disabilities or ELs in the appropriate assessment;</li> <li>• The State’s written procedures for monitoring the use of accommodations during test administration, such as information provided to districts; instructions and protocols for State, district and school staff; and schedules for monitoring;</li> <li>• Summary of results of monitoring for the most recent year of test administration in the State. The current level of fidelity of administration is unclear.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

**SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING**

**Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>For academic content standards:</b> The State formally adopted <b>challenging academic achievement standards</b> in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities;</li> <li>The State applies its 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;</li> </ul> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (1) at least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third for lower achievement; (2) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (3) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>    </u> <b>KAS Assessment Science</b> <u>    </u></p> <p>In Kentucky, the Commissioner adopts academic achievement standards.</p> <p><b>0_2 KAS 03 KY Science Standard Setting 2018 TechReport V1.2.pdf</b> (see Final Performance Level Standards p. 30)</p> <p><b>6_1 KAS_01 Performance Level Descriptors_KY_Science_Grade 4.pdf</b></p> <p><b>6_1 KAS_02 Performance Level Descriptors_KY_Science_Grade 7.pdf</b></p> <p><b>6_1 KAS_03 KPREP Cut Scores 2017-18.pdf</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>    </u> <b>KAS Alternate Assessment</b> <u>    </u></p> <p><b>1_3 ALT_01 Science PLDs.pdf</b></p> <p><b>3_2 ALT_02 Science Standard Setting Report.pdf</b></p>	<p>No evidence was requested for R/LA and mathematics general following previous review.</p> <p><b>General Assessment – R/LA, Mathematics, Science</b></p> <p>0_2 KAS 03 indicates cut scores for determining proficiency in science for grades four and seven, for two categories of high achievement and two for lower achievement (p. 30). Performance level descriptors are included on p. 2.</p> <p>The State must provide evidence of the adoption of the academic achievement standards (e.g., State Board of Education minutes; memo announcing formal approval from the Chief State School Officer to districts; legislation, regulations, or other binding approval, memo to districts).</p> <p><b>Alternate Assessment – R/LA, Mathematics, Science</b></p> <p>1_3 ALT_01 includes performance level descriptors for Alternate K-PREP, as well as information on two categories of high achievement and two for lower achievement.</p> <p>3_2 ALT 02 (p. 4) provides cut scores for the alternate K-PREP in science.</p> <p>The State must provide formal evidence of the adoption of the alternate academic achievement standards.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>X<u>  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of <u>formal adoption</u> of the State's: (1) academic achievement standards and (2) alternate academic achievement standards.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

**Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards.</u></b></li> </ul>	<p align="center"><u>    KAS Assessment Science    </u></p> <p><b>0_2 KAS 03 KY Science Standard Setting 2018 TechReport V1.2.pdf</b> Standard Setting Procedure p. 15 Committee Participant Composition pp. 49-52</p> <p align="center"><u>    KAS Alternate Assessment    </u></p> <p><b>3_2 ALT_02 Science Standard Setting Report.pdf</b></p>	<p><b>General Assessment – R/LA, Mathematics, Science</b></p> <p>0_2 KAS 03 (p. 15) indicates the Extended Modified Angoff Method was used to set academic achievement standards.</p> <p>15 participants per grade level seemed like a small number.</p> <p>The ACT QualityCore EOC R/LA, mathematics, and science has been discontinued and so no additional evidence related to the assessment will be submitted for this or other CEs.</p> <p><b>Alternate Assessment – R/LA, Mathematics, Science</b></p> <p>No evidence requested following previous review</p> <p>3_2 ALT 02 (p. 1) indicates a Modified Angoff procedure was used to set academic achievement standards.</p> <p>12 participants seemed like a small number of participants. With such a small number, it also seems unlikely the appropriate specialists were available for each panel.</p> <p>The State should provide documentation that the panels for setting alternate academic achievement standards included individuals knowledgeable about the State’s academic content standards and special educators knowledgeable about students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>For all assessments, the State must provide:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• List and description of the criteria used to select participants in the standard setting.</li> <li>• Description of the composition of the grade level panels, such as a matrix indicating the relevant characteristics of the members of each panel.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

**Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b><u>For academic achievement standards:</u></b>                      The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards and with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards such that a student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards (1) are aligned with the State’s challenging academic content standards for the grade in which a student is enrolled; (2) promote access to the general curriculum consistent with the IDEA; (3) reflect professional judgment as to the highest possible standards achievable for such students; (4) are designated in the IEP for each student for whom alternate academic achievement standards apply; and (5) are aligned to ensure that a student who meets the alternate academic achievement standards is on track to pursue postsecondary education or competitive integrated employment.</p>	<p align="center"><u>    KAS Assessment Science    </u></p> <p><b>0_2 KAS 03 KY Science Standard Setting 2018 TechReport V1.2.pdf</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Goals (p. 6) “...the Kentucky Academic Standards for Science in grades K-12 define a set of performance expectations for what students should know and be able to do and are derived from the National Research Council’s Framework for K-12 Science Education, also known as the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS).”</li> </ul> <p>ALT:                      Standard-setting process: <b>3_2 ALT_01 Standards Validation Report 2015-16.pdf</b></p> <p align="center"><u>    KAS Alternate Assessment    </u></p> <p>Please see cut scores and expert judgement based on standard setting and standard validations which find 92% of the participants indicating cut scores “are just about right” in:  <b>5_1 ALT_02 Science Standard Setting Report.pdf</b></p> <p>Alternate KPREP Performance Level Descriptors are available in <b>1_3 ALT_01 Science PLDs.pdf</b></p> <p><b>6_3 ALT_01 ALTERNATE K-PREP Science Standard Setting Training.pdf</b> (slide 23 in particular</p>	<p><b>General Assessment – R/LA, Mathematics, Science</b></p> <p>No evidence was requested following previous review.</p> <p>0_2 KAS 03 indicates the goal in developing the achievement standards. It does not provide evidence, such as outside expert review or predictive analyses, the achievement standards are consistent with entrance requirements.</p> <p>Documentation that the State’s academic achievement standards are aligned with the State’s academic content standards is needed.</p> <p>Documentation that the State’s academic achievement standards are challenging is needed.</p> <p><b>Alternate Assessment – R/LA, Mathematics, Science</b></p> <p>Follow-up studies are needed that examine proficiency on the high-school assessments and performance in post-secondary education, vocational training or competitive integrated employment.</p> <p>3_2 ALT_01 Standards Validation Report 2015-16 p. 9 is referenced, although this document refers to the Alternate K-PREP and has only four pages.</p> <p>3_2 ALT_02 indicates 11 of 12 experts involved with setting the cut scores agreed with the outcome.</p> <p>The evidence provided is specific to science and does not address requests from the previous review. Requirements as articulated in CE 6.3 are also not met by the evidence.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
		Documentation that the State’s alternate academic achievement standards are aligned with the State’s academic content standards for the grade in which a student is enrolled is needed.
<b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>For general science and the alternate in all content areas, the State must provide:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation that the State’s academic achievement standards are challenging.</li> <li>• Documentation that the State’s alternate academic achievement standards are aligned with the State’s academic content standards for the grade in which a student is enrolled.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

**Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State reports its assessment results for all students assessed, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public.</p> <p>The State reports to the public its assessment results on <b><u>student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level<sup>4</sup></u></b></p> <p>For <b><u>academic content assessments</u></b>, 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 <b><u>specific academic needs of students</u></b>, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its academic content assessments that:</li> </ul>	<p align="center"><u>    KAS Assessment Science    </u></p> <p><b>6_4 ALL_01 KPREP Student Reports Elementary School.pdf</b>  <b>6_4 ALL_02 KPREP Student Reports Middle School.pdf</b>  <b>6_4 ALL_03 KPREP Student Reports High School.pdf</b>  <b>6_4 ALL_07 KPREP School Listing Elementary School.pdf</b>  <b>6_4 ALL_08 KPREP School Listing Middle School.pdf</b>  <b>6_4 ALL_09 KPREP School Listing High School.pdf</b>  <b>6_4 ALL_11 KPREP School Summary Report Elementary School.pdf</b>  <b>6_4 ALL_12 KPREP School Summary Report Middle School.pdf</b>  <b>6_4 ALL_13 KPREP School Summary Report High School.pdf</b>  <b>6_4 ALL_14 KAS Science 2019 School Summary Reports.pdf</b>                      Online resource for school reports:  <b>6_4 ALL_17 SRC Home.pdf</b>  <b>6_4 ALL_16 Home - Kentucky School Report Card.pdf</b> Note Language (English or Spanish) Option in upper right  <b>6_4 ALL_15 Sch Report Card Simpsonville EL.pdf</b></p> <p><b>0_7 ALL_01 R18-146 2017-18 Accountability Results</b></p>	<p><b>All</b></p> <p>The evidence provided is not very parent friendly. Peer reviewers are not sure it is meeting any of the critical elements. It is very text dense and is English only. Reports should display information in a uniform format and use simple language that is free of jargon and understandable to parents, teachers, and principals, as well as accessible in a variety of forms and languages.</p> <p>The State could provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any examples of reports of assessment results at the classroom, school, district and State levels provided to teachers, principals, and administrators that include itemized score analyses, results according to proficiency levels, performance level descriptors, and, as appropriate, other analyses that go beyond the total score (e.g., analysis of results by strand/domain/component);</li> <li>Evidence that the State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports;</li> </ul> <p>6_4 All_01-03 provide individualized reports with descriptions of performance levels by content area, as well as comparisons to school, district, and state means.</p> <p>6_4 All_07-09, 11-13 provide school level reports of performance.</p>

