



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

May 18, 2020

The Honorable Clayton Burch  
Superintendent of Schools  
West Virginia Department of Education  
1900 Kanawha Boulevard East  
Charleston, WV 25305-0330

Dear Superintendent Burch:

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 West Virginia Department of Education (WVDE) to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in March 2020.

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 WVDE's submission and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that this component of your assessment system met some, but not all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of the ESEA. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and our own analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

- Reading/language arts (R/LA), mathematics, and science general assessments in high school (SAT): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- Science AA-AAAS for grades 5, 8, and high school (DLM Science): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**

The assessments that substantially meet requirements of the ESEA, as amended by ESSA, means that these assessments meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. The Department expects that WVDE may be able to provide this additional information within one year.

I request that WVDE 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

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

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

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: Vaughn Rhudy, Executive Director, Office of Assessment

**Critical Elements Where Additional Evidence is Needed for West Virginia’s Assessment System**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Additional Evidence Needed</b>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards for the grade that is being assessed and includes processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (e.g., a plan and a timeline to address and remedy the alignment issues identified in the existing alignment studies, particularly in mathematics).</li> </ul> <p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the test design addresses the full breadth and depth of the State’s academic content standards (e.g., a plan and timeline to address issues raised in the alignment study).</li> </ul>
<b>2.2 – Item Development</b>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</li> </ul> <p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that clarifies how the development and review process for Essential Element Concept Maps (EECMs) contributes to a technically sound test item development process.</li> </ul>
<b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State monitors the administration of assessments (e.g., completed checklists, reports, or a schedule of monitoring visits).</li> </ul> <p>For the DLM Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State monitors the administration of assessments (e.g., completed checklists, reports, or a schedule of monitoring visits).</li> </ul>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence in 2.1 will satisfy this critical element.</li> </ul> <p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence requested in critical element 2.1 will satisfy this critical element.</li> </ul>
<b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for high school as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</li> </ul>
<b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b>	<p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the science tests are related as expected with similar variables (e.g., other measures of science achievement).</li> </ul>
<b>4.1 – Reliability</b>	<p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of updated reliability for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the student population overall and each student group once certain conditions have been met (e.g., expansion of the item pool, increase of number of items per testlet, increase in the number of linkage levels).</li> </ul>
<b>4.2 – Fairness and accessibility</b>	<p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that the assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments, including additional analysis by student subgroup to analyze test fairness.</li> </ul>
<b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</b>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the State administers multiple forms of academic assessments within a content area and grade level, within school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within school years. Specifically, the State should provide an explanation regarding the differences in student counts among forms administered. This explanation should also address the differences in observed form reliabilities.</li> </ul>
<b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b>	<p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of a plan to monitor the science test before, during, and after the inclusion of Phase II development items to the test item banks, including clear and technically sound criteria.</li> <li>Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website.</li> </ul>
<b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b>	<p>For the DLM Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State does not preclude a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who takes an AA-AAAS from attempting to complete the requirements for a regular high school diploma.</li> </ul>
<b>5.3 - Accommodations</b>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>
<b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</b>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for all students.</li> </ul> <p>For the DLM Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in science.</li> </ul>
<b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b>	<p>For DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its alternate academic achievement standards in science to ensure they are valid and reliable.</li> </ul>
<b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the academic achievement standards are aligned with the State’s academic content standards and with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards such that a student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</li> </ul> <p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DLM alternate academic achievement standards ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. WVDE should provide this evidence by December 31, 2020.</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<b>6.4 – Reporting</b>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence that the State reports to the public its assessment results on student academic achievement for each student group at each achievement level.</li><li>• Evidence that 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>○ 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 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.</li></ul></li></ul> <p>For the DLM Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence that the State reports to the public its assessment results on student academic achievement for each student group at each achievement level.</li><li>• Evidence that 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>○ 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></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.

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 ..... 9**

**Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments 11**

**Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments..... 13**

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS.....14**

**Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development ..... 14**

**Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development ..... 18**

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

**Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration ..... 23**

**Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security ..... 25**

**Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy .. 28**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY .....30**

**Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content30**

**Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes ..... 32**

**Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure..... 33**

**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 ..... 39**

**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring..... 40**

**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms..... 41**

**Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment ..... 42**

**Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance ..... 43**

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS.....45**

**Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 45**

**Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments..... 49**

**Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations ..... 51**

**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.

..... 54

**SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING.....57**

**Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students..... 57**  
**Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting ..... 59**  
**Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards ..... 60**  
**Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting ..... 62**

**SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS..65**

**Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments ..... 65**  
**Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments ..... 67**  
**Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State Assessments ..... 69**

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As 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 West Virginia SAT 2020

**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><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      WV DLM Evidence 01 – WVBE Policy 2510 Assuring the Quality of Education: Regulations for Education Programs, (Sections 4.1, 4.1a, 4.1a.1, p. 3)</p> <p>General Academic Achievement Standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 02 – WVBE Board April 2015 Meeting Minutes Adoption of Policy 2520.3C, Next Generation content Standards and Objectives for Science in West Virginia Schools, (Section XXIX, p.8)</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 03 – Revision Process Documentation for West Virginia Board of Education Policies 2520.1A and 2520.2B, December 2015 (p.4-94)</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 04 – Policy 2520.3C Next Generation content Standards and Objectives for Science in West Virginia Schools, July 2016 (p.3)</li> </ul> <p>Alternate Academic Achievement Standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 05 – WVBE minutes October 11, 2017– Adoption Policy 2520.16 (West Virginia Alternate Academic Achievement Standards (WVAAAS)) - Science, (Section XXII, p. 8)</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 06 – WVAAAS Standards, Policy 2520.16, science standards (p.139)</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 07 – WVBE minutes June 13 2018 Policy 2322 (West Virginia System of Support and Accountability) and 2340</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      The reviewers found clear evidence that the State formally adopted academic science content standards.</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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	(Measures of Academic Proficiency) approval (pp.5-6)	<p><u>SAT</u>                      WV previously met the requirements for this critical element in its December 2018 peer review submission as indicated in the March 20, 2019, outcome letter from USED.</p>
<b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b>		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR West Virginia SAT 2020**

**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><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      General Academic Achievement Standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 08 – WV Code §18-2-39 – College and Career Readiness Initiative, p. 1</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 09 – WVBE Policy 2510 Assuring the Quality of Education: Regulations for Education Programs, p. 3</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 10 – Revision Process Documentation for West Virginia Board of Education Policies 2520.1A and 2520.2B, December 2015 (p.4 – 94)</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 04 – Policy 2520.3C Next Generation content Standards and Objectives for Science in West Virginia Schools, July 2016 (p.3)</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 11 – WV HEPC Series 21-2019 §133-21-4.1., p. 2, §133-21-5.1.b, p. 4                      WV DLM Evidence 12 – WV CCTCE Series 21-2019 §135-21-4.1., p. 2, §135-21-5.1.b, p. 4).</li> </ul> <p>Alternate Academic Achievement Standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 06 – WVAAAS Standards, Policy 2520.16, science standards (p.139)</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 13 – Participant list for Building Guidance Document Support for AAAS involvement</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 14 – Alternate Support Document grades 6-8</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 15 – Alternate Support Document grades 9-12</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 16 – Alternate Support Document grades k-5</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      The evidence shows that the standards are aligned with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the state. According to the submission, “West Virginia University worked closely with WVDE to make sure the standards met the requirements for colleges and universities in West Virginia.”</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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b><u>SAT</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 01 – <i>WV Code College and Career Readiness Initiative</i>, p. 1</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 02 – WVBE Policy 2510, <i>Assuring the Quality of Education: Regulations for Education Programs</i>, p. 3</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 03 – Revision Process Documentation for West Virginia Board of Education Policies 2520.1A and 2520.2B, December 2015, pp. 494</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 04 – WVBE Policy 2520.1A, <i>West Virginia College- and Career-Readiness Standards for English Language Arts</i>, §126-44AA, p. 3</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 05 – WVBE Policy 2520.2B, <i>West Virginia College- and Career-Readiness Standards for Mathematics</i>, §126-44BB, p. 3</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 06 – WVBE Policy 2520.3C, <i>Next Generation content Standards and Objectives for Science in West Virginia Schools</i>, §126-44CC, p. 3</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 07 – Cover of the WV Spotlight Final Report</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 08 – Agendas and Participants of Standards Review</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 09 – Tab 10 Summary Review Sheets for Math Standards</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 10 – Tab 11 Summary Review Sheets for ELA Standards</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 11 – Tab 14 Review Recommendations for Math Standards</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 12 – Tab 15 Review Recommendations for ELA Standards</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>SAT</u></b></p> <p>The State has met 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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

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>• WV SAT Evidence 13 – WV HEPC Series 21-2019 §133-21-4.1., p. 2, §133-21-5.1.b, p.</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 14 – WV CCTCE Series 21-2019 §135-21-4.1., p. 2, §135-21-5.1.b, p. 4).</li> </ul>	
<b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b>		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR West Virginia SAT 2020**

**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</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 17 – WVBE Policy 2340 (Measures of Academic Proficiency), §126- 14- 4.4.1 (pp. 8-9)</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 18 – Guidelines for Participation in State Assessments (p. 4, 25- 26)</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 19 – WV Code 18- 2E-5 – Administration of High School assessment at grade 11 (pp. 3-4)</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 20 – WV House Bill 2711</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 21 – WVBE Board meeting Minutes Feb 14 2018 Waiver to Policy 2340 (Measures of Academic Proficiency) Regarding testing students in Grade 11 only at the high school level, section XI (pp 3-4).</li> </ul>	<p>West Virginia had already met this requirement for mathematics and reading/language arts in a previous peer review. For science, WVDE provided evidence that it has a policy for testing students in science in grades 5, 8, and 11. It provided participation policies demonstrating that all students are included in the assessment system, and that it has an alternate assessment in science for the same grade levels for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

<p>assessment typically administered in eighth grade and allow the student to take the State end-of-course mathematics test instead.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Department may have approved the State, under the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority, to permit students in some LEAs to participate in a demonstration assessment system in lieu of participating in the State assessment.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 1.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR West Virginia SAT 2020**

**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</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 17 – WV BE Policy 2340 (Measures of Academic Proficiency), §126- 14- 4.4.1 (pp. 8-9)</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 18 – Guidelines for Participation in State Assessments (p. 4, 25- 26)</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 22 – Agenda of District Test Coordinator Meeting December 2017</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 23 – Weekly Wednesday Webinar Feb 28, 2018 Students with Disabilities</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 24 – WVBE Policy 2419 (Regulations for the Education of Students with Exceptionalities), (pp. 1, 2, 56) (Chapter 8, p. 79)</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 25 – Navigating the Online IEP Accommodations component</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 26 – W.Va. Code 18-20- 1b Education of Exceptional Children</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 27 – Policy 2417 (Regulations and English Language Proficiency Standards for English Learners) (p. 2)</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 28 – Federal Register Jan 30 2018 Listing of Federally recognized Indian tribes in the United States</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 29 – Number of American Indian students enrolled in WV Public Schools as of 1 – 16-2019</li> </ul>	<p>WVDE has clear policies requiring the inclusion of all students, including students with disabilities and those in private placements as determined by IEP teams for providing special education services. WVDE has clear requirements for the assessment of English learners, including those with disabilities.</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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

