



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Susan Bunting  
Secretary of Education  
Delaware Department of Education  
401 Federal Street, Suite Two  
Dover, DE 19901-3639

June 9, 2020

Dear Superintendent Bunting:

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 Delaware Department of Education (DDOE) to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in February and March 2020. Specifically, DDOE submitted evidence regarding the grades 5, 8, and high school biology Delaware System of Student Assessment Science Assessment (DeSSA Science Assessment).

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 DDOE'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, as amended by ESSA. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and our own analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

- General assessment in grades 5, 8, and high school biology (DeSSA Science Assessment):  
**Partially meets requirements of the ESEA.**

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

400 MARYLAND AVE., SW, WASHINGTON, DC 20202  
[www.ed.gov](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 specific list of items required for the DDOE to submit is enclosed with this letter. I request that the DDOE submit a plan within 30 days outlining when it will submit all required additional documentation for peer review. I recognize the unprecedented situation affecting you and your schools due to widespread and extended school closures caused by the novel coronavirus, COVID-19. As a result, if you need more than 30 days to submit your plan, please let my staff know at [ESEA.Assessment@ed.gov](mailto:ESEA.Assessment@ed.gov). Upon submission of the plan, the Department will reach out to the SEA to determine a mutually agreeable schedule. Resubmission should occur once all necessary evidence is complete (rather than in multiple submissions).

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: [ESEA.Assessment@ed.gov](mailto:ESEA.Assessment@ed.gov).

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank T. Brogan  
Assistant Secretary for  
Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Theresa Bennett, Director of Office of Assessment

**Critical Elements Where Additional Evidence is Needed to Meet the Requirements for Delaware’s Use of the DeSSA Science Assessment**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Additional Evidence Needed</b>
<b>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</b>	For the NGSS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the science standards are aligned with relevant State career and technical education standards and entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State.</li> </ul>
<b>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</b>	For the DeSSA Science Assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all students in the State, including those children with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, are included in the assessment.</li> </ul>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b>	For the DeSSA Science Assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the test blueprints are aligned to the depth and breadth of the NGSS for the grades that are being assessed, given that the test blueprints have been adjusted following the alignment study.</li> </ul>
<b>2.3 – Test Administration</b>	For the DeSSA Science Assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of English learners, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to know how to administer the assessment and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during testing for all students with disabilities (e.g., attendance sheets from test administration trainings).</li> <li>• Evidence that the State has included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration (e.g., steps to follow when students encounter issues using the test delivery system).</li> </ul>
<b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b>	For the DeSSA Science Assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State adequately monitors the administration of the assessment to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools (e.g., site visit reports after observing the test administration of the assessment).</li> </ul>
<b>2.5 – Test Security</b>	For the DeSSA Science Assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 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:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Detection of test irregularities (e.g., number of times that information about the assessment was found on social media sites following a State-led inquiry).</li> <li>○ Remediation following any test security incidents involving the assessment (e.g., types of remediation imposed based on the findings of a State-led social media inquiry).</li> <li>○ Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b>	For the DeSSA Science Assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of adequate alignment between the assessment and the NGSS the assessment is designed to measure in terms of balance of content, given that the test blueprints have been adjusted to improve the alignment ratings.</li> <li>• Evidence requested for critical element 2.1 will also apply to this critical element.</li> </ul>
<b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b>	For the DeSSA Science Assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Validity evidence based on the internal structure of the assessment that shows levels of validity generally consistent with expectations of current professional standards (e.g., differential item functioning analyses for English learners and non-English learners, as well as, students with disabilities and students without disabilities).</li> </ul>
<b>4.1 – Reliability</b>	For the DeSSA Science Assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of adequate reliability on the assessment for each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards (e.g., additional analyses to explain the relatively low reliabilities for English learners (grades 5 and 8) and students with disabilities (grade 8); and guidance on how to interpret the classification accuracy and consistency results).</li> </ul>
<b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b>	For the DeSSA Science Assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum (e.g., analyses which show that the assessment produces adequately precise estimates of student performance across the full performance continuum despite the U-shaped distributions showing larger standard errors in the tails of the observed score scale (or ability level scale) and smaller standard errors in the center of the distributions).</li> </ul>
<b>4.4 – Scoring</b>	For the DeSSA Science Assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State’s documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for the assessment produce reliable and meaningful results, and facilitate valid score interpretations (e.g., exact agreement, adjacent agreement, and inter-rater reliability for the 10 percent second scoring that was done for operational items).</li> </ul>
<b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b>	For the DeSSA Science Assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of adequate technical quality which is made public, including on the State’s website.</li> </ul>
<b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b>	For the DeSSA Science Assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the assessment (e.g., State-created evidence that can be made available to districts and parents rather than evidence gathered from other state department of education offices).</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<p><b>5.3 - Accommodations</b></p>	<p>For the DeSSA Science Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has determined that the accommodations that it provides:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Do not alter the construct being measured (e.g., impact of accommodations on the construct being measured).</li> <li>○ Allow for 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 ensures that accommodations for the assessment does not deny students with disabilities or English learners the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment (e.g., awarding students who use accommodations with an alternate high school diploma rather than a traditional high school diploma).</li> </ul>
<p><b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b></p>	<p>For the DeSSA Science Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State monitors test administration in its district and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:               <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 the assessment.</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 the assessment (e.g., site visit reports that discuss findings of monitoring accommodations during test administration).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</b></p>	<p>For the DeSSA Science Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has formally adopted academic achievement standards in science for the required test grades (e.g., clear statement that the State has formally adopted the academic achievement standards that it uses).</li> <li>• Evidence that the State applies its academic achievement standards in science 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>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<p><b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b></p>	<p>For the DeSSA Science Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State uses a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting academic achievement standards in science (e.g., description of the process for selecting panelists, documentation that panels included individuals with appropriate experience and expertise).</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b></p>	<p>For the DeSSA Science Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the Next Generation Science 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 (e.g., evidence that is specific to the assessment rather than the Dynamic Learning Map – Science Assessment).</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p>	<p>For the DeSSA Science Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State reports assessment results, including itemized score analysis, 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 (e.g., evidence of more detailed reports such as item analysis reports).</li> <li>• Evidence that the State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports (e.g., reports by item, standard, or domain) after each administration of its DeSSA Science Assessment that:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 (e.g., how soon after testing are the results made available).</li> </ul>

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## March 2020 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 DELAWARE

Contents

**SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS .....4**

**Critical Element 1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students ..... 4**

**Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content Standards ..... 6**

**Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments ..... 8**

**Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments 10**

**Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments..... 12**

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS..... 13**

**Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development ..... 13**

**Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development ..... 16**

**Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration..... 19**

**Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration ..... 21**

**Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security ..... 22**

**Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy .. 25**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY .....28**

**Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content28**

**Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes ..... 30**

**Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure..... 32**

**Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables..... 34**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER.....35**

**Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability ..... 35**

**Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility ..... 37**

**Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum ..... 40**

**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring..... 42**

**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms..... 44**

**Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment ..... 45**

**Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance ..... 47**

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS.....49**

**Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 49**

**Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments..... 52**

**Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations ..... 54**

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

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

..... 56

**SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING.....58**

**Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students..... 58**  
**Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting ..... 60**  
**Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards ..... 61**  
**Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting ..... 63**

**SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS**

.....**ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.**

**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 DELAWARE**

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

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

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 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>Delaware Administrative Code identifies the implementation of the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) as of the 2013-2014 school year. These standards were officially recommended by an official NGSS review committee on June 20, 2013 and adopted by the State Board of Education on September 19, 2013.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 1.1.1 <b>Title 14 DE Admin Code Reg 501</b> (p.1)</li> <li>- Document 1.1.2 <b>NGSS Report to State Board of Education</b> (p.1)</li> <li>- Document 1.1.3 <b>DE State Board of Education Minutes_Sep 2013</b> (3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, p.11000 (7))</li> </ul> <p>Delaware has adopted the Next Generation Science Standards as they exist and can be viewed in their entirety at <a href="http://www.nextgenscience.org">www.nextgenscience.org</a> . However, to facilitate state assessment, the standards (already grade level arranged in 3-5) were delineated to grade level topical arrangements from grades 6-10 to identify what should be taught when. The topical arrangement of assessable standards (end-of-unit or summative) are provided as document 1.1.4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 1.1.4 <b>Grades 3-10 Topical Arrangements of the NGSS PEs</b></li> </ul>	<p>DE has adopted the NGSS as they are, which were developed in partnership with 26 states, with DE being one of them. The standards are arranged in a topical manner by grade level and are taught as such to facilitate the state summative assessments. The evidence provided is sufficient to 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 DELAWARE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</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 DELAWARE**

**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>Delaware State Code requires science instruction in grades K-12 where all grades K-8 demonstrate alignment to adopted science standards and all students in grades 9-12 are required to complete credits necessary to graduate from high school. High school graduation requires three science credits where each course includes scientific investigations aligned with adopted science standards and one course is required to be Biology.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 1.2.1 <b>Reg 503 science requirement</b> (p.1 § 3)</li> <li>- Document 1.2.2 <b>Reg 505 graduation requirement</b> (p.4 § 5.1.2)</li> </ul> <p>In preparing for adoption of the NGSS, a committee of local stakeholders presented a report to the state Board of Education. The report addressed College and Career readiness and alignment of these standards to the goals set forth in Delaware.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 1.1.2 <b>NGSS Report to State Board of Education</b> (p.8-9)</li> </ul> <p>Additional note from submission:</p> <p>Delaware has adopted the Next Generation Science Standards as they exist and can be viewed in their entirety at <a href="http://www.nextgenscience.org">www.nextgenscience.org</a> . However, to facilitate state assessment, the standards were</p>	<p>The evidence provided is sufficient to meet the requirements. However, there is limited evidence that explicitly addresses the alignment of NGSS to career and technical education requirements. It is implied, though, throughout 1.1.2 that the NGSS will create “citizens” who are able to engage with their community in more effective ways and have career-essential skills, etc. The state might consider including more explicit connections to career and technical education in their documentation.</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 DELAWARE**

<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>
	delineated to grade level topical arrangements from grades 6-10 to identify what should be taught when. A report to the state Board of Education, including stakeholder involvement and participation is included as document 1.1.4	
<b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or  <input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</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 DELAWARE**

**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>Reviewed by Department Staff Only</p>	<p>Reviewed by Department Staff Only</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 DELAWARE

<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>		
<b>Section 1.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</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 DELAWARE**

**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>Reviewed by Department Staff Only</p>	<p>Reviewed by Department Staff Only</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 DELAWARE**

<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>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</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 DELAWARE**

**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>Reviewed by Department Staff Only</p>	<p>Reviewed by Department Staff Only</p>
<p><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</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 DELAWARE**

**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</li> </ul>	<p>Delaware’s Next Generation Science Assessment is a fixed form online assessment given at grades 5, 8 and HS Biology. Test Item and Specifications Documents, developed with the assistance of our vendors WestEd and Pearson, are attached for your review. Test Blueprints used for the first operational assessment are included as are the layout of the first operational base forms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 2.1.1 <b>DE NGSS Item Specifications 8.30.19</b></li> <li>- Document 2.1.2 <b>DE ITA Blueprints pre Oct 2019 TAC Recs</b></li> </ul> <p>The Independent Alignment Study completed by HumRRO is included along with follow-up Delaware TAC recommendations and Delaware’s immediate action. Updated Blueprints are also included.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 2.1.4 <b>Final DE NGSA Alignment Report_v3</b></li> <li>- Document 2.1.5 <b>DE TAC Recommendations 10 2019</b></li> <li>- Document 2.1.6 <b>DDOE Response and Action Taken in Response to 2019 Delaware NGSA Alignment Report</b></li> </ul>	<p>Peer reviewers were impressed with the rationale and classification system of cognitive complexity (pp. 10-12 Document 2.1.1) introduced for the science tests based on the framework by Tekkumru-Kisa et al. (2015), which also accounts for the number of dimensions to which an item is aligned. Peer reviewers applaud its implementation.</p> <p>Although it is commendable that the state spent time reviewing the alignment study results, consulting with their TAC, and considering revisions to the blueprint, it is unclear what rationale was used to select the +/- 10% standardized target. The state should provide evidence that the alignment between blueprints and standards still reflects the intended construct representation. Rather than updating the original blueprint to improve alignment, the state should address why the original blueprint had the ranges it did, what might be done to correct the issues from an item pool perspective, or what rationale supported the standardized targets as opposed to the variable targets in the original blueprint.</p> <p>Peer reviewers noted in Document 2.1.4 (p. 25) the discrepancies between DE educators’ ratings and item metadata, and educators’ ratings and the new approach to cognitive complexity classifications. Peer reviewers trust that DE will work to provide more training and make improvements.</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 DELAWARE**

<p>and intended uses and interpretations of results.</p> <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>Document 2.1.7 DE ITA Blueprints _updated 10-17-19</b></p> <p>Additional note from submission:</p> <p>Delaware has developed a balanced approach to science assessment. The Next Generation Science Assessment System for Delaware learners is a comprehensive and balanced assessment system with three distinct parts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Embedded Classroom Assessments</i> are developed by teachers to provide information on learning in real time in every grade from third grade through tenth grade. The assessments are primarily for instructional use and are therefore short and administered at the discretion of each teacher. The development of these has been supported by professional development.</li> <li>• <i>End-of-Unit Assessments</i>, aligned to instructional units in every grade from third through tenth, are administered by teachers after the completion of each instructional unit. Each End-of-Unit Assessment is meant to provide information on student learning of the NGSS content in each unit for the purposes of instruction (e.g., to determine whether additional instruction on previously instructed topics is needed, or to use as a classroom assessment for grading purposes) and evaluation (e.g., to inform curriculum adoption, adaptation, and modification) at classroom, school, and district levels. End-of-Unit</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 DELAWARE**

	<p>Assessments are developed by vendors working with DDOE staff and informed by educator reviews for classroom administration by teachers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The <i>SUMMATIVE Integrative Transfer Assessment</i></b> is administered to students in grade 5, grade 8, and high school biology. The Integrative Transfer Assessment is meant to capture students’ learning of the content instructed during the entire year in each of the three grades in greater depth than the End-of-Unit Assessments. The Integrative Transfer Assessment requires students to apply their knowledge of science to grade-level-appropriate situations in order to solve unique, real-life problems. Integrative Transfer Assessments are developed by vendors working with DDOE staff and informed by educator committee reviews. They are administered through an online system in a secure testing environment and used for state accountability purposes.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide evidence that the alignment between revised blueprints and standards still reflects the intended construct representation.</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 DELAWARE**