<sup>4</sup> Although all students with disabilities must be included in a State’s assessment system, requirements for public reporting in ESEA section 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) apply only to children with disabilities as defined in section 602(3) of the IDEA.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a <b><u>student’s academic achievement</u></b>;</li> <li>○ Report the <b><u>student’s academic achievement</u></b> in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards;</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific <b><u>academic needs of students</u></b>;</li> <li>○ Are provided in an understandable and uniform format;</li> <li>○ Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian;</li> <li>○ Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.</li> <li>● 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.</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>          KAS Alternate Assessment          </u></p> <p><b>6_4 ALL_04 Alternate KPREP Student Reports Elementary School.pdf</b></p> <p><b>6_4 ALL_05 Alternate KPREP Student Reports Middle School.pdf</b></p> <p><b>6_4 ALL_06 Alternate KPREP Student Reports High School.pdf</b></p> <p><b>6_4 ALL_10 Alternate KPREP School Listing High School.pdf</b></p> <p>KDE has included sufficient interpretive information on the Alternate K-PREP report and considers the report itself to be an interpretive guide. Some information to support reporting is found in this guide:</p> <p><b>5_1 ALT_01 Parent_Guide_to_Alternate_K-Prep.pdf</b></p> <p>ALT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KDE publishes test score reports by proficiency level by student subgroups for all students at each grade level. The results of general and alternate assessments are combined. KDE determined that privacy business rules (minimum N) would not allow any actionable data to be provided to school and district with disaggregated summaries of only students who took the Alternate KPREP.</li> <li>• KDE currently encourages schools and districts to support parents who need alternate formats. KDE is developing policies and procedures to make alternate format availability more reliable and comprehensive.</li> </ul>	<p>6_4 ALL_14 is an example of demographic descriptive information at the school level.</p> <p>6_4 ALL_15 provides an example of school data on proficiency category by student group.</p> <p>0_7 ALL_01 on p. 9 indicates the percentage of students at Proficient/Distinguished levels by content area, year, and grade band.</p> <p>Evidence is not included for proficiency for each student group at each achievement level, reports with specific academic needs of students (scores may not have been precise enough to justifiably include subdomains), a timeline for delivery of results, or instructions for requesting reports in different formats (other languages or formats for persons with disabilities).</p> <p>Many of the alphas for subdomain scores, reported across grades and content areas in Appendix M of the Yearbook, are very low (i.e., in the .60s and lower). If this is the rationale for not including information on the specific academic needs of students (i.e., subscale scores), a plan for addressing this limitation is needed.</p> <p>More information is needed regarding proficiency for each student group at each achievement level.</p> <p>Evidence regarding reports that address the specific academic needs of students is needed.</p> <p>Interpretive guide that supports appropriate use is needed--for the range of stakeholders.</p> <p>Schedule to ensure timeliness/that reflects of results is needed.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>KDE has included sufficient interpretive information on the Alternate K-PREP report and considers the report itself to be an interpretive guide. Some information to support reporting is found in this guide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>6_4 ALT_01 Parent_Guide_to_Alternate_K-Prep.pdf</b></li> </ul> <p><b>6_4 ALL_10 Alternate KPREP School Listing High School.pdf</b></p> <p>KDE has included sufficient interpretive information on the Alternate K-PREP report and considers the report itself to be an interpretive guide. Some information to support reporting is found in this guide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>5 1 ALT_01 Parent_Guide to Alternate K-Prep.pdf</b></li> </ul>	
<b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>No evidence for the critical element was provided.</p> <p><b>No evidence for the critical element was provided. The State must provide evidence of the following:</b></p> <p>The State reports its assessment results for all students assessed, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public.</p> <p>The State reports to the public its assessment results on <b><u>student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level</u></b><sup>5</sup></p> <p>For <b><u>academic content assessments</u></b>, 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.</p>		

<sup>5</sup> Although all students with disabilities must be included in a State’s assessment system, requirements for public reporting in ESEA section 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) apply only to children with disabilities as defined in section 602(3) of the IDEA.

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR KENTUCKY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its academic content assessments that:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s academic achievement;</li> <li>○ Report the student’s academic achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards;</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;</li> <li>○ Are provided in an understandable and uniform format;</li> <li>○ Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian;</li> <li>○ Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples of such evidence include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More information regarding proficiency for each student group at each achievement level;</li> <li>• Evidence regarding reports that address the specific academic needs of students;</li> <li>• Interpretive guide that supports appropriate use for the range of stakeholders;</li> <li>• Schedule to ensure timeliness of dissemination of results;</li> <li>• Information for parents and educators regarding how to request alternate forms (e.g., by language, format) of the individualized reports.</li> </ul>		

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.