<p>may assess a student with native 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><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR West Virginia SAT 2020

### **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)).

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 30 – Press Releases (November 2015 through 2017 regarding the changes to standards and assessments in WV)</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 31 – Screen Shot of Academic Spotlight Website that addressed questions regarding standards raised during stakeholder meetings across the state in the fall of 2015.</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 10 – Revision Process Documentation for West Virginia Board of Education Policies 2520.1A (WV ELA Standards) and 2520.2B (WV Math Standards), December 2015</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 20 – WV House Bill 2711 (Establishing the Requirement to Assess Students in Grade 11)</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 28 – Federal Register Jan 30 2018 Listing of Federally recognized Indian tribes in the United States</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 29 – Number of American Indian students enrolled in WV Public Schools as of 1 – 16-2019</li> </ul>	<p>This critical element was met for reading/language arts and mathematics in the 2019 peer review. WVDE adopted science standards in April, 2015, prior to the passage of ESSA. No further evidence is required.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>x No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR West Virginia SAT 2020

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      ATLAS/Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment Consortium has submitted, on behalf of the State of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 2.1 – Test Design and Development. Please refer to the response in Critical Element 2.1 within ATLAS/DLM’s submission for peer review.</p> <p>In addition to the evidence submitted by ATLAS/DLM, West Virginia offers the following additional evidence in support of Critical Element 2.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 17 – WVBE Policy 2340 (Measures of Academic Proficiency), §12614-4.4.1</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 19 – WV Code 18- 2E-5</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 32 – Waiver Letter for Speaking and Listening from USED</li> </ul> <p>WV DLM Evidence 33 – Extension of Waiver for Speaking and Listening from USED</p>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      Per the August 2019 DLM peer review, “Evidence of an overall test design and test blueprints that measure the full breadth of the State’s grade-level academic content standards in science (e.g., evidence that the test design adequately samples the essential elements in science).”</p> <p>The state has not provided evidence related to this requested evidence.</p> <p>With regards to “processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards,” the State must provide evidence of the alignment between the State’s content standards and the assessment given that the State has adopted the Next Generation Standards and Objectives for Science and, based on the information from the August 2019 DLM peer review notes, DLM has not used the Next Generation Science Standards for the assessment.</p> <p>While not cited for this critical element, the reviewers did consider Evidence 76 with regards to alignment. This study identified alignment issues and the State should provide a plan and timeline for addressing them. Additionally, the reviewers have concerns with regards to the way in which the alignment data were summarized by the vendor. For example, Exhibit 12 on p. 10 summarizes that 100% are “Linked to WVAAS”; however more than 75% are listed as “Far Links” across grades. As another example, Exhibit 15 on p. 12 shows that 77.8% for Grade 8 are categorized as “Some” but then shows that 100% are “Linked to WVAAS.” The reviewers do not agree with these categorizations or findings based on the alignment data.</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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

<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><u>SAT</u></b>                  College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of WV, narrative and supporting evidence related to 2.1 – Test Design and Development regarding the SAT School Day. Please refer to the response in Critical Element 2.1 within College Board’s submission for peer review.                  In addition to the evidence submitted by College Board, West Virginia offers the following additional evidence in support of Critical Element 2.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 15 – WVBE Policy 2340, West Virginia Measures of Academic Performance. • §126-14-2, Page 1, includes a statement of the purpose of the assessment program.</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 16 – WV Code 18-2E-5d – Establishment of a statewide student assessment program, pp. 3-4</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 17 – Using SAT to Support Student Success on Campus</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 18 – WV Final Alignment Report</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 19 – Appendix A_E Group Consensus DOK Values for WVCCR for ELA – Grade 11</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 20 – Appendix A_F Group Consensus DOK Values for WVCCR for Science – Grade 11</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 21 – Appendix A_G Group Consensus DOK Values for WVCCR for Math – Grade 11</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 22 – Final Report on the 2018 SAT Standard Setting for West Virginia</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 23 – Waiver Letter for Speaking and Listening from USED</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>SAT</u></b>                  Per the August 2019 SAT peer review, “a plan and a timeline to address the alignment issues as identified in the existing alignment studies” is required.</p> <p>Statements of purpose were found in Evidence 15-17.</p> <p>While the State has asserted that because the SAT assesses college and career readiness, that it is sufficiently aligned, this does not meet the requirements of this critical element, specifically that the assessment is aligned to “the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards for the grade that is being assessed.”</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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 24 – Extension of Waiver for Speaking and Listening through 2018-19 from USED • Page 2 indicates the waiver applies to 2016-2017, 2017-2018, and 2018-2019</li> </ul> <p>WebbAlign conducted an external, independent alignment analysis in November 2018 to provide information about the degree of alignment of the SAT with the West Virginia College- and Career-Readiness Standards for English Language Arts (ELA) Grade 11, for high school mathematics Grades 9-11 (Algebra I, Geometry, and Algebra II), and for the Next Generation Science Content Standards for high school (Earth and Space Science, Biology, and Physical Science) (WV SAT Evidence 18 – WV Final Alignment Report).</p> <p>Based on the alignment report, West Virginia asserts acceptable alignment in ELA but acknowledges some challenges for math and science. However, instead of measuring specific grade-level standards, the SAT measures the skills that matter for college and career readiness as documented in the evidence submitted by the College Board. This aligns with West Virginia’s goal of measuring college and career readiness. West Virginia also maintains that the SAT content of the SAT School Day reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging matter and requires complex demonstrations of applications of knowledge and skills in reading/language arts, math, and science.</p> <p>West Virginia and other states will continue to work with College Board to explore expanding on the existing alignment studies to provide a better representation of the extent of alignment that does exist (e.g., show alignment to the higher-level concepts instead of individual standard statements; consider alignment to multiple forms of the SAT). This is an ongoing concern.</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 West Virginia SAT 2020

<b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b><u>DLM</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The State must provide<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <b>the State’s academic content standards</b>, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills) (e.g. an alignment study between the DLM standards and the State adopted standards).</li></ul></li><li>• See DLM peer review notes from August 2019 for additional requirements.</li></ul> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence that the assessment is aligned to the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards for the grade that is being assessed.</li><li>• See SAT peer review notes from August 2019.</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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

**Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess student achievement based on the <b><u>State’s academic content standards</u></b> in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      ATLAS/Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment Consortium has submitted, on behalf of the State of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 2.2 – Item Development. Please refer to the response in Critical Element 2.2 within ATLAS/DLM’s submission for peer review.</p> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b>                      College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 2.2 – Item Development for the SAT School Day. Please refer to the response in Critical Element 2.2 within College Board’s submission for peer review</p>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      The State has opted to use its consortium submission for this critical element. The reviewer defers to the DLM Science Peer Review determination for Critical Element 2.2.</p> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b>                      Per the August 2019 SAT peer review, “Evidence of reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State's academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills” and the “final HumRRO SAT Cognitive Lab Report” are required.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b><u>DLM</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See DLM peer review notes from August 2019.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See SAT peer review notes from August 2019.</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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

**Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>○ Has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities;</li> <li>○ If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      ATLAS/Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment Consortium has submitted, on behalf of the State of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 2.3 – Test Administration. Please refer to the response in Critical Element 2.3 with ATLAS/DLM’s submission for peer review.</p> <p>In addition to the evidence submitted by ATLAS/DLM, West Virginia offers the following additional evidence in support of Critical Element 2.3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 17 – WVBE Policy 2340 (Measures of Academic Proficiency) §12614-5; Appendices A-I (pp.21-36)</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 18 – 2018-2019 Guidelines for Participation in West Virginia Assessments (pp. 157-167)</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 34 – Agenda for District Test Coordinator Meeting December 2018</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 35 – January 2019 DTC Sp Ed Director Training PowerPoint</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 36 – West Virginia Statewide Assessment Technology Contingency Plan</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      The State referred to the DLM submission; however, DLM did not submit evidence for this critical element for the August 2019 peer review.</p> <p>Neither the State nor DLM (for the August 2019 peer review) have provided a Test Administration Manual (or comparable documentation) to address “clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations.”</p> <p>While the State has provided evidence of training materials, the reviewers could not find evidence of “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.” Specifically, who is responsible for ensuring that all test administrators receive the training, and is there a process for documenting training completion?</p> <p>Per the state, “The WVDE is in the process of revising contingency plans for technological challenges that may appear due to attacks from ransomware, DOS attacks, malware, or other cases when necessary technology has been made unavailable during the testing window.” The state should submit the updated plan when it is completed.</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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

	<p><b><u>SAT</u></b>          College Board has submitted, on behalf of the State of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 2.3 – Test Administration for SAT School Day. Refer to the response in Critical Element 2.3 within College Board’s submission for peer review.          In addition to the evidence submitted by College Board, West Virginia offers the following additional evidence in support of Critical Element 2.3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 15 – WVBE Policy 2340, West Virginia Measures of Academic Progress, §126-14-5 through §126-14-7, pp. 10-17</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 25 – 2018-19 Guidelines for Participation in West Virginia State Assessments, p. 16</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 26 – Agenda for District Test Coordinator Meeting September 2018</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 27 – PowerPoints – Updates WVGSA SAT School Day Final – September 2018</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 28 – Agenda for District Test Coordinators/Special Education Directors Meeting December 2018</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 29 – PowerPoint – WVDE SAT Training 2019 Final</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 30 – January 2019 DTC Sp Ed Director Training PowerPoint</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 31 – Weekly Wednesday Webinar PowerPoint, 08 07 2019</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 32 – WVDE SAT School Day Implementation Training 2019 Final</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 33 – SAT Educators Resources Khan Updates 11 1 2018</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>SAT</u></b>          Evidence of training required by State per August 2019 peer review of SAT.</p> <p>While the State has provided evidence of training materials, the reviewers could not find evidence of “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.” Specifically, is there a process for documenting training completion?</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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 34 – Email – IMPORTANT NOTICE_SSD Coordinator Webinar Invitation and Additional Information</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 35 – West Virginia SAT School Day Accommodations Overview_2018-2019</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 36 – Email – IMPORTANT ANNOUNCEMENT - Webinar training opportunity for SAT School Day Test Coordinators</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 37 – Email – West Virginia Q&amp;A Office Hours Sessions for SSD Coordinators</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 38 – 2018-19 SAT School Day Hall and Room Monitor Training_WV_FINAL</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 39 – Email – IMPORTANT NOTICE_Preadministration, Consent, Rosters, and the NAR pre-recorded training</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 40 – 2018-19 SAT School Day Preadministration, Consent, Rosters, and the NAR</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 41 – West Virginia Statewide Assessment Technology Contingency Plan</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 42 – Scribe Verification Form</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:  <b><u>DLM</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State:             <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 (e.g. Test Administration Manual);</li> </ul> </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 West Virginia SAT 2020

- 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;
- If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.