**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>State’s academic content standards</b> in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</li> </ul>	<p>Delaware’s Next Generation Science Assessment is a fixed form online assessment given at grades 5, 8 and HS Biology. Before developing the new NGSS assessment system, Delaware conducted a Phase I investigatory study to design, develop, and pilot innovative science assessment tasks of various types (e.g., simulations, performance tasks, item clusters, and extended open-ended constructed-response items) to inform specifications for the operational assessments and prepare the field for system implementation. The final report for this work is available for your review here:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Document 2.2.1a-1 DE NGSS Phase I Final Report 2017</b></li> <li><b>Document 2.2.1b-2 DE NGSS Phase I Final Report 2017 Appendix A</b></li> <li><b>Document 2.2.1c-3 DE NGSS Phase I Final Report 2017 Appendix B</b></li> <li><b>Document 2.2.1d-4 DE NGSS Phase I Final Report 2017 Appendix C</b></li> <li><b>Document 2.2.1e-5 DE NGSS Phase I Final Report 2017 Ancillary Materials</b></li> </ul>	<p>Peer reviewers like the two rounds of cognitive interviews following the initial and revised task development to examine usability and the two feasibility studies to explore factors that may impact test administration. The evidence provided is sufficient to 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 DELAWARE**

	<p>Test Item and Specifications Documents, developed with the assistance of our vendors WestEd and Pearson, are attached for your review. Cognitive complexity is monitored using a new framework described in the CSAI White paper included. The Independent Alignment Study completed by HumRRO is included along with Delaware TAC recommendations and a report outlining Delaware’s immediate follow-up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document 2.1.1 <b>DE NGSS Item Specifications 8.30.19</b></li> <li>• Document 2.2.2 <b>CSAI Whitepaper_Cog Load 3D NGSS</b></li> <li>• Document 2.2.3 <b>DE Item Writer Training November 2017</b></li> <li>• Document 2.1.4 <b>Final DE NGSA Alignment Report_v3</b></li> <li>• Document 2.1.5 <b>DE TAC Recommendations 10 2019</b></li> <li>• Document 2.1.6 <b>DDOE Response and Action Taken in Response to 2019 Delaware NGSA Alignment Report</b></li> </ul> <p>Additional note from submission:</p> <p>See also Critical Element 2.1 for additional information regarding Blueprints.</p>	
<p><b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DELAWARE

\_\_\_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DELAWARE**

**Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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</li> </ul>	<p>Delaware provided DeSSA Social Studies and Next Generation Science test administration manuals including scripts, guidelines, and administration descriptions for both test administrators and students.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 2.3.1 <b>DeSSA19_Online_TAM_FORWEB</b></li> </ul> <p>To assist district personnel in the ordering of accommodated forms, preparation, creation, and administration of online assessments and all follow-up tasks in completion of testing sessions, teachers are referred to the Pearson Assessment portal (<a href="http://delaware.pearsonaccessnext.com/manuals/">http://delaware.pearsonaccessnext.com/manuals/</a>) where the following documents, tutorials and guides are provided for instructional and training purposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 2.3.2 <b>Create_a_Test_Session_in_PAN</b></li> <li>- Document 2.3.3 <b>DE_Add_Students_Test_Session</b></li> <li>- Document 2.3.4 <b>DE_Prepare_Test_Session</b></li> <li>- Document 2.3.5 <b>DE_Start_Test_Session</b></li> <li>- Document 2.3.6 <b>DE_Unlock_Lock_Student_Tests</b></li> <li>- Document 2.3.7 <b>Secure browser installation screen shot</b></li> <li>- Document 2.3.8 <b>UPS_Pick-Up_Instructions</b></li> </ul> <p>Teachers of students with accommodations are supported with the following documents, also located on the Pearson Assessment portal (<a href="http://delaware.pearsonaccessnext.com/manuals/">http://delaware.pearsonaccessnext.com/manuals/</a>)</p>	<p>The evidence provided is sufficient and comprehensive.</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 DELAWARE**

<p>other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 2.3.9 <b>Order_Printed_Materials</b></li> <li>- Document 2.3.10 <b>Accommodated_TTS_Administration_Instructions</b></li> <li>- Document 2.3.11 <b>American_SignLanguage_Administration_Instructions</b></li> <li>- Document 2.3.12 <b>Braille_Transcription_Administration_Instructions</b></li> <li>- Document 2.3.13 <b>Paper_Transcription_Administration_Instructions</b></li> <li>- Document 2.3.14 <b>Spanish_Administration_Instructions</b></li> </ul> <p>Document 2.3.15 <b>Translation_of_Key Terms_Administration_Instructions</b></p>	
<p><b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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 DELAWARE**

**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>
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.	Reviewed by Department Staff Only	Reviewed by Department Staff Only
<b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</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 DELAWARE**

**Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>Delaware Regulations require LEAs to report information associated with number of students tested, corrections to inaccurate assessment scores, adhere to inclusion policies, and disclose any violations associated with testing and cooperate with any investigations of data reporting violations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 1.3.1a <b>DE Administrative Code Title 14 Education</b>; state assessment system security Subchapter IV, Section 171 on Security and Data Procedures (p.33); Section 172 on Assessment behavior violations in (p.34), Section 173 on Data reporting violations (p.34), Section 174 on Civil sanctions for violations (p.34)</li> </ul> <p>Delaware System of Student Assessments (DeSSA) has a yearly Test Security Manual and training required of every educator administering or assisting with the administration of State assessments for Grades 3-8 and High School for all state assessments (regular and Alternate)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 2.5.1a <b>DeSSA Test Security Manual 2018-19</b></li> <li>- Document 2.5.1b <b>DeSSA Test Security Manual 2017-18</b></li> <li>- Document 2.5.1c <b>2019 DeSSA Test Security Training TAs STCs DTCs</b></li> </ul>	<p>The state has well-established procedures regarding test security, including state regulations, policies, training of all personnel (including support staff) related to test administration, security agreement forms, reporting, and consequences of test security violation. However, no evidence was provided showing the state’s approach to detecting test irregularities other than those that are self-reported.</p> <p>Although incident levels and types of issues are summarized in the test security chart to guide reporting, peer reviewers expect to see how irregularities and test security incidents are tracked and summarized as well as remediation plans following their occurrences.</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 DELAWARE**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 2.5.1d <b>2019_DeSSA_Test_Security_Training_Support_Staff-final-1</b></li>   <li>DDOE trained staff to follow protocols for responding to potential and confirmed violations. DDOE has created training and a flowchart for Test Security Incidents so educators can follow it to make correct decisions. Districts are also responsible for enforcing test security at educator and student levels. Delaware has an internal Secure Help Desk Ticket System. Districts and schools use this system to report incidents and irregularities on state assessments.</li>   <li>- Document 2.5.3a <b>Test Security Incident Flow Chart Final</b></li>   <li>- Document 2.5.3b <b>Incident Report Form 2015-16_District Sample</b></li>   <li>- Document 2.5.3c <b>Protocol Verification Sheet 2014_District Sample</b></li>   <li>- Document 2.5.3d <b>DeSSA Testing Checklist 2015_District Sample</b></li>   <li>- Document 2.5.4 <b>DOE Help Desk Quick Reference Guide</b></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide evidence on how the state detects test irregularities other than reporting or self-reporting.</li> <li>• Provide evidence of how the state tracks and summarizes irregularities, such as evidence of most recent year’s security incidents and evidence of remediation following test security incidents.</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 DELAWARE