### SAT

- The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State:
  - 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

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As 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 West Virginia SAT 2020

**Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. Monitoring of test administration should be demonstrated for all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS.</p>	<p>WV DLM Evidence 17 – WVBE Policy 2340 (Measures of Academic Proficiency) – §126- 14-5; Appendices A-I (pp.21-36)                      WV DLM Evidence 37 – WVS.326 ELPA_DLM                      WV DLM Evidence 38 – Test Administration Observation Guidance for Local Observers                      WV DLM Evidence 39 – Test Administration Observations Protocol short version                      WV DLM Evidence 40 – Kite Collector App Instructions                      WV DLM Evidence 18 – 2018-2019 Guidelines for Participation – Appendix I (pp. 174-176)                      WV DLM Evidence 35 – 2019 District Test Coordinator - Special Educator Director Training Slide Deck (slides 3-18)                      WV DLM Evidence 41 – Weekly Wednesday Webinar (WWW) April 3, 2019 (Slides 3, 9- 12)                      WV DLM Evidence 42 – Weekly Wednesday Webinar (WWW) March 13, 2019 (Slides 2- 8)                      WV DLM Evidence 43 – West Virginia Statewide Assessments Monitoring Plan (p. 2)                      WV DLM Evidence 44 – School Test Administration Monitoring Checklist                      WV DLM Evidence 45 – DLM Test Administration Manual (pp. 10-15)</p> <p>WV SAT Evidence 15 – WVBE Policy 2340, West Virginia Measures of Academic Progress, §126-14-5.2d, p. 11.                      WV SAT Evidence 25 – Guidelines for Participation in West Virginia State Assessments, p. 16.                      WV SAT Evidence 31 – Weekly Wednesday Webinar PowerPoint, 08 07 2019                      WV SAT Evidence 43 – WVS.326 Accommodations Monitoring Form – SAT School Day</p>	<p><u>DLM:</u>                      WVDE provided an observation protocol and instructions for use with the DLM assessments. It also provided a State-specific administration checklist and a State monitoring policy. It would be helpful to have clarification of how and when the DLM observation process and the State’s checklist are used. It would also be helpful to have information about monitoring that occurred, such as a recent schedule or sample monitoring reports.</p> <p><u>SAT:</u>                      For all assessments, WVDE provided a monitoring process that includes random monitoring of all school districts for test administration and the provision of accommodations. A monitoring checklist specifically for the SAT was provided that demonstrates that the State is monitoring test administration. However, the State did not provide any evidence that monitoring actually occurred, such as a schedule or a sample of a completed monitoring report. The State should provide this.</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 West Virginia SAT 2020

	WV SAT Evidence 44 – SAT School Day - School Test Administration Monitoring Checklist WV SAT Evidence 45 – West Virginia Statewide Assessments Monitoring Guide WV SAT Evidence 46 – Protocol for Alert Responses in WV-MAP Assessments	
<b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• For SAT and DLM Science, evidence that the State monitors the administration of assessments (e.g., completed checklists, reports, or a schedule of monitoring visits).</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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

**Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> <li>• Application of test security procedures to all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      ATLAS Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment Consortium has submitted, on behalf of the State of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 2.5 – Test Security. Please refer to the response in Critical Element 2.5 within ATLAS/DLM’s submission for peer review.</p> <p>In addition to the evidence submitted by ATLAS/DLM, West Virginia offers the following additional evidence in support of Critical Element 2.5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 17 – WVBE Policy 2340 (Measures of Academic Proficiency) - §12614-5; §126-14-7; Appendices A-H</li> <li>• WV Evidence 18 – October 2018-2019 Guidelines for Participation – Appendices AH; pp. 157 – 166</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 46 – DLM Test Security Agreement</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 47 – WVASA Security Checklist</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 48 – Weekly Wednesday Webinar (WWW) March 21, 2018 (slides 6-7)</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 49 – Investigations Database Screenshots</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 50 – DLM Refresher Remix (slide 8)</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 51 – Redacted Email Regarding Testing Irregularity</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      The State referred to the DLM submission; however, DLM did not submit evidence for this critical element for the August 2019 peer review.</p> <p>While the State has provided evidence to demonstrate a process for documenting test irregularities, the reviewers did not provide sufficient evidence of “remediation following any test security incidents” or “investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.” Evidence 51 refers to a different assessment. To meet this portion of the critical element, the State could provide a summary of annual reported irregularities for the WV DLM assessments as well associated investigations and follow-up actions taken.</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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

	<p><b><u>SAT</u></b>          College Board has submitted on behalf of the State of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 2.5 – Test Security for SAT School Day. Refer to the response in Critical Element 2.5 within College Board’s submission for peer review.</p> <p>In addition to the evidence submitted by College Board, West Virginia offers the following additional evidence in support of Critical Element 2.5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 15 – WVBE Policy 2340, West Virginia Measures of Academic Progress, §126-14-7, pp. 15 -17, and §126-14-8, pp. 17 – 20, pp. 21-35.</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 44 – SAT School Day - School Test Administration Monitoring Checklist</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 47 – Test Security Incident Log</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 48 – WV Office of Assessment Investigative Database</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 49 – WV Test Administration and Security Handbook</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 50 – Redacted Email Regarding Testing Irregularity</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>SAT</u></b>          Per the August 2019 SAT peer review, the State must provide, “annual training requirements for test security policies and procedures was conveyed in each state to appropriate staff.”</p> <p>While Evidence 15 refers to training of staff on security, these policies refer to WV-MAP assessments not the SAT. The State should provide evidence of annual training requirements for test security policies and procedures relevant to the SAT.</p> <p>While the State has provided evidence to demonstrate a process for documenting test irregularities, the reviewers could not find sufficient evidence of “remediation following any test security incidents” or “investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities” either in the State submission or in the August 2019 SAT peer notes. Evidence 50 is relevant to these aspects of the critical element; however, it is not sufficient as there is no evidence of the results of the assessments (e.g. Did the student retest? Was the score validated?)</p>
<p><b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b><u>DLM</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State must provide evidence that annual training requirements for test security policies and procedures was conveyed in each state to appropriate staff.</li> <li>• 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>○ Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> </ul> </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 West Virginia SAT 2020

- Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As 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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results;</li> <li>• To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> <li>• To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      ATLAS/Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment Consortium has submitted, on behalf of the State of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy. Please refer to the response in Critical Element 2.6 within ATLAS/DLM’s submission for peer review.</p> <p>In addition to the evidence submitted by ATLAS/DLM, West Virginia offers the following additional evidence in support of Critical Element 2.6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 52 – Data Management Guidance</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 53 – WVBE Policy 4350 (Family Education Rights and Privacy Act) §126-94-3.3.b</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 54 – Data Privacy PowerPoint</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 55 – Protecting the Privacy and Confidentiality of Student Data</li> </ul> <p>WV DLM Evidence 56 – Data Access and Management</p> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b>                      College Board has submitted, on behalf of the state of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy for SAT School Day. Refer to the response in Critical Element 2.6 within College Board’s submission for peer review.</p> <p>In addition to the evidence submitted by College Board, West Virginia offers the following additional evidence in support of Critical Element 2.6:</p>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      The State referred to the DLM submission; however, DLM did not submit evidence for this critical element for the August 2019 peer review.</p> <p>While the State did not submit evidence related to “protecting 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,” the reviewers found the minimum N count of 10 for reporting in the State’s ESSA state plan.</p> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b>                      While the August 2019 SAT peer review notes stated that, “no additional evidence required per August 2018 letter to CSDE for SAT,” State-specific evidence related to this critical element is required.</p> <p>Evidence 51 provides information about the policies and procedures for WV Department of Education staff.</p> <p>Evidence 58 provides training information for district staff on data privacy.</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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 15 – WVBE Policy 2340, West Virginia Measures of Academic Progress, §126-14-7, pp. 15 -17 and §126-14-8, pp. 17 – 20.</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 51 – Data Access and Management Guidance</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 52 – WVBE Policy 4350, Procedures for the Collection, Maintenance, and Disclosure of Student Information</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 53 – WV Code §18-2-5h, the Student Data Accessibility, Transparency, and Accountability Act</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 54 – HS – Contractor Access to Student Data Agreement Between WV and SAT</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 55 – Addendum to Student Data Agreement</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 56 – HS – Statement of Confidentiality and Nondisclosure</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 57 – ZoomWV/Edvantage Solution Security Document</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 58 – PowerPoint – Privacy-andAssessment_Sept2018</li> </ul>	<p>Evidence 54 provides information about the agreement between the State and the College Board with regards to data.</p> <p>The State has met the requirements for this critical element.</p>
<b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b>		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR West Virginia SAT 2020

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. The State’s validity evidence includes evidence that:</p> <p><b><u>The State’s academic assessments</u></b> measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> <li>• Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards;</li> <li>• If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards and administers alternate assessments aligned with those standards, the assessments show adequate alignment to the State’s academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b> ATLAS/Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment Consortium has submitted, on behalf of the State of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content. Please refer to the response in Critical Element 3.1 within ATLAS/DLM’s submission for peer review.</p> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b> College Board has submitted, on behalf of the state of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content for the SAT School Day. Refer to the response in Critical Element 3.1 within College Board’s submission for peer review. In addition to the evidence submitted by College Board, West Virginia offers the following additional evidence in support of Critical Element 3.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 16 – WV Code 18-2e-5d(3), pp. 34</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 17 – Using SAT to Support Student Success on Campus</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 18 – WV SAT Alignment Report - Final</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 19 – WV SAT Alignment Report – Appendix A_E ELA WV 2018</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 20 – WV SAT Alignment Report – Appendix A_F Science WV 2018</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 21 – WV SAT Alignment Report – Appendix A_G Math WV 2018</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b> Per the August 2019 DLM peer review, “additional evidence will be submitted for DLM Science in June 2020.”</p> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b> Per the August 2019 SAT peer review, “a plan and timeline for addressing alignment issues” is required.</p> <p>“Based on the alignment report, West Virginia asserts acceptable alignment in ELA. Although alignment challenges were identified in math and science, West Virginia maintains that the SAT content of the SAT School Day reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging matter and requires complex demonstrations of applications of knowledge and skills in reading/language arts, math, and science. Also, as stated in CE.2.1, West Virginia and other states will continue to work with College Board to explore expanding on the existing alignment studies to provide a better representation of the extent of alignment that does exist (e.g., show alignment to the higher-level concepts instead of individual standard statements; consider alignment to multiple forms of the SAT). This is an ongoing concern.”</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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

<p>and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>		<p>With regards to the alignment, see comments from Critical Element 2.1.</p>
<b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b><u>DLM</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See DLM peer review notes from August 2019.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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:</li> <li>• <b><u>The State’s academic assessments</u></b> measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> <li>○ Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As 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 West Virginia SAT 2020

**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><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      ATLAS/Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment Consortium has submitted, on behalf of the State of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes. Please refer to the response in Critical Element 3.2 within ATLAS/DLM’s submission for peer review</p>	<p><b><u>SAT</u></b>                      Per the August 2019 SAT peer review, “Validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for high school as represented in the State’s academic content standards” is required.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for <b><u>DLM</u></b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:  <b><u>SAT</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See SAT peer review notes from August 2019.</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 West Virginia SAT 2020

**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><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      ATLAS/Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment Consortium has submitted, on behalf of the State of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure. Please refer to the response in Critical Element 3.3 within ATLAS/DLM’s submission for peer review.</p> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b>                      College Board has submitted, on behalf of the state of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure for SAT School Day. Refer to the response in Critical Element 3.3 within College Board’s submission for peer review. In addition to the evidence submitted by College Board, West Virginia offers the following additional evidence in support of Critical Element 3.3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 22 – WV SAT Standard Setting Report Final 2018 – 07-10</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      This CE was met prior to the August 2019 peer review.</p> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b>                      Per the August 2019 SAT peer review, “Scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State's academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based” is required.</p> <p>The State’s provided evidence does not address this critical element.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>X<u>  </u> No additional evidence is required for <b><u>DLM</u></b></p> <p><u>  </u>X<u>  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:  <b><u>SAT</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See SAT peer review notes from August 2019.</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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      ATLAS/Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment Consortium has submitted, on behalf of the State of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables. Please refer to the response in Critical Element 3.4 within ATLAS/DLM’s submission for peer review.</p>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      Per the August 2019 DLM peer review, “a three year validity study will start in spring 2020, expanding on a process piloted in spring 2019 to survey teachers about students’ skills. Correlational data from the first year of the study will be submitted in June 2020.”</p> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b>                      No additional evidence required per previous peer reviews.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for <b><u>SAT</u></b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:  <b><u>DLM</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See DLM peer review notes from August 2019.</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 West Virginia SAT 2020

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER

**Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability**

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 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><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      ATLAS/Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment Consortium has submitted, on behalf of the State of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 4.1 - Reliability. Please refer to the response in Critical Element 4.1 within ATLAS/DLM’s submission for peer review.</p> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b>                      College Board has submitted, on behalf of the state of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 4.1 – Reliability for the SAT School Day. Refer to the response in Critical Element 4.1 within College Board’s submission for peer review.                      In addition to the evidence submitted by College Board, West Virginia offers the following additional evidence in support of Critical Element 4.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 59 – SAT Subgroup Reliability Report</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      Per the August 2019 DLM peer review, “additional evidence will be submitted for DLM Science in June 2020.”</p> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b>                      Per the August 2019 SAT peer review, “evidence of adequate reliability for students with disabilities, English learners, and students who received accommodations” is required.</p> <p>Based on Evidence 59, more than 16,800 students took the SAT in 2019; however, no data were reported for students with disabilities. The reviewers question why there were so few students with disabilities taking the assessment which is resulting in data being suppressed for this population.</p> <p>Based on Evidence 59, the four forms of the assessment are not being administered equally across students. The reviewers would like to know how or why this is being done.</p> <p>The reliability values by subject area for Forms 1 and 2 are substantially lower than those for Forms 3 and Form 4. The State should provide additional information to explain the differences in reliability across forms.</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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b><u>DLM</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See DLM peer review notes from August 2019.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State must provide               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population (e.g. evidence of adequate reliability by form as noted above);</li> </ul> </li> <li>• See SAT peer review notes from August 2019.</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 West Virginia SAT 2020

**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><u>For academic content assessments,</u></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><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      ATLAS/Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment Consortium has submitted, on behalf of the State of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility. Please refer to the response in Critical Element 4.2 within ATLAS/DLM’s submission for peer review.</p> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b>                      College Board has submitted, on behalf of the state of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility for the SAT School Day. Refer to the response in Critical Element 4.2 within College Board’s submission for peer review.                      In addition to the evidence submitted by College Board, West Virginia offers the following additional evidence in support of Critical Element 4.2:</p>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      Per the August 2019 DLM peer review, the following evidence is required:                      Evidence of reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that the assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development, and analysis of its assessments, based on the updated version of the assessment. Such evidence may include the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Once sufficient data exists, additional analysis by student subgroup to analyze test fairness.</li> <li>• Once sufficient data exists, additional item analysis to examine the effects of certain stimuli (e.g., “fictionalized” science stories) and item response characteristics (response order) on test fairness.</li> <li>• Specific criteria used for external test reviewers and test item writers regarding fairness and accessibility.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b>                      No additional evidence required per previous peer reviews.</p> <p>Evidence 25 demonstrates consistency with SAT guidelines.</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 West Virginia SAT 2020

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• WV SAT Evidence 25 – Guidelines for Participation in West Virginia State Assessments</li></ul>	
<b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for <b>SAT</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <b>DLM</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• See DLM peer review notes from August 2019.</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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

**Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for <b><u>academic assessments</u></b>, including performance for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      ATLAS/Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment Consortium has submitted, on behalf of the State of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum. Please refer to the response in Critical Element 4.3 within ATLAS/DLM’s submission for peer review.</p>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      This critical element has been met by DLM.</p> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b>                      No additional evidence required per previous peer review.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>X No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR West Virginia SAT 2020**

**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s <b><u>academic achievement standards</u></b>.</p>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      ATLAS/Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment Consortium has submitted, on behalf of the State of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 4.4 - Scoring. Please refer to the response in Critical Element 4.4 within ATLAS/DLM’s submission for peer review.</p>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      This critical element was met prior to the August 2019 DLM peer review.</p> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b>                      No additional evidence required per previous peer review.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR West Virginia SAT 2020**

**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>If the State administers multiple forms of <b>academic assessments</b> within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s <b>academic content standards</b> and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      ATLAS/Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment Consortium has submitted, on behalf of the State of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms. Please refer to the response in Critical Element 4.5 within ATLAS/DLM’s submission for peer review.</p>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      This critical element was met prior to the August 2019 DLM peer review.</p> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b>                      No additional evidence required per previous peer review.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>X No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR West Virginia SAT 2020**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>If the State administers any of its assessments in multiple versions within a subject area (e.g., online versus paper-based delivery; <b><u>or a native language version of the academic content assessment</u></b>), grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>• Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      ATLAS/Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment Consortium has submitted, on behalf of the State of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment. Please refer to the response in Critical Element 4.6 within ATLAS/DLM’s submission for peer review.</p>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      This critical element was met prior to the August 2019 DLM peer review.</p> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b>                      No additional evidence required per previous peer review.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>X No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR West Virginia SAT 2020**

**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><b><u>DLM</u></b>            ATLAS/Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment Consortium has submitted, on behalf of the State of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance. Please refer to the response in Critical Element 4.7 within ATLAS/DLM’s submission for peer review.            In addition to the evidence submitted by ATLAS/DLM, West Virginia offers the following additional evidence in support of Critical Element 4.7:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WV DLM Evidence 57 – WV NTAC – List and Bios of members</li> <li>WV DLM Evidence 58 – WV NTAC InPerson Meeting Agenda – December 11-12, 2018</li> <li>WV DLM Evidence 59 – WV NTAC Webinar Agenda – September</li> </ul> <p>WV DLM Evidence 60 – Assessment Advisory Council Agenda</p> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b>            College Board has submitted, on behalf of the state of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance. Refer to the response in Critical Element 4.7 within College Board’s submission for peer review.            In addition to the evidence submitted by College Board, West Virginia offers the following additional evidence in support of Critical Element 4.7:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WV SAT Evidence 60 – Triannual Planning Meeting Agenda</li> <li>WV SAT Evidence 61 – SAT State User Group Agenda</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>            Per the August 2019 DLM peer review:            “Evidence of a plan to monitor the science test before, during, and after the inclusion of phase II development items to the test item banks, including clear and technically sound criteria.”</p> <p>Evidence is provided that WVDE seeks the advice of its TAC and other advisory groups. However, no evidence is provided that “evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website.”</p> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b>            Per the August 2019 SAT peer review, evidence of a “system for 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” is required.</p> <p>Adequate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the State has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving as need its assessment system.</p> <p>Evidence 66-67 provides evidence that the technical quality information is made public.</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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 62 - WV NTAC – List and Bios of members</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 63 - WV NTAC In-Person Meeting Agenda – December 11-12, 2018</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 64 - WV NTAC Webinar Agenda – September</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 65 – Assessment Advisory Council Agenda</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 66 – WV SAT Test Analysis Report</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 67 – Screenshot of Test Analysis Report Posted on State’s Website</li> </ul>	
<b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b><u>DLM</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• See DLM peer review notes from August 2019.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See SAT peer review notes from August 2019.</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 West Virginia SAT 2020

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> </ul>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>            ATLAS/Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment Consortium has submitted, on behalf of the State of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities. Please refer to the response in Critical Element 5.1 within ATLAS/DLM’s submission for peer review.</p> <p>West Virginia offers the following additional evidence in support of Critical Element 5.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 18 – October 2018-2019 Guidelines for Participation (pp. 16, 67-75)</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 09 – WVDE Policy 2510 §126-42-5.4.i.1, p. 25</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 17 – WVBE Policy 2340, West Virginia Measures of Academic Progress, §126-14-2.1, p. 1, §126-14-4., pp.8 -10, §126-14-5.6 and 5.6a, p. 13, §126-143.58, p. 7, and §126-14-4.3, 4.3.a-c, p. 9,</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 18 – 2018-2019 Guidelines for Participation in West Virginia State Assessments, Sections II, IV, and V.</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 62 – WVS.326 and ACCM.14 app training</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 63 – Navigating the Online IEP Accommodations Section</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 61 – WVBE Policy 2419, Regulations for the Education of Students with Exceptionalities, pp. 51, 56-59, 91</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>            The State referred to the DLM submission; however, DLM did not submit evidence for this critical element for the August 2019 peer review.</p> <p>The State’s definition of “students with the most significant cognitive disabilities” was found in Evidence 18 on p.67.</p> <p>Neither the State nor DLM (for the August 2019 peer review) have provided the DLM Accommodations and Accessibility Manual.</p> <p>The reviewers could not locate information about how participation in the AA-AAAS should “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.”</p> <p>While Evidence 66 provides evidence of communication with parents, it does not explain to parents that “that their child’s achievement will be measured based on alternate academic achievement standards.” Additional evidence is needed to address this.</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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