--

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>Delaware has a policy for its state assessments to protect data, privacy of data, and detect violations including from DDOE staff.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Document 1.3.1a <b>DE Administrative Code Title 14 Education</b>; state assessment system security Subchapter IV</p> <p>In addition, Delaware employees and external parties that access internal state systems are required to sign an Acceptable Use Policy with language specifically relevant to maintaining security of sensitive materials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 2.6.5a <b>Acceptable Use Policy</b></li> <li>- Document 2.6.5b <b>K-12 Statement of Intent and Data Privacy Statement - General Use</b></li> <li>- Document 2.6.5c <b>Delaware Terms and Conditions Governing State Data Usage Policy</b></li> <li>- Document 2.6.5d <b>Delaware Data Usage Terms and Conditions Agreement</b></li> <li>- Document 2.6.5e <b>eRecords Request Policy</b></li> </ul> <p>and also abides by policies governing the disposal of electronic equipment and storage media,</p>	<p>The evidence provided is sufficient and comprehensive.</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 DELAWARE**

	<p>appropriate storage and use of data, and appropriate passwords.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 2.6.5f <b>Disposal Policy</b></li> </ul> <p>There are Data Security Protocols for LEAs who access state systems governed by DDOE policies. Access to information is managed and controlled by a single sign on – Identity Management System (IMS) that each licensed and registered educator can have.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 2.6.1 <b>Database Access and Creation Policy</b></li> <li>- Document 2.6.2 <b>User Id and Password Policy</b></li> <li>- Document 2.6.3 <b>Education SSO Project-Vision-Scope</b></li> <li>- Document 2.6.4 <b>User Management Specs</b></li> </ul> <p>Based on the guidelines in the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), the DDOE uses the suppression rules of 95 percent and 5 percent in order to better protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, particularly at the school and subgroup levels in disaggregated reporting</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 DELAWARE

	- Document 2.6.6 <b>DDOE Data Reporting Rules -2018</b>	
<b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or		
<input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</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 DELAWARE**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY**

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

<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 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</li> </ul>	<p>Delaware conducts annual Content Item and Bias review committee meetings with teachers to ensure alignment between the states academic content standards and the assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 3.1.1a <b>2018-2019 DE NGSS ITA Technical Report_122319_(2)</b> pages 27, 41-44</li> <li>- Document 3.1.1b <b>2018-2019 DE NGSS ITA Technical Report Appendices_122219</b> Appendix B and Appendix C</li> <li>- Document 3.1.2 <b>DE Science 2018 IRC Slides EoU</b></li> <li>- Document 3.1.3 <b>DE Science 2018 IRC Slides FINAL</b></li> <li>- Document 3.1.4 <b>DE NGSS Content-Bias Review Training 2018_Recording</b></li> <li>- Document 3.1.5 <b>DE NGSS Content-Bias Review Training 2018_Slides</b></li> <li>- Document 3.1.6 <b>DE Science 2018 IRC Detailed Agenda Final</b></li> </ul>	<p>This critical element requires evidence that demonstrates adequate alignment between the state’s assessment and its academic content standards. Alignment includes demonstration that the assessment includes items to cover the depth and breadth of the content standards.</p> <p>The alignment study, as cited previously, should be included here. In addition, “2.2.1a 1 DE NGSS Phase I Final Report 2017” should also be included as supporting evidence.</p> <p>Peer reviewers noted instances of inaccuracies of file names and page numbers. For example, the page references in Doc 3.1.1a should be pages 41-44. It appears that the DE Index is listing a file name with the date of 122319, but DDOE sent a file with the date of 122419. Similarly, the Doc 3.1.1b has a date in the file name of 122219 but DDOE sent a file with the date of 122419.</p> <p>Regardless, the evidence provided is sufficient to 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 DELAWARE**

<p>and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 3.1.7 <b>DE Science 2018 IRC Participant Agenda Final</b></li> <li>- Document 3.1.8 <b>Participant Agenda_DE Science 2018 CBR</b></li> <li>- Document 3.1.9 <b>DE NGSS CBR Pre-training 2019</b></li> <li>- Document 3.1.10 <b>DE NGSS Content-Bias Review Training 2019_Slides</b></li> <li>- Document 3.1.11 <b>DE EoU for CBR Aug 2019</b></li> <li>- Document 3.1.12 <b>DE NGSS Content-Bias Review 2019 Participant Agenda</b></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</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 DELAWARE**

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

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 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>Before developing the new NGSS assessment system, Delaware conducted a Phase I investigatory study to design, develop, and pilot innovative science assessment tasks of various types (e.g., simulations, performance tasks, item clusters, and extended open-ended constructed-response items) to inform specifications for the operational assessments and prepare the field for system implementation. Preliminary science assessment tasks were piloted during cognitive interview sessions with Delaware students. These interviews were used to gather input from students to inform the structure and format of the final assessment tasks, task types, and potential test designs. The final report for this work is available for your review here:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document 2.2.1a-1 DE NGSS Phase I Final Report 2017</li> <li>• Document 2.2.1b-2 DE NGSS Phase I Final Report 2017 Appendix A</li> <li>• Document 2.2.1c-3 DE NGSS Phase I Final Report 2017 Appendix B</li> <li>• Document 2.2.1d-4 DE NGSS Phase I Final Report 2017 Appendix C</li> <li>• Document 2.2.1e-5 DE NGSS Phase I Final Report 2017 Ancillary Materials</li> </ul>	<p>Peer reviewers commend Delaware’s efforts in the development of the science assessment system, which includes the investigative study with two rounds of cognitive interviews to inform the design and development of the science items and tests and two feasibility studies to explore factors that may affect test administration at the classroom level. The evidence provided is sufficient and comprehensive.</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 DELAWARE**

	<p>Delaware came to recognize that to adequately provide evidence of proficiency along a continuum of cognitive complexity for students interacting with the NGSS, it would be necessary to identify an evaluative scale that goes beyond a singular focus to acknowledge the three-dimensionality of the NGSS. Recognizing the effect of innate content difficulty along with the level of strategy independence (problem solving) and information processing required of the learner under such three-dimensional circumstances demanded a different way of looking at cognitive complexity, which is described in the following white paper.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document 2.2.2 CSAI Whitepaper_Cog Load 3D NGSS</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</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 DELAWARE**

**Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure**

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 validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s <b><u>academic content standards</u></b>.</p>	<p>Delaware’s science assessments provide an evaluative measure in the benchmark years at the end of elementary school (grade 5), middle school (grade 8), and high school (biology). Subscores are not provided (see NOTES section). The internal structure of the assessments are consistent with the structure of the content standards as illustrated by the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 2.1.1 <b>DE NGSS Item Specifications 8.30.19</b></li> <li>- Document 2.1.2 <b>DE ITA Blueprints pre Oct 2019 TAC Recs</b></li> <li>- Document 3.1.1a <b>2018-2019 DE NGSS ITA Technical Report_122319_(2)</b> <i>Chapter 9: Reliability and Validity: pages 41-44</i></li> <li>- Document 3.1.1b <b>2018-2019 DE NGSS ITA Technical Report Appendices_122219</b> <i>Appendix B and Appendix C</i></li> </ul> <p>Notes from DE’s submission:</p> <p>“Delaware’s science assessments provide an evaluative measure in the benchmark years at the end of elementary school (grade 5), middle school (grade 8), and high school (biology). The results of</p>	<p>Although many researchers use principal components analysis to support claims related to factor structure, a more appropriate approach to examining the internal structure for the assessments is to use factor analysis techniques such as confirmatory factor analysis where the latent variable(s) intended structure is used to guide the analysis.</p> <p>It was unclear why the evidence 2.1.2 was provided instead of the updated blueprint, as it is understood by peers that the updated blueprint is the operational blueprint, not the original blueprint.</p> <p>The technical report noted that the reference groups for DIF analysis were either male or Caucasian students and that DIF analyses were conducted for operational items and field test items using MH for dichotomously scored items and SMD for polytomously scored CR items. Sample size requirements for conducting DIF analysis, though, are not provided. Peer reviewers note that, for grade 5, the number of students was 1,306 for English Learners and 1,914 for students with disability (p. 39, Document 3.1.1a) and that DIF was not conducted. The state should provide its rationale for the selection of groups for DIF analysis, as sample sizes appear to be sufficient for additional groups that were not included in the analysis.</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 DELAWARE**

	<p>the summative assessment are reported as a singular score of proficiency. The score from the summative assessment is intended to make a broad statement about lasting and pervasive knowledge and skills and provide educators, parents, and the public with information on student progress towards science literacy. Subscores are not provided, as the length of the assessments does not provide for reliable information that is actionable in a benchmark model of assessment. The assessments are specifically designed to evaluate the proficiency of students to meet the NGSS standards in benchmark years, including the ever present and ever progressing practices and crosscutting concepts in the shortest amount of time possible (to meet the needs/expectations of the field). The ITAs offer a systemic measure while EoUs and Embedded assessments offer more refined measures of student achievement during instruction when adaptation and adjustment to ongoing instruction is most appropriate. ”</p>	
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide sample size requirements for DIF analysis and rationale for choosing groups for the analysis.</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 DELAWARE**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.	<b>This information is coming—information will be sent when made available by our vendor (Pearson).</b>	The state must provide evidence of the ITAs relationship with other variables.
<b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide evidence of the ITAs relationship with other variables.</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 DELAWARE**

**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 a <b><u>student’s academic achievement</u></b>.</li> </ul>	<p>The estimates of reliability reported for DeSSA-Science are internal consistency measures, which are derived from analysis of the consistency of the performance of individuals on items within a test (internal consistency reliability). Therefore, they apply only to the test form being analyzed. See:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 3.1.1a <b>2018-2019 DE NGSS ITA Technical Report_122319_(2) Chapter 9: Reliability and Validity: pages 39-41</b></li> <li>- Document 3.1.1b <b>2018-2019 DE NGSS ITA Technical Report Appendices_122219 Appendix E: Reliability Breakdowns by Grade and Subgroup</b></li> </ul>	<p>Chapter 9 references that CSEMs are provided for each theta level, but Figures E.1-E.3 show the CSEM on the scale score metric. The text describing the table doesn’t match what is shown in the table. It’s understood that the metric is not of much concern as the shape of the curve would look the same regardless of the metric. Peers wanted to point out that the language is inconsistent with the graphs.</p> <p>Of bigger concern is the size of the CSEMs and also the low reliability, especially for grade 5. The state should provide some commentary on the low reliabilities.</p> <p>Similarly, reliability estimates are found to be lower for English Learners for both grade 5 (.60) and grade 8 tests (.61) and for SWD in grade 8 (.67). Peer reviewers expect to see additional analyses (e.g., score distributions) and interpretations for the low reliability obtained for these groups.</p> <p>As for classification accuracy and consistency, which is included in the Document 3.1.1a but not cited here, it would be helpful for the state to include some guidance on the interpretation.</p> <p>Peer reviewers noted instances of inaccurate citations. For example, the page references in Doc 3.1.1a should be pages 41-44. It appears that the DE Index is listing a file name with the date of 122319, but DDOE sent a file with the date of 122419. Similarly, the Doc 3.1.1b has a date in the file name of 122219 but DDOE sent a file with the date of 122419.</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 DELAWARE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide commentary that explains the overall low reliability of the science tests and how that might impact the validity of scores.</li> <li>• Conduct additional analyses (e.g., score distributions) and explain the low reliability obtained for English Learners for grades 5 and 8 and for SWD in grade 8.</li> <li>• Provide interpretation for classification accuracy and consistency.</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 DELAWARE**

**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>Delaware has combined Content Item and Bias Review committee meetings. All prospective items are reviewed for content, alignment and bias, however DDOE also utilizes DIF statistics from field test data to identify potential biases. Items performing poorly in terms of DIF statistics are usually pulled from the item bank until subsequent reviews by content experts and bias/sensitivity can determine the source and meaning of performance differences and/or editing or removal from the bank is determined as best course of action.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 3.1.1a <b>2018-2019 DE NGSS ITA Technical Report_122319_(2)</b> <i>Differential Item Functioning pages 29-31</i></li> <li>- Document 3.1.1b <b>2018-2019 DE NGSS ITA Technical Report Appendices_122219 Appendix C:</b> <i>Differential Item Functioning</i></li> <li>- Document 3.1.2 <b>DE Science 2018 IRC Slides EoU</b></li> <li>- Document 3.1.3 <b>DE Science 2018 IRC Slides FINAL</b></li> </ul>	<p>Peer reviewers like the practice of removing items with poor DIF statistics based on field testing from item bank until subsequent content and bias/sensitivity review.</p> <p>Peer reviewers recommend inclusion of procedures for how items with extreme DIF are treated subsequent to an operational administration.</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 DELAWARE**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 3.1.4 <b>DE NGSS Content-Bias Review Training 2018_Recording</b></li> <li>- Document 3.1.5 <b>DE NGSS Content-Bias Review Training 2018_Slides</b></li> <li>- Document 3.1.6 <b>DE Science 2018 IRC Detailed Agenda Final</b></li> <li>- Document 3.1.7 <b>DE Science 2018 IRC Participant Agenda Final</b></li> <li>- Document 3.1.8 <b>Participant Agenda_DE Science 2018 CBR</b></li> <li>- Document 3.1.9 <b>DE NGSS CBR Pre-training 2019</b></li> <li>- Document 3.1.10 <b>DE NGSS Content-Bias Review Training 2019_Slides</b></li> <li>- Document 3.1.11 <b>DE EoU for CBR Aug 2019</b></li> <li>- Document 3.1.12 <b>DE NGSS Content-Bias Review 2019 Participant Agenda</b></li> </ul> <p>Additional note from submission :</p> <p>During the initial development cycle of 8 months there was limited time to devote to separate meetings for Item content and bias reviews. Therefore the committees were held as a single meeting ensuring that participants represented students with special needs (school for the deaf,</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 DELAWARE

	special education teachers, varied cultural and racial backgrounds among the teacher populations represented in content review etc). In future development cycles the meetings are intended to be separated to ensure ongoing fairness and bias reviews additional and separate from content item reviews.	
<b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or  <input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</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 DELAWARE**

**Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>Delaware’s DeSSA Science assessments were designed as criterion referenced tests in that they offer indicators of student performance in relation to a set of achievement descriptions premised on the Next Generation Science Standards. Achievement level descriptions (ALDs) describe what students at each of the four levels generally know and can do. The determination of what ITA scale score values reflect each of the thresholds between achievement levels was determined in the summer of 2019 as a result of standard setting (see document 4.3.3).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 4.3.1 <b>DE NGSS ALD slides FINAL</b></li> <li>- Document 4.3.2 <b>DeSSA_ALDs Technical Report_approved 2019.10.11</b></li> <li>- Document 4.3.3 <b>DE_Science &amp; Social Studies_Achievement Level Setting Technical Report_v1.0</b></li> </ul> <p>The 2019 Delaware DeSSA Science assessments yield scale scores that range between 300 and 900. As a result of calibration, scaling, and future equating, the scale scores from operational base forms are comparable over time within the same grade, but not across grade levels. Generally, the only inferences that can be appropriately drawn</p>	<p>For this critical element, peer reviewers expect to see score distributions, CSEM, and a cohesive narrative that describes adequate precision across the score scale. Because the narrative provided here does not describe the appropriate evidence, peer reviewers could not determine whether the evidence supports the claim in this critical element.</p> <p>Doc 4.3.3 has typos referencing VDOE and not DDOE.</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 DELAWARE**

	<p>from scale scores are that higher scale scores represent higher performance on the ITAs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 3.1.1a <b>2018-2019 DE NGSS ITA Technical Report_122319_(2)</b> <i>Chapter 8: Student Scores, Achievement Standards, and Student Performance, pp. 36-38</i></li> <li>- Document 3.1.1b <b>2018-2019 DE NGSS ITA Technical Report Appendices_122219 Appendix F: Conditional Standard Error of Measurement</b></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a cohesive narrative with evidence that the assessments produce adequately precise estimates of student performance across the full performance continuum.</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 DELAWARE**

**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>Delaware’s DeSSA Science assessments were designed as criterion referenced tests in that they offer indicators of student performance in relation to a set of achievement descriptions premised on the Next Generation Science Standards. Achievement level descriptions (ALDs) describe what students at each of the four levels generally know and can do. The determination of what ITA scale score values reflect each of the thresholds between achievement levels was determined in the summer of 2019 as a result of standard setting (see document 4.3.3).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 4.3.1 <b>DE NGSS ALD slides FINAL</b></li> <li>- Document 4.3.2 <b>DeSSA_ALDs Technical Report_approved 2019.10.11</b></li> <li>- Document 4.3.3 <b>DE_Science &amp; Social Studies_Achievement Level Setting Technical Report_v1.0</b></li> </ul> <p>The 2019 Delaware DeSSA Science assessments yield scale scores that range between 300 and 900. As a result of calibration, scaling, and future equating, the scale scores from operational base forms are comparable over time within the same grade, but not across grade levels. Generally, the only inferences that can be appropriately drawn</p>	<p>The organization of this narrative was challenging to follow. A more helpful organization would be to first describe the procedures to ensure accurate, defensible scoring for both machine- and hand-scoring (e.g., the hand-scoring procedures as provided, but also keychecks for selected response items and any score validation procedures that are used prior to score reporting). Then the narrative would describe how the valid scores, produced from these procedures, can be appropriately reported and interpreted using score reports including aligned achievement level descriptors.</p> <p>In spite of the omission of appropriate evidence regarding portions of the scoring process, peer reviewers identified Chapter 10 in Document 3.1.1a as supporting evidence.</p> <p>Procedures of training, scoring, and monitoring with regard to CR and ER items on the Science tests is included in Document 3.1.1a (pp. 23-28). And the required standards for qualifications, inter-rater reliability and validity are provided in Table 5.1. Peer reviewers desire to see exact agreement, adjacent agreement, and inter-rater reliability for the 10% of responses receiving a second score.</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 DELAWARE**

	<p>from scale scores are that higher scale scores represent higher performance on the ITAs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 3.1.1a <b>2018-2019 DE NGSS ITA Technical Report_122319_(2)</b> <i>Chapter 8: Student Scores, Achievement Standards, and Student Performance, pp. 36-38</i></li> <li>- Document 3.1.1b <b>2018-2019 DE NGSS ITA Technical Report Appendices_122219</b> <i>Appendix F: Conditional Standard Error of Measurement</i></li> <li>- Document 4.7.7 <b>SC_FREQ_DIST</b> frequency of scale score distribution</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide exact agreement, adjacent agreement, and inter-rater reliability for the CR and ER items that received a second rating.</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 DELAWARE**

**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>Delaware uses a fixed form with a matrix set embedded for field test purposes to assess students for DeSSA Science in grades 5, 8 and HS Biology. Multiple test forms are used at each grade level. Calibration, Scaling and Equating procedures are described in the Technical report listed below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 3.1.1a <b>2018-2019 DE NGSS ITA Technical Report_122319_(2)</b> <i>Chapter 7: Calibration, Scaling, and Equating</i></li> <li>- Document 3.1.1b <b>2018-2019 DE NGSS ITA Technical Report Appendices_122219</b> <i>Appendices B-E for supporting statistical analysis</i></li> </ul>	<p>Calibration and equating procedures are included in the technical report. The evidence provided is sufficient to meet the requirements.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</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 DELAWARE**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State administers any of its assessments in multiple versions within a subject area (e.g., online versus paper-based delivery; <b>or a native language version of the academic content assessment</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>Delaware provides students with all testing accommodations for students with disabilities (students with IEPs or 504 Plans) or students who are English Learners. In addition, braille test booklets and transcription services are provided for students with sight impairments. Text to speech is universal, with accommodated text to speech available as a special education accommodation and language based accessibility features are built into the online format. Please see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 3.1.1a <b>2018-2019 DE NGSS ITA Technical Report_122319_(2)</b> <i>Chapter 4: Test Administration page 19-21 also page 43</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Accessibility guidelines can be reviewed here:</b></p> <p>Document 5.1.1a <b>Accessibility Guidelines 2018-19 FINAL</b></p> <p><b>Additional Note from submission:</b></p> <p><i>Delaware has an inability to run comparability statistics between paper, Braille, and ASL assessment forms because our n-counts are extremely low.</i></p>	<p>Peer reviewers understand the challenge for conducting comparability studies between the online and accommodated or paper form because of low participation counts. However, peer reviewers would like to see the state’s plan and approach to evaluate score comparability, including steps taken in the assessment design phase to address comparability issues.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 DELAWARE

- Provide the state's plan and approach to evaluate score comparability between online and accommodated or paper forms, including steps taken in the assessment design phase to address comparability issues.

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>Delaware and it’s vendors have a quality control element built into the development and administration of the DeSSA-Science Assessment. For further information see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 3.1.1a <b>2018-2019 DE NGSS ITA Technical Report_122319_(2) Chapter 10: Quality Control Procedures</b></li> <li>- Document 4.7.1 <b>The Goals of the Delaware TAC</b></li> <li>- Document 4.7.2 <b>List of Technical Advisory Committee Members</b></li> <li>- Document 4.7.3. <b>Agenda for October 1 and 2_2018 TAC meeting_final (p.2)</b></li> <li>- Document 4.7.4 <b>DE TAC Recommendations Oct 2018 Final with DDOE actions (pp.1-2)</b></li> <li>- Document 4.7.5 <b>Agenda for Feb. 28-Mar. 1, 2019 TAC meeting (p.2)</b></li> <li>- Document 4.7.6 <b>DE TAC- Recommendations with DDOE Actions- Feb 2019 (pp.3-4)</b></li> <li>- Document 4.7.7 <b>SC_FREQ_DIST</b> frequency of scale score distribution</li> </ul> <p>Additional notes from submission:</p>	<p>Peer reviewers acknowledge that Delaware has a monitoring system in place. The TAC advised on improving test blueprints and item writing specifications for science (4.7.6).</p> <p>Peer reviewers expect to see evidence that the information about the technical quality of the assessments is made publicly available.</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 DELAWARE**

	<p>The Delaware Technical Advisory Committee advises the Delaware Department of Education (DDOE) to ensure that the state assessment system will derive valid and reliable test scores, and fairness in testing for all Delaware students to meet the federal requirements and improve teaching and learning [4.7.1 <i>The Goals of the Delaware TAC</i> and 4.7.2 <i>List of Technical Advisory Committee Members</i>]. The TAC members reviewed the technical documentations from Pearson and discussed technical issues for the Science Assessment. A sample of TAC meeting agenda and the TAC Recommendations with DDOE actions provide evidence to support monitoring, maintaining, and improving the technical quality of the assessment system [4.7.3. <i>Agenda for October 1 and 2 2018 TAC meeting_final (p.2)</i>; 4.7.4 <i>DE TAC Recommendations Oct 2018 Final with DDOE actions (pp.1-2)</i>; 4.7.5 <i>Agenda for Feb. 28-Mar. 1, 2019 TAC meeting (p.2)</i>; 4.7.6 <i>DE TAC-Recommendations with DDOE Actions- Feb 2019 (pp.3-4)</i>]</p>	
<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide evidence that the information about the technical quality of the assessments is made publicly available.</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 DELAWARE

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>DDOE offered manuals and yearly trainings for LEAs about Special Populations; in particular, Students with Disabilities to help make informed decisions about the type of assessments (Regular vs Alternate) students should take.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 5.1.1a <b>DE-Accessibility Guidelines_2018-19</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ (Section II. for SWDs outlines the decision making-process for SWDs participation in regular or alternate State assessments.</li> <li>○ Figure 2. p.17 includes the decision tree for assessing SWDs)</li> <li>○ (Section III, p.18, for ELLs, Figure 3. p.22 includes the decision tree for assessing ELLs).</li> <li>○ (Section IV, p.23, for students that are both SWD and ELL)</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Document 5.1.1b <b>DOE-Approved Process Accessibility Guidelines and Appendix Training 2018</b>. Coordinators how to request special accommodations for our students on the general assessment.</li> </ul>	<p>Some of the evidence provided here was produced by other workgroups. However, peer reviewers expect to see evidence of materials produced by the DDOE that are made available to districts and parents.</p> <p>Peer reviewers note that 5.1.3b provides information on what parents need to know about accommodations for statewide assessments. However, the document was created by the Minnesota Department of Education. Peer reviewers would like to understand the extent to which they apply to Delaware practice, including the differentiation between accommodations and modifications.</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 DELAWARE**

<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>DDOE staff from different workgroups provided information and workshops to inform parents, stakeholders about available accommodations, which should guide IEPs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 5.1.3a <b>Testing Accommodations Parent Session_PIC of Del</b> (p.3)</li> <li>- Document 5.1.3b <b>What Parents Need to Know_PIC of Del</b></li> <li>- Document 5.1.3c <b>Presentation to Governor's Advisor Council for Exceptional Citizens (GACEC) Oct 13, 2018</b></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 DELAWARE**

<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>		
<b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide evidence of materials produced by the DDOE that are made available to districts and parents.</li> <li>• Provide information on the extent to which Document 5.1.3b apply to Delaware practice, including the differentiation between accommodations and modifications or submit the correct document.</li> </ul>		

<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 DELAWARE**

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

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 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>The state requires ALL students to be assessed either with general assessment or alternate assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 1.3.1 <b>DE Administrative Code Title 14 Education</b>; Subchapter III (pp.18-19) Section 151 Paragraphs a through f.</li> <li>- Document 1.3.2a <b>DE Requirement to Test Students.</b></li> <li>- Document 1.3.2b <b>DE Requirement to Test Students.Spanish</b></li> <li>- Document 5.2.1 <b>Assessment Updates for EL Coordinator Meeting 4-12-2018</b> (Sections III and IV of Accessibility Guidelines for specific information; <b>slides 3-5 and 7</b>)</li> <li>- Document 5.1.2 <b>Accessibility Guidelines 2018-19 FINAL</b> provided information on Accessibility Guidelines to EL workgroup for inclusion in state’s assessment system. These are for regular students with needed accommodations but it is always good practice to remind educators of what is allowed on Alternate assessment (no restrictions) and other assessments where students need accommodations.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section III - English Learners (pg. 18).</li> </ul>	<p>Evidence is sufficient and comprehensive.</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 DELAWARE**

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>• Section III, Fig. 3 (p.22) – Decision tree for accessing ELLs</li> <li>• Section III, Justifiable Rationale for Selection and Deletion of EL Accommodations</li> </ul> <p>Appendix D-6, (p.102), for suggested Spanish test Reader Script</p> <p>Additional note from submission:</p> <p>Delaware requires ALL students to be assessed either with general assessment or alternate assessment and should not be denied the right to take the state assessment. Students who qualify for alternate science assessment are given the DLM Science Assessment. <b>Peer review of DLM-Science is a separate submission.</b></p>	
<b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</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 DELAWARE**

**Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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</li> </ul>	<p>See DDOE evidence provided in Critical elements 5.1 and 5.2 for accommodations requirements specified in Accessibility Guidelines.</p> <p>The state requires ALL students to be assessed either with general assessment or alternate assessment.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">- Document 5.3.1 <b>Accessibility Guidelines Training for EL Coordinators Oct25</b></p> <p>Document 5.3.2 <b>2019 Accommodations Platforms for DeSSA</b> (Slides 13-21)</p>	<p>Evidence for the availability of accommodations is provided. However, no information is provided about the impact of accommodations on the construct being measured and test performance as well as guidelines for score interpretations.</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 DELAWARE**