<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>• Provide information for IEP Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provides a clear explanation of the differences between assessments aligned with grade-level academic achievement standards and those aligned with alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student's education resulting from taking an AA-AAAS, such as how participation in such assessments may delay or otherwise affect the student from completing the requirements for a regular high school diploma;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Ensure that parents of students assessed with an AA-AAAS are informed that their child's achievement will be measured based on alternate academic achievement standards;</li> <li>• Not preclude a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who takes an AA-AAAS from attempting to complete the requirements for a regular high school diploma; and</li> <li>• Promote, consistent with requirements under the IDEA, the involvement and progress of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in the general education</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 64 – West Virginia Alternate Summative Assessment (WVASA) Eligibility Rubric</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 18 – October 2018-2019 Guidelines for Participation (pp. 28-36, 73, 76-90, 199-202)</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 65 – West Virginia Alternate Summative Assessment (WVASA) Informational Guide</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 66 – WV Alternate Assessment Parent Letter</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 67 – Alternate Diploma Parent Brochure</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 68 – All Things Alternate Presentation (Slides 6, 8, 10, 15, 16, 17, 22, 30, 36-40)</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 69 – Course Code Manual</li> </ul> <p><b>SAT</b> College Board has submitted on behalf of the state of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities. Refer to the response in Critical Element 5.1 within College Board's submission for peer review. In addition to the evidence submitted by College Board, West Virginia offers the following additional evidence in support of Critical Element 5.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 02 – WVDE Policy 2510 §126-425.4.i.1, p. 25</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 15 – WVBE Policy 2340, West Virginia Measures of Academic Progress, §126-14-2.1, p. 1, §126-14-4., pp.8 -10, §126-14-5.6 and 5.6a, p. 13, §126-14-3.58, p. 7, and §126-14-4.3, 4.3.a-c, p. 9,</li> </ul>	<p><b>SAT</b> Per the August 2019 SAT peer review, evidence that “states follow procedures to request SAA be college-reportable” is required.</p> <p>Because the State does not permit SAA, the reviewers are concerned that some students with disabilities may not be included in this assessment or that “student’s individual abilities and needs” are not being met.</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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>curriculum that is based on the State’s academic content standards 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WV SAT Evidence 25 – 2018-2019 Guidelines for Participation in West Virginia State Assessments, Sections II, IV, and V.</li> <li>WV SAT Evidence 68 – WVBE Policy 2419, Regulations for the Education of Students with Exceptionalities, pp. 51, 56-59, 91</li> <li>WV SAT Evidence 44 – SAT School Day - School Test Administration Monitoring Checklist</li> <li>WV SAT Evidence 69 – WVEIS Directions for Administrators to Verify Accommodations</li> <li>WV SAT Evidence 70 – WVS.326 and ACCM.14 app training</li> <li>WV SAT Evidence 71 – Navigating the Online IEP Accommodations Section</li> <li>WV SAT Evidence 72 – Section 504 Record</li> <li>WV SAT Evidence 73 – SAT School Day Parent Letter and Flyer March Test Date</li> <li>WV SAT Evidence 74 – SAT School Day Parent Letter and Flyer April Test Date</li> <li>WV SAT Evidence 75 – WV Alternate Assessment Informational Guide for Parents/Guardians</li> <li>WV SAT Evidence 76 – WV Alternate Assessment Parent Letter – 2018</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b><u>DLM</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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;</li> </ul> </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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b><u>SAT</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given the State’s policy on SAA, the State must provide evidence that it 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.</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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all ELs in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s academic content assessments and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed with a linguistic accommodation(s);</li> <li>• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for ELs;</li> <li>• Assistance regarding selection of appropriate linguistic accommodations for ELs, including to the extent practicable, assessments in the language most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what those students know and can do to determine the students’ mastery of skills in academic content areas until the students have achieved English language proficiency.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>            ATLAS/Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment Consortium has submitted, on behalf of the State of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 5.2 – Procedures for Including ELs. Please refer to the response in Critical Element 5.2 within ATLAS/DLM’s submission for peer review.</p> <p>West Virginia offers the following additional evidence in support of Critical Element 5.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 18 – October 2018-2019 Guidelines for Participation (pp. 76-90)</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 27 – (WVDE Policy 2417, Regulations and English Language Proficiency Standards for English Learners) (§126-15-3.4-5, §126-15-3.8; p. 4, 7)</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 17 – WVBE Policy 2340, West Virginia Measures of Academic Progress §126-14-4.2.a-c, p. 8 and §126-145.6, p.13</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 70 – Screenshot of EL Plan</li> </ul> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b>            College Board has provided on behalf of the state of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 5.2 Test Administration. Refer to the response in Critical Element 5.2 within College Board’s submission for peer review.</p> <p>In addition to the evidence submitted by College Board, West Virginia offers the following additional evidence in support of Critical Element 5.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 77 – Policy 2417 – Regulations and English Language Proficiency</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>            The State referred to the DLM submission; however, DLM did not submit evidence for this critical element for the August 2019 peer review.</p> <p>Neither the State nor DLM (for the August 2019 peer review) have provided the DLM Accommodations and Accessibility Manual.</p> <p>The State must provide more specific information to guide assessments for EL students with significant cognitive disabilities. Currently the information appears to be somewhat disjointed in that information for ELs is provided in one location and information for students with significant cognitive disabilities is provided in a different location. In order to meet this critical element, the State must provide evidence that it clearly communicates procedures to ensure the inclusion of all ELs in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s Alternate academic content assessments.</p> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b>            Because the State does not permit SAA, the reviewers are concerned that some ELs and ELs with disabilities may not be included in this assessment or that “student’s individual abilities and needs” are not being met.</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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Standards for English Learners §126-15-3.5, and §126-15-3.6, p. 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 78 – WVBE Board Meeting Minutes Adoption of Policy 2417 Section XI (page 4)</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 15 – WVBE Policy 2340, West Virginia Measures of Academic Progress §126-144.2.a-c, p. 8 and §126-14-5.6, p.13</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 25 – Guidelines for Participation in West Virginia State Assessments, Sections III, IV, and V and appendices O, P and Q.</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 79 – WWW Presentation 2 28 18</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 80 – District Test Coordinators Meeting Agenda 9 14 2018</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 69 – WVEIS Directions for Administrators to Verify Accommodations</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 71 – Navigating the Online IEP Accommodations Section</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 81 – Screenshot of EL Plan</li> </ul>	
<b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b><u>DLM</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all ELs in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s <u>Alternate academic content assessments</u> and <u>clearly communicates</u> this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents</li> </ul> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Given the State’s policy on SAA, the State must provide evidence of the State’s procedures to ensure the inclusion of all ELs in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s academic content assessments</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 West Virginia SAT 2020

**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>academic achievement</b> of students with disabilities.</li> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs;</li> <li>• Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> <li>• Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> <li>• Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>            ATLAS/Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment Consortium has submitted, on behalf of the State of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 5.3 – Accommodations. Please refer to the response in Critical Element 5.3 within ATLAS/DLM’s submission for peer review.            West Virginia offers the following additional evidence in support of Critical Element 5.3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 17 – WVBE Policy 2340, West Virginia Measures of Academic Progress, §126-14-4.3 p. 9, §126-14-5.6, p.13 and Appendix I</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 61 – WVBE Policy 2419, Regulations for the Education of Students with Exceptionalities (p.55)</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 71 – Navigating the Online IEP Slide Deck (slides 76, 85-86, 114)</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 35 – 2019 District Test Coordinators/Special Educator Director Training Slide Deck (slides 4-14)</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 18 – 2018-19 Guidelines for Participation (pp. 70-75, 78-92, 106)</li> <li>• WV Evidence 18 – 2018-19 Guidelines for Participation (pp. 70-75)</li> </ul> <p>WV Evidence 18 – 2018-19 Guidelines for Participation (pp. 19, 104, 138)</p> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b>            College Board has provided on behalf of the state of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 5.3 -- Accommodations. Refer to the response in Critical Element 5.3 within College Board’s submission for peer review.</p>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>            The State referred to the DLM submission; however, DLM did not submit evidence for this critical element for the August 2019 peer review.</p> <p>The reviewers could not find evidence that the State “ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs,” specifically those with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p> <p>Neither the State nor DLM (for the August 2019 peer review) have provided the DLM Accommodations and Accessibility Manual to demonstrate 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.”</p> <p>Evidence 18 refers to all assessments but does not provide sufficient information for DLM.</p> <p>The reviewers found the documentation of the process for requesting exceptional accommodations beyond those routinely available in Evidence 18 on p. 104.</p> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b>            Per the August 2019 SAT peer review, evidence is required to show that the accommodations provided “(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</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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

<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>students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.</p>	<p>In addition to the evidence submitted by College Board, West Virginia offers the following additional evidence in support of Critical Element 5.3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 15 – WVBE Policy 2340, West Virginia Measures of Academic Progress, §126-14-4.3 p. 9, §126-14-5.6, p.13 and Appendix I</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 25 – Guidelines for Participation in West Virginia State Assessments, Sections I, II, III and Appendix K</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 68 – WVBE Policy 2419, Regulations for the Education of Students with Exceptionalities, p.55</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 80 – District Test Coordinators Meeting Agenda 9 14 2018</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 69 – WVEIS Directions for Administrators to Verify Accommodations</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 72 – Section 504 Record</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 82 – W. Va. Code 18-20-1d, Education of Exceptional Children</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 83 – Section 504 Guidance Brochure</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 84 – Email Communication with College Board Regarding Special Accommodations Request</li> </ul>	<p>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.”</p> <p>While Evidence 84 provides an example of an exceptional request, the State has not provided information regarding the process that is followed for such requests.</p> <p>Given the State’s policy on SAA, the State should demonstrate how it “ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.”</p>
<p><b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b><u>DLM</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs (ELs with significant cognitive disabilities)</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> </ul> </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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b><u>SAT</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> <li>○ Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• See SAT peer review notes from August 2019.</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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>○ Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>○ Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>○ Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL;</li> <li>○ Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures;</li> <li>○ Monitored for administrations of all required academic content assessments and AA-AAAS.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      ATLAS/Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment Consortium has submitted, on behalf of the State of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations. Please refer to the response in Critical Element 5.4 within ATLAS/DLM’s submission for peer review. West Virginia offers the following additional evidence in support of Critical Element 5.4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 17 – Policy 2340 (Measures of Academic Proficiency) §12614-4.3 (p. 9); §126-14-5-2-d (p. 11); §126-145-6 (p. 13)</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 18 – 2018-2019 Guidelines for Participation (p. 21-25, 167, 172-173)</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 61 – Policy 2419 (Regulations for the Education of Students with Exceptionalities) (p. 53, 56)</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 71 – Navigating the Online IEP Slide Deck</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 72 – Monitoring Testing of Special Populations</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 71 – Navigating the Online IEP Slide Deck</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 73 – WVS.326 and ACCM.14 app training</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 88 – ACCM.14 Assessment Accommodations Verification Instructions</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 37 – WVS.326 ELPA21DLM form</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      The State referred to the DLM submission; however, DLM did not submit evidence for this critical element for the August 2019 peer review.</p> <p>The State has not provided evidence to demonstrate that the state “monitors test administration in districts and schools;” therefore the State must provide evidence of monitoring in order to meet each aspect of this critical element.</p> <p>Evidence 72 appears to be a document created specifically for the purpose of Peer Review rather than formal State policy or procedure.</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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>WV DLM Evidence 74 – Alternate Assessment – More than Just a Test (Slides 715)</p> <p><b>SAT</b> College Board has provided on behalf of the state of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations. Refer to the response in Section 5.4 within College Board’s submission for peer review. In addition to the evidence submitted by College Board, West Virginia offers the following additional evidence in support of Critical Element 5.4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 77 – WVBE Policy 2417, Regulations and English Language Proficiency Standards for English Learners, §126-15-3.5, and §126-15-3.6, p. 2</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 15 – WVBE Policy 2340, West Virginia Measures of Academic Progress, §126-14-3.1, p. 1; §126-14-5 pp.10 – 13, §126-14-3.57, p.7; §126-14-4.2 p. 8; §126-14-4.3 p. 9, §126-14-5.6, p.13 and Appendices A-I, pp.21-36</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 25 – Guidelines for Participation in West Virginia State Assessments, Sections I, II, III, V, VI, VII and Appendices K, M and N.</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 85 – Agenda of District Test Coordinator Meeting Dec. 2017</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 68 – WVBE Policy 2419, Regulations for the Education of Students with Exceptionalities, pp. 55-56.</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 86 – Evidence Regarding Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations for West Virginia State Assessments</li> </ul>	<p><b>SAT</b> Per August 2019 SAT peer review, evidence related to this critical element must be provided by the State.</p> <p>Evidence 45 provides information related to the State’s monitoring procedures; however, it refers specifically to the WVGSA and WVASA and not to the SAT. The State should provide confirmation that the information applies to the SAT.</p> <p>While the State has provided evidence of procedures for monitoring, the State has not provided evidence of implementation of those procedures (e.g. summary of results of monitoring from the most recent year of test administration in the state).</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR West Virginia SAT 2020**

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>• WV SAT Evidence 80 – District Test Coordinators Meeting Agenda 9 14 2018</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 69 – WVEIS Directions for Administrators to Verify Accommodations</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 71 – Navigating the Online IEP Accommodations Section</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 72 – Section 504 Record</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 81 – Screenshot of EL Plan</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 45 – West Virginia Statewide Assessments Monitoring Guide</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 87 – 2016-17 Special Education Compliance Report</li> </ul>	
<b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b><u>DLM</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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:               <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> </li> </ul> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Monitored for administrations of all required academic content assessments and AA-AAAS (i.e. confirmation that policies apply to the SAT).</li> <li>○ Evidence of implementation of monitoring procedures (e.g. summary of results of monitoring from the most recent year of test administration in the state)</li> </ul> </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.