<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>
students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.		
<b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide information about the impact of accommodations on the construct being measured and test performance as well as guidelines for score interpretation.</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 DELAWARE**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>Delaware Regulations require LEAs to comply with test administration security and monitoring.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 1.3.1a <b>DE Administrative Code Title 14_Education</b> - Subchapter IV state assessment system security, Section 171 and Section 172</li> </ul> <p>DDOE monitors all state Assessment administrations, including DeSSA-Science administration, during scheduled school visits and discusses findings with Districts and school test coordinators (DTCs/STCs). DDOE provides a liaison to the school to help prepare for the scheduled school visit and shares a report of findings for the school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 2.4.1 <b>DeSSA Site Visits 2017-2020 Schedule</b></li> <li>- Document 2.4.1a <b>DeSSA 2019 School Visits Training</b></li> <li>- Document 2.4.1b <b>DeSSA Site Visit Observation Form 2019</b></li> <li>- Document 2.4.1c <b>DeSSA 2019 Site Visit Protocol</b></li> <li>- Document 2.4.1d <b>DeSSA Site Visit interview questions</b></li> </ul>	<p>The state submitted evidence with detailed information on site visits, training, observation protocol, interview questions, and a sample report. Peer reviewers recommend a synthesized summary of all site visits or monitoring reports for future administrations.</p> <p>Peer reviewers would prefer to have specific sections or pages identified to support submitted evidence.</p> <p>DDOE should have included Doc 5.4.1 which is a summary of Approved Test Accommodations for this critical element.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DELAWARE**

<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 align="center">- Document 2.4.1e <b>Milford Central Academy DeSSA Site Visit Report 2019</b></p> <p>Additional note from submission :</p> <p>Delaware requires ALL students to be assessed either with general assessment or alternate assessment and should not be denied the right to take the state assessment. Students who qualify for alternate science assessment are given the DLM Science Assessment. <b>Peer review of DLM-Science is a separate submission.</b></p>	
<b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</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 DELAWARE

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

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

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></p> <p>The State formally adopted <b><u>challenging academic achievement standards</u></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>See Critical Element 1.1 and 1.2 for relevant standards information relating to our DeSSA Science Assessment for ALL students <i>except those with significant cognitive disabilities.</i></p> <p><i>Students who qualify for alternate science assessment are given the Dynamic Learning Maps Science Assessment—<b>The Peer Review Process for DLM is a separate submission.</b></i></p> <p>For the DeSSA Science General assessment WestEd and DDOE developed ALDs with the assistance of grade-level teacher teams to enable valid inferences about student content area knowledge and skill in relation to the Next Generation Science Performance Expectations as measured by large-scale assessment. The technical report and accompanying ALDs for each assessment performance level AS WELL as each NGSS Performance expectation is found in the following document:</p> <p><b>Document 4.3.2 DeSSA_ALDs Technical Report_approved 2019.10.11</b></p> <p>Additional Note from Submission:</p>	<p>Peer reviewers note that achievement standards are levels used to classify and describe student achievement, determined by the cut scores set and adopted by the state. The state needs to provide evidence of Delaware’s adoption of achievement standards and their application to all public students (with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to who alternate achievement standards apply).</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 DELAWARE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Delaware requires ALL students to be assessed either with general assessment or alternate assessment.</p> <p>Dynamic Learning Maps provides assessment services for our students with significant cognitive disabilities. <i>The DLM Peer Review Process is a separate submission.</i></p>	
<b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide evidence of Delaware’s adoption of achievement standards and their application to all public students (with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to who alternate achievement standards apply) in grades 5, 8, and Biology.</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 DELAWARE**

**Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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><b><i>Built into DLM process— Peer review of DLM- Science is a separate submission.</i></b></p> <p>Additional note from submission:</p> <p>Delaware requires ALL students to be assessed either with general assessment or alternate assessment.</p> <p>Dynamic Learning Maps provides assessment services for our students with significant cognitive disabilities. <b><i>The DLM Peer Review Process is a separate submission.</i></b></p>	<p>Peer reviewers acknowledge the note of a separate submission for DLM, which is not relevant to this peer review. Peers expect to see evidence of setting academic achievement standards for the general science assessments. Note such evidence was provided for Critical Element 4.3.</p> <p>Peer reviewers express concerns that the small number of teachers participated in the standard setting (five per grade) and that all five teachers were female in grade 5.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</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 DELAWARE

**Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement 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 achievement standards:</u></b></p> <p>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</p>	<p><b><i>Built into DLM process— Peer review of DLM-Science is a separate submission.</i></b></p> <p>Additional note from submission: Delaware requires ALL students to be assessed either with general assessment or alternate assessment.</p> <p>Dynamic Learning Maps provides assessment services for our students with significant cognitive disabilities. <b><i>The DLM Peer Review Process is a separate submission.</i></b></p>	<p>Peer reviewers note that this critical element requires evidence for the Science assessments for the general student population, not for DLM. No such evidence is 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 DELAWARE**

<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>
postsecondary education or competitive integrated employment.		
<b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide evidence required for this Critical Element for the science assessments for the general student population.</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 DELAWARE**

**Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>3</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>	<p>Delaware regulations requires DDOE to report all state assessment score results and other public data in multiple formats.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 1.3.1a <b>DE Administrative Code Title 14_Education</b>, Section 155</li> </ul> <p>The state publicly reports the results of its state assessments in paper and electronic formats posted on the DDOE website and in public media releases.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 6.4.2 <b>DE_NextGen_Science_Assessment_Brochure_FORWEB</b></li> <li>- Document 6.4.3 <b>DE_Parent Brochure_Sci-FORWEB-Spanish</b></li> <li>- Document 6.4.4 <b>Science Public Reporting Sample - DE Open Data Portal</b></li> </ul> <p>District and educators can access their released data via secure access (EdInsight Portal). See Section 2.6 for more details on accessing state data securely.</p> <p>DDOE sends a printed copy of the Score reports to parents of students who participate in the DeSSA-Science assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document 6.4.1 <b>DE_SCIENCE_05_08_HS_ISR-Sample</b></li> </ul> <p>Parents are referred to an online copy of the achievement level descriptors to provide further details outlining the meaning of their student(s)' score(s) :</p>	<p>Peer reviewers expect to see the process that ensures the accessibility of score reports to parents/guardians with limited English proficiency or with disabilities.</p> <p>Peer reviewers expect to see the rationale for missing components (e.g., itemized score analysis).</p> <p>Peer reviewers acknowledge the note that score reports will be made available for peer review after its release to the public at the end of January 2020. Peer reviewers look forward to them.</p>

<sup>3</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 DELAWARE**

<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>• 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 <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</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Refer to link <a href="http://delaware.pearsonaccessnext.com/alds">http://delaware.pearsonaccessnext.com/alds</a></li> </ul> <p>Or see the following document:</p> <p><b>Document 4.3.2 DeSSA_ALDs Technical Report_approved 2019.10.11</b></p> <p>Additional note from submission:</p> <p>The first year operational scores for the Delaware Science DeSSA assessment will not be released until the end of January 2020. For that reason, SAMPLE individual student reports and EXAMPLES of online reporting venues are being made available for this peer review cycle. Upon the release of scores to the public, live web links and score reports can be made available for review.</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 DELAWARE**

<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>or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>		
<b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Provide evidence that ensures the accessibility of score reports to parents/guardians with limited English proficiency or with disabilities.</li> <li>● Provide evidence of score reports made to the public following their release at the end of January 2020.</li> <li>● Provide evidence to be submitted under “Information coming” about the accessibility to EdInsight Portal and its appropriate use.</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.