**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><b><u>DLM</u></b></p> <p>West Virginia offers the following additional evidence in support of Critical Element 6.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 06 – Policy 2520.16 WVAAAS (ELA, Math, and Science)</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 76 – WVAAAS-EE Alignment Study Report</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 04 –Policy 2520.3C Next Generation Science Standards</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 14 – Alternate Support Document Grades 6-8</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 15 – Alternate Support Document Grades 9-12</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 16 – Alternate Support Document Grades K-5</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 68 – All Things Alternate Presentation (slides 17-29)</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 86 – Guide to Scoring and Reporting for SEAs</li> </ul> <p>WV DLM Evidence 87 – Science and EOI Biology Performance Descriptors</p> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 22 – WV SAT Standard Setting Report</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 15 – WVBE Policy 2340, West Virginia Measures of Academic Progress, §126-14-4.1, p. 8; §126-14-4.6.5.a, p. 14; §126-14-4.6.5.b, p. 15.</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 80 – District Test Coordinators Meeting Agenda 9 14 2018</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b></p> <p>The state has provided the academic content standards as evidence. This critical element requires formal approval of the achievement standards (cut scores) for the assessments.</p> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b></p> <p>While the August 2019 SAT peer review notes state that “no additional evidence required per August 2018 letter to CSDE for SAT,” the State must provide evidence related to this critical element.</p> <p>The State has not provided evidence of the formal adoption of challenging academic achievement standards (e.g. Board minutes). Evidence 89 is a memo and therefore does not demonstrate formal adoption.</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 West Virginia SAT 2020

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>• WV SAT Evidence 88 – WV Scaled Score/Performance Descriptor Information <a href="https://wvde.us/assessment/scaled-score-information/">https://wvde.us/assessment/scaled-score-information/</a></li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 89 – MEMO – College Board - Approval of WV Cut Scores for SAT School Day</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 90 – Cut Score Approval PowerPoint</li> </ul>	
<b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b><u>DLM</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State formally adopted <b><u>challenging academic achievement standards</u></b> in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for all students, specifically:               <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> </li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State formally adopted <b><u>challenging academic achievement standards</u></b> in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for all students</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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

**Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards.</u></b></li> </ul>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      ATLAS/Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment Consortium has submitted, on behalf of the State of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting. Please refer to the response in Critical Element 6.2 within ATLAS/DLM’s submission for peer review.</p> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 22- WV SAT Standard Setting Report</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 91 – SAT Standard Setting Agenda Writing</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 92 – SAT Standard Setting Agenda Math</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 93 – SAT Standard Setting Agenda ERW</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 94 – SAT Standard Setting Agenda Science</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      Per the August 2019 DLM peer review:                      “Evidence of a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting alternate academic achievement standards in science to ensure they are valid and reliable.”</p> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b>                      No additional evidence required per previous peer review.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for <b><u>SAT</u></b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:  <b><u>DLM</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See DLM peer review notes from August 2019.</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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b><u>For academic achievement standards:</u></b></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><u>DLM</u></b></p> <p>ATLAS/Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment Consortium has submitted, on behalf of the State of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards. Please refer to the response in Critical Element 6.3 within ATLAS/DLM’s submission for peer review.</p> <p>West Virginia offers the following additional evidence in support of Critical Element 6.3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 76 – West Virginia Alternate Academic Achievement Standards – Essential Elements Alignment Study Report</li> <li>• WV DLM Evidence 77 –Transition Technical Assistance Center</li> </ul> <p>WV DLM Evidence 78 – Screenshots and Links to PathwaysWV Transition Resources</p> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 22- WV SAT Standard Setting Report</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 13 – WV HEPC Series 21-2019 §133-21-4.1., p. 2, §133-21-5.1.b, p. 4</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 14 – WV CCTCE Series 21-2019 §135-21-4.1., p. 2, §135-21-5.1.b, p. 4).</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b></p> <p>Per the August 2019 DLM peer review: “Evidence that the DLM alternate academic achievement standards ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. Oklahoma State Department of Education should provide this evidence by December 31, 2020.”</p> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b></p> <p>Per August 2019 peer review, “Evidence of how the academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school.”</p> <p>While the State has asserted that because the SAT assesses college and career readiness, that it is sufficiently aligned, this does not meet the requirements of this critical element, specifically that the assessment is 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</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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

<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.		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.
<b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b><u>DLM</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See DLM peer review notes from August 2019.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards and with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards such that a student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</li> </ul>		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As 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 West Virginia SAT 2020

**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</u></b><sup>3</sup></p> <p>For <b><u>academic content assessments</u></b>, the State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the <b><u>specific academic needs of students</u></b>, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      ATLAS/Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment Consortium has submitted, on behalf of the State of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 6.4 – Reporting. Please refer to the response in Critical Element 6.4 within ATLAS/DLM’s submission for peer review.</p> <p>West Virginia offers the following additional evidence in support of Critical Element 6.4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WV DLM Evidence 79 – ZoomWV Screenshots</li> <li>WV DLM Evidence 80 – DLM Interpretive Guide</li> <li>WV DLM Evidence 81 – Guide to the West Virginia Alternate Summative Assessment</li> <li>WV DLM Evidence 82 – Print Job Request – DLM Individual Student Reports</li> <li>WV DLM Evidence 83 – Sept 2018 District Test Coordinator Training DLM (slide 33)</li> <li>WV DLM Evidence 84 – DLM Toolkit</li> </ul> <p>WV DLM Evidence 85 – Timely Release of Reports to Superintendent Verification</p> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b>                      College Board has submitted, on behalf of the state of West Virginia, narrative and supporting evidence related to 6.4 Test Administration. Refer to the response in Section 6.4 within</p>	<p><b><u>DLM</u></b>                      The State referred to the DLM submission; however, DLM did not submit evidence for this critical element for the August 2019 peer review.</p> <p>While Evidence 79 provides some publicly available results, the State must provide evidence of reporting “to the public its assessments on student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level.”</p> <p>The State does not currently have parent reports available in languages other than English – and do describe other processes it may use to provide information to parents who are not proficient in English. Per the State, “West Virginia is working with ATLAS/DLM to create Spanish versions of the parent reports. Other languages to follow.”</p> <p>The State must provide evidence of providing, “upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, ...[reports] in an alternative format accessible to that parent.”</p> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b>                      Per the August 2019 SAT peer review, the States must provide</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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>after each administration of its academic content assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a <b><u>student’s academic achievement</u></b>;</li> <li>○ Report the <b><u>student’s academic achievement</u></b> in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards;</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific <b><u>academic needs of students</u></b>;</li> <li>○ Are provided in an understandable and uniform format;</li> <li>○ Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian;</li> <li>○ Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative</li> </ul>	<p>College Board’s submission for peer review. In addition to the evidence submitted by College Board, West Virginia offers the following additional evidence in support of Critical Element 6.4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 15 – WVBE Policy 2340 West Virginia Measures of Academic Progress §126-14-6.1, p. 13</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 95 – Memo Final GRF 2019</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 96 – ZoomWV State Assessment Summary Screenshot <a href="https://zoomwv.k12.wv.us/Dashboard/dashboard/7301">https://zoomwv.k12.wv.us/Dashboard/dashboard/7301</a>.</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 97 – ZoomWV State Assessment by Subgroups Screenshot</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 98 –SAT School Day Online Reporting Training Superintendents’ Update</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 99 – Grade 11 Sample Parent Report SAT School Day</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 100 – Interpretive Guide SAT School Day Family Report</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 101 – PowerPoint Presentation for Understanding SAT School Day Parent Reports</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 102 – Translation Contract for Chinese</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 103 – Translation Contract for Spanish</li> <li>• WV SAT Evidence 104 – Timely Release of Reports Memo</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors)</li> <li>• Alternate formats are available (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand</li> <li>• Evidence of process and timeline is needed from states that student reports are provided to teachers, principals and parents as soon as practicable.”</li> </ul> <p>Evidence 99 demonstrates that the State “reports the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors).”</p> <p>While the State has stated in their peer review evidence submission that they translations and alternate formats can be provided, the State has not provided evidence of this being communicated to the field or having provided such translations or alternate formats.</p> <p>Evidence 104 demonstrates timely 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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">format accessible to that parent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b><u>DLM</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State reports to the public its assessment results on <b><u>student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level</u></b></li> <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>○ 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> </ul> <p><b><u>SAT</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its academic content assessments that:             <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> </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 West Virginia SAT 2020

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

(if applicable; evidence for this section would be submitted in ADDITION to evidence for sections 1 through 6)

**Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has established technical criteria to use in its review of any submission of a locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment. The State has completed this review using its established technical criteria and has found the assessment meets its criteria <b>prior to</b> submitting for the Department’s assessment peer review.</p> <p>The State’s technical criteria include a determination that the assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is aligned with the challenging State academic standards; and</li> <li>• Addresses the depth and breadth of those standards.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <p>The State has procedures in place to ensure that a district that chooses to use a nationally recognized high school academic assessment administers the same assessment to all high school students in the district except for students with the most significant</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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

<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>cognitive disabilities who may be assessed with an AA-AAAS.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The technical criteria established by the State in reviewing a locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment must ensure that the use of appropriate accommodations does not deny a student with a disability or an EL—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The opportunity to participate in the assessment; and</li> <li>• Any of the benefits from participation in the assessment that are afforded to students without disabilities or students who are not ELs.</li> </ul>		
<b>Section 7.1 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 West Virginia SAT 2020

**Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School**

**Academic Assessments**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State must have procedures in place to ensure that:</p> <p><b>Before</b> a district requests approval from the State to use a nationally recognized high school academic assessment, the district notifies all parents of high school students it serves—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the district intends to request approval from the State to use a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in place of the statewide academic assessment;</li> <li>• Of how parents and, as appropriate, students may provide meaningful input regarding the district’s request (includes students in public charter schools who would be included in such assessments); and</li> <li>• Of any effect of such request on the instructional program in the district.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 7.2 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 West Virginia SAT 2020

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

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As 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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

**Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State 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 locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is equivalent to or more rigorous than the statewide assessment, with respect to—               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The coverage of academic content;</li> <li>○ The difficulty of the assessment;</li> <li>○ The overall quality of the assessment; and</li> <li>○ Any other aspects of the assessment that the State may establish in its technical criteria;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Produces valid and reliable data on student academic achievement with respect to all high school students and each subgroup of high school students in the district that—               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Are comparable to student academic achievement data for all high school students and each subgroup of high school students produced by the statewide assessment at each academic achievement level;</li> <li>○ Are expressed in terms consistent with the State’s academic achievement standards; and</li> <li>○ Provide unbiased, rational, and consistent differentiation among schools within the State for the purpose of the State determined accountability system including calculating the Academic Achievement indicator and annually meaningfully differentiating between schools.</li> </ul> </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 West Virginia SAT 2020**

<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>
<b>Section 7.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<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.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## August 2019 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

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 ..... 9**

**Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments 11**

**Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments..... 13**

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS.....14**

**Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development ..... 14**

**Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development ..... 18**

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

**Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration ..... 23**

**Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security ..... 25**

**Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy .. 28**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY .....30**

**Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content30**

**Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes ..... 32**

**Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure..... 33**

**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 ..... 39**

**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring..... 40**

**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms..... 41**

**Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment ..... 42**

**Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance ..... 43**

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS.....45**

**Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 45**

**Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments..... 49**

**Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations ..... 51**

**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.

..... 54

**SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING.....57**

**Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students ..... 57**  
**Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting ..... 59**  
**Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards ..... 60**  
**Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting ..... 62**

**SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS..65**

**Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments ..... 65**  
**Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments ..... 67**  
**Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State Assessments ..... 69**

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

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b><u>For academic content standards:</u></b>                      The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public schools and public school students in the State.</p>	<p>No additional evidence required per August 2018 letter to CSDE for SAT</p>	
<p><b>Section 1.1 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 SAT Consortium Resubmission**

**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>No additional evidence required per August 2018 letter to CSDE for SAT</p>	
<p><b>Section 1.2 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 SAT Consortium Resubmission**

**Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>No additional evidence required per August 2018 letter to CSDE for SAT</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 SAT Consortium Resubmission**

<p>             eighth grade and allow the student to take the State end-of-course mathematics test instead.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Department may have approved the State, under the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority, to permit students in some LEAs to participate in a demonstration assessment system in lieu of participating in the State assessment.</li> </ul> </p>		
<p><b>Section 1.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p> <input 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> </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 SAT Consortium Resubmission**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>No additional evidence required per August 2018 letter to CSDE for SAT</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 SAT Consortium Resubmission**

<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 SAT Consortium Resubmission**

**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>State-specific; not applicable.</p>	
<p><b>Section 1.5 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 SAT Consortium Resubmission

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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><b>Evidence Document:</b>  <b>2.1.a SAT User Group Geometry Review</b> Discussion of math, specifically geometry, alignment took place at a meeting of state partners and College Board. The analysis resulting from this discussion is included to show the ongoing work to ensure the SAT is well aligned with state standards and classroom expectations. SAT state partners have conducted independent alignment studies with UConn, HumRRO, and WebbAlign using SAT test forms and item data as a resource. We are submitting some examples of these documents to be clear that states using the SAT are not relying on vendor produced alignment reports to support future submissions by state’s using SAT.</p> <p><b>Evidence Documents:</b>  <b>2.1.b Connecticut SAT Alignment Report Final June 2016</b>  <b>2.1.c SAT Alignment Final Report_DE</b>  <b>2.1.d SAT Alignment Final Report_Maine</b>  <b>2.1.e WV DRAFT alignment report 12_06_2018</b></p> <p><b>Evidence Document:</b>  <b>2.1.f SAT Assessment Reporting</b>            Question Analysis screenshot referenced in the notes section. Score reporting resources allow teachers and students to see the content and state specific standards alignment of each item as part of the reporting process</p>	<p>Additional evidence requested for the SAT:  <b>A plan and a timeline to address the alignment issues identified in the existing alignment studies, particularly in mathematics.</b></p> <p><b>2.1.a SAT User Group Geometry Review</b>            After a February 27, 2019 meeting with States, College Board wrote a response indicating how the geometry content is selected for the SAT. Delaware, Michigan, Connecticut, New Hampshire, Maine, Illinois, Rhode Island “agreed that the alignment of the SAT Math Test to state standards is satisfactory and adequately meets their assessment needs” to which College Board provided a summary of the alignment study results, a summary of how the SAT assesses state high school mathematics standards, and a rationale for why the alignment is sufficient. The rationale stated “there are questions derived from the CCSS high school geometry standards that will align to other SAT Math Test domains. Therefore, students who take the SAT Math Test may be exposed to questions that are aligned to the six CCSS conceptual categories under high school geometry.” The text is intended to provide evidence that the geometry content assessed on the SAT Math Test requires a deep understanding of existing high school geometry standards and is therefore assessing an acceptable breadth of the geometry state standards.</p> <p>Page 2 states the independent alignment studies had different results. Even though the results confirm weak alignment to geometry and functions, SAT describes some of the noted gaps as “intended” (p. 3), which makes it sound as though the SAT has not changed the content but has studied it and defends the quality of the geometry items</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 SAT Consortium Resubmission**

<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>that <b>may</b> be presented to students. SAT does not forecast changing the content to better align to the CCSS.</p> <p><b>2.1.b Connecticut SAT Alignment Report Final June 2016</b></p> <p>The CT alignment study examined the SAT framework and the CT standards – items were not used for this alignment study. “Panelists were not asked to comment on the degree of match or the nature of the match.” Instead it seems that the number of panelists claiming a match was used to define strong, moderate, or weak match. Then the process for summarizing ratings of standard-dimension associations implied that panelists DID comment on the degree of match, and the summarization scheme may have produced inflated results.</p> <p>In the Data Collection Procedures section, “we did not examine the extent to which the CT Core Standards are covered in the CT SAT School Day.” Furthermore, the policy decisions section #1 implies that the one-way alignment study sought to align the test framework to the standards, not to insure the breadth and depth of the standards were apparent in the test framework.</p> <p>Mathematics table of results: introduction states that weak.no matches are not included. This seems to be an incomplete, possibly misleading representation of the results, if true. But then several rows in the tables that follow include No Match findings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted alignment gaps: Geometry – CO and Functions</li> <li>• Discussion indicates modest alignment for math.</li> <li>• Demographic information not supplied for panelists.</li> </ul> <p><b>2.1.c SAT Alignment Final Report_DE</b></p> <p>Alignment study also cited flaws in the alignment, particularly for math, in that there are topics in the DE state standards that are not addressed by the SAT (e.g., gaps in content, mathematical practices, grade level, etc.). Report</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 SAT Consortium Resubmission**

		<p>recommends that the state supplement the SAT in such areas to insure they assess the breadth and depth of the standards.</p> <p><b>2.1.d SAT Alignment Final Report_Maine</b>  HUMRRO study for Maine, page 15:  “Because the blueprint is not identified in terms of CCSS standards or numbers of items, no statement about how well the test meets the blueprint using the CCSS can be made.” The criteria beginning on page 16 list alignment of items or item specs to standards and other features, but there is not a criterion to measure the assessment of the breadth of the standards.</p> <p>The Special Study using the CCSSO Criteria evaluated whether the SAT (only one form) aligned to the content standards.</p> <p>Alignment results indicate poor rigor alignment between the CCSS and the SAT.</p> <p>Although HUMRRO report indicates that there is non alignment the states could address this in other ways, such as directing teachers to teach the missing concepts. However, there is no State mechanism for monitoring this.</p> <p>This report also directs Maine to satisfy gaps in how the SAT measure the content standards using supplementary assessments in the state.</p> <p><b>2.1.e WV DRAFT alignment report 12_06_2018</b>  It is of interest to note that Reviewers comments were redacted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Table 3 indicates only about half of the ELA standards aligned to one or more test items on the two forms studied.</li> <li>• Table 11 notes several math items are aligned to middle school standards and not to the HS standards.</li> </ul>
--	--	---

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium Resubmission**

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Table 12 indicates that only 16% of the standards are addressed by at least one test item. Both math forms had weak Range of Knowledge.</li> <li>• Table 13 indicates that MOST of the items on the math forms required major adjustments to achieve sufficient alignment to the standards.</li> <li>• Tables 14 and 15 indicates that Geometry and higher concepts in Algebra did not align.</li> </ul> <p>Summary: The available evidence does <b>not</b> justify the alignment of the SAT to the breadth and depth of the mathematics state standards or the depth of the state standards in ELA. Several of the cited reports advise states to incorporate additional assessments to complement the SAT to insure the breadth and depth of the standards are assessed. Evidence should be provided as requested.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A plan and a timeline to address the alignment issues as identified in the existing alignment studies.</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 SAT Consortium Resubmission

**Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>The following reviewer guides provide the relevant evidence for item development and selection as requested.</p> <p><b>Evidence Documents:</b>  <b>2.2.a SAT Suite Writing and Language TD Reviewer Guide</b>  <b>2.2.b SAT Suite Reading TD Reviewer Guide</b>    <b>2.2.c SAT Suite Test Development Guide for the Reading Test</b>  <b>2.2.d SAT Suite Test Development Guide for the Writing and Language Test</b>  <b>2.2.e SAT Suite Math TD Reviewer Guide</b></p>	<p>Additional evidence requested for the SAT:</p> <p><b>Evidence of reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State's academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</b></p> <p>2.2.a – 2.2.e provide detailed information about test development and review, including item development and test assembly.</p> <p><b>2.2.c SAT Suite Test Development Guide for the Reading Test, pp. 26-37 p. 89 – item review criteria -</b>  <b>2.2.d SAT Suite Test Development Guide for the Writing and Language Test, pp. 31-40</b>  Evidence submitted in this section did not indicate that the items were created based on any state’s academic content standards.  The evidence did not directly address cognitive processes; however, text complexity is addressed in the test development guides for ELA tests.</p> <p><b>3.2.a Overview of SAT Cognitive Lab Report</b>  The College Board partnered with HumRRO to conduct a Cognitive Lab Study of the SAT due September 2019 which may provide information on the cognitive process, including higher order thinking skills. This report should be submitted for review.</p> <p><b>2.1.d SAT Alignment Final Report_Maine</b>  The HumRRO study submitted for section 2.1 pointed out some of the issues with DOK and reporting category alignment based on state standards.</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 SAT Consortium Resubmission

		<p>P. 8 indicates that when comparing item DOK levels with the CB identified standards DOK levels, panelists’ rating demonstrate that the majority of items are either equal to or lower than the grade level standards. (first paragraph, last page.). Teachers also made comments that items were at lower level than CT standards.</p> <p>P. 39 Item DOK distribution. No evidence provided about CB DOK classification – no blueprints; however, in the report, HumRRO must have known the DOK. What does the blueprint require and how are items assigned to position in blueprint? What is the plan to address items that have lower DOK than the grade level standards?</p> <p>Evidence not submitted to meet this component of the critical element.</p> <p><b>Evidence of guidelines for item writers with respect to fairness in the development and review process.</b></p> <p><b>2.2.a SAT Suite Writing and Language TD Reviewer Guide</b>  <b>2.2.b SAT Suite Reading TD Reviewer Guide</b>  <b>2.2.e SAT Suite Math TD Reviewer Guide</b>          Test development reviewer guidelines for each content area describe the review process that includes both content and fairness reviews. Fairness reviews use both quantitative and qualitative methods. Fairness review criteria include diversity requirements, topics to avoid, portrayal, stereotyping, group identification, ethnocentrism, regionalism, language, testing context, and gender. The cited pages for these test development guides provide clear guidelines for ensuring fairness and diversity in passages, graphics, items, item responses. Demographic information on the developers and reviewers could have been provided to enhance the fairness and diversity development and review process.</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 SAT Consortium Resubmission**

		<p>Available evidence justifies appropriate attention to fairness in item development and review phases.</p> <p><b>4.2.a SAT Suite Universal Design Principles</b> This document addresses development of items for fairness.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State's academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</li> <li>• Final HumRRO <u>SAT Cognitive Lab Report</u>.</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 SAT Consortium Resubmission

**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 other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>	<p>While some state partners using the SAT, notably CSDE as lead state for this response, did not receive requests for additional information here, we are including the following additional evidence based on the summary notes in our consortia submission from 2018. Every testing site receives the following testing manual in time for state specific SAT school day training.</p> <p><b>Evidence Document:</b>  <b>2.3.a SAT-School Day Accommodated Testing Manual State-Provided</b>            Pages 10-11 outline the preparation coordinators and proctors need to make prior to test day            Pages 12-13 outline the materials needed for accommodated testing including readers            Pages 15-16 includes “Plan for transcribing answers”            Page 31 includes the specific process for administering readers and scribes            Pages 35-84 for script associated with correct timing and accommodation – as indicated on the roster            Each state makes this training available through live, online, or webinar and tracks participation. The following is a script from the online training available in 2018-19 to all state SAT users as a common example to show that the training includes the specific evidence required.  <b>Evidence Document:</b>  <b>2.3.b Online Test Day Training Script</b>            (page references are to the pages # in the pdf document)            Pages 3-7 provide the instructions for planning accommodating testing</p>	<p>The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p><b>Provide evidence to address policies and procedures for standardized test administration that:</b>  <b>Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, specifically administration with accommodations, that is, read aloud and scribe;</b></p> <p><b>2.3.a SAT-School Day Accommodated Testing Manual State-Provided.</b> Directions and scripts, as appropriate, for all allowable accommodations are included in this manual. Specific reader scripts are provided to readers and testing must be administered in a one-to-one setting. Directions for administering scribes are provided and this accommodation also must be administered in a one-to-one setting. Associated extend testing times are provided for these accommodations. Directions for transcribing student responses are included.</p> <p><b>Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s assessment receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments, including verification of training</b></p> <p><b>2.3.b Online Test Day Training Script</b>            p. 34 Test Coordinators must complete online training and attain a passing score of 80%.</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 SAT Consortium Resubmission**

	<p>Pages 22-24 cover how to read the non-standard scripts included in the Accommodated Testing Manual including reinforcement of the policy to practice the scripts in advance of administration.</p> <p><b>Evidence Document:</b>  <b>2.3.c CSDE-Test-Day-Training-2272019</b>          As a state specific example from CSDE, pages 45 &amp; 47 respectively cover the Reader &amp; Scribe policies and processes that were included in the mandatory SAT Coordinator training. Page 90 includes the policy to use the accommodated testing manual (Evidence 2.3.a) for training the staff responsible for administration.</p> <p><b>Evidence Document:</b>  <b>2.3.d SAT School Day Coordinator Manual State-provided</b>          Pages 61-62 have an example of the staff agreement form that each educator responsible for materials and/or room proctor must sign. This allows College Board and state SAT users to have an auditable record that training was completed, and processes followed.</p>	<p><b>2.3.c CSDE-Test-Day-Training-2272019</b>          p. 66 “All staff must participate in coordinator test training live or online . . .”</p> <p>Training presentation slides and script reiterate information about accommodations that are in the accommodations manual.</p> <p><b>2.3.d SAT School Day Coordinator Manual State-provided, pp. 61-62.</b>          The cited pages only require test administrators, proctors, or monitors to agree they have read the manual. Although there is a statement on this document that Test Coordinators must ensure that test administrators are properly trained, there is no completion of training documentation provided in this evidence.</p> <p>States should submit verification that training was implemented as described in SAT documents.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required of SAT</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed from States:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States must submit verification that training was implemented as described in SAT documents.</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 SAT Consortium Resubmission**

**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.	State-specific; not applicable.	
<p><b>Section 2.4 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 SAT Consortium Resubmission

**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><b>Evidence Document:</b>  <b>2.3.c CSDE-Test-Day-Training-2272019</b>                      As a state specific example from CSDE, this in-person training is required and tracked for every testing site. Pages 9-10 stress the importance of training and adherence to all security policies and processes outlined in the presentation and manuals provided. They also outline the key policies that have been most relevant to past SAT and other CT state assessments. Pages 105-109 review the handling of test materials. Page 121 covers seating                      Pages 126-129 cover the handling of breaks and protection of test materials during administration Pages 138-139 cover the scripts and when/how to dismiss students                      Pages 143-159 cover all of the procedures for coordinators to monitor testing and report any conduct that could violate state testing policy  <b>Evidence Document:</b>  <b>2.3.b Online Test Day Training_Script</b>                      (page references are to the pages # in the pdf document)                      Key test security processes are covered throughout this training, which is available, and required unless changed by specific state policy, for every testing site. Though every part of administration is applicable to test security, pages 7-13 &amp; 17-29 cover procedures most relevant to test security.</p>	<p>Additional evidence requested for the SAT:  <b>Evidence of annual training requirements for test security policies and procedures for Connecticut educators for all assessments.</b></p> <p><b>2.3.b Online Test Day Training Script</b>                      Page citations communicate clear security policies and procedures for administration of SAT.</p> <p><b>2.3.c CSDE-Test-Day-Training-2272019</b>                      Page citations communicate clear security policies and procedures for administration of SAT. p. 67 states that Test Coordinators must “participate in mandatory Coordinator’s training – either live or online.”</p> <p>Documentation describes test security safeguards. Although the comments from SAT claim that online training is required, the evidence does not make clear how completion of training is documented. Are there online data collected when a person completes the training?</p> <p>The documentation offered by the SAT only requires test administrators, proctors, and monitors to agree they have received and read the manual.</p> <p>Only Connecticut provided evidence for this component of the critical element.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required from SAT</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed from States</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual training requirements for test security policies and procedures was conveyed in each state to appropriate staff.</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 SAT Consortium Resubmission**

--

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results;</li> <li>• To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> <li>• To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.</li> </ul>	<p>No additional evidence required per August 2018 letter to CSDE for SAT</p>	
<p><b>Section 2.6 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 SAT Consortium Resubmission

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. The State’s validity evidence includes evidence that:</p> <p><b><u>The State’s academic assessments</u></b> measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), , balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> <li>• Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards;</li> <li>• If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards and administers alternate assessments aligned with those standards, the assessments show adequate alignment to the State’s academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content</li> </ul>	<p><b>Evidence Document:</b>  <b>2.1.a SAT User Group Geometry Review</b> Discussion of math, specifically geometry, alignment took place at a meeting of state partners and College Board. The analysis resulting from this discussion is included to show the ongoing work to ensure the SAT is well aligned with state standards and classroom expectations. SAT state partners have conducted independent alignment studies with UConn, HumRRO, and WebbAlign using SAT test forms and item data as a resource. We are submitting some examples of these documents to be clear that states using the SAT are not relying on vendor produced alignment reports to support future submissions by state’s using SAT.</p> <p><b>Evidence Documents:</b>  <b>2.1.b Connecticut SAT Alignment Report Final June 2016</b>  <b>2.1.c SAT Alignment Final Report_DE</b>  <b>2.1.d SAT Alignment Final Report_Maine</b>  <b>2.1.e WV DRAFT alignment report 12_06_2018</b></p> <p><b>Evidence Document:</b>  <b>2.1.f SAT Assessment Reporting</b>                  Question Analysis screenshot referenced in the notes section. Score reporting resources allow teachers and students to see the content and state specific standards alignment of each item as part of the reporting process</p>	<p>Additional evidence requested for the SAT:  <b>Evidence requested in Critical Element 2.1 will satisfy this Critical Element.</b></p> <p>Please refer to comments in 2.1</p> <p>Summary: the available evidence does <b>not</b> justify the alignment of mathematics to the SAT to the breadth of the mathematics state standards. Several of the cited reports advise states to incorporate additional assessments to complement the SAT to insure the breadth of the standards are assessed.</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 SAT Consortium Resubmission

and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.		
<b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b>		
__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A plan and a timeline to address the alignment issues as identified in the existing alignment studies.</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 SAT Consortium Resubmission

**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><b>Evidence Document:</b>  <b>3.2.a Overview of SAT Cognitive Lab Report</b></p>	<p><b>Additional evidence requested for the SAT: Validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for high school as represented in the State's academic content standards.</b></p> <p><b>3.2.a Overview of SAT Cognitive Lab Report</b>                      This memo provides a high-level overview of the project and updates as of June 2019. The College Board partnered with HumRRO to conduct a Cognitive Lab Study of the SAT. The purpose of the research study is to learn more about how test takers solve questions (i.e., test items) on the Evidence-based Reading and Writing (ERW) and Math sections of the SAT test. The evidence describes the research questions and sampling for a cognitive lab study. The interview questions and results were not provided. The evidence is insufficient to determine whether the SAT evokes the intended cognitive processes.                      A final report should be submitted when it is complete.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for high school as represented in the State's academic content standards.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium Resubmission

**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 <u>academic content standards</u>.</p>	<p><b>Evidence Documents:</b>  <b>3.3.a SAT Suite Technical Manual Appendixes (October)</b>                      Page 73 has a table with the section score characteristics                      Pages 139-141 (table A-6.9.1 through A-6.9.3) has the raw score correlations for Reading, Writing &amp; Language, and Math on three operational forms of the SAT                      Pages 158-160 (table A-6.12.1 through A-6.12.3) has the scaled score correlations for Reading, Writing &amp; Language, and Math on three operational forms of the SAT  <b>3.3.b StudentScoreReport_Redacted</b>                      This document shows how the section scores are reported to students &amp; families in the most generic paper report from College Board. It describes the performance related to the SAT benchmarks; states provide supplemental reports for their own performance levels  <b>3.3.c Delaware parent report</b>                      Provided as an example of how one state provides the intended interpretations in the context of their state content standards and performance descriptors.  <b>3.3.d skills insight sat suite</b>                      Provided as evidence of how College Board presents the students performance in each test section in the context of academic skills. Educators have a map of these skills to specific state standards available to them, dynamically, through online score reporting tools.</p>	<p>Additional evidence requested for the SAT:  <b>Evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State's academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</b></p> <p><b>2.1.c. SAT Alignment Final Report_DE</b>                      p. 46. “However, reporting the subscores does not provide additional information, statistically, above and beyond the information offered through the total score used alone. Thus, caution should be used in placing too much emphasis on or over-interpreting what the subscores mean regarding strengths and weaknesses of a student. This cautionary message needs to be disseminated down to principals, teachers, and anyone who may use the subscores; the subscores may be misleading if used alone.”</p> <p><b>3.3.a SAT Suite Technical Manual Appendixes (October)</b>                      Provides evidence that subscores are correlated with each other as expected (math subscores with each other, ELA subscores with each other).</p> <p>The HUMRRO study illuminated some of the issues with the subscores, particularly within the math section. Also, the underlying issues with these validity critical elements are aligned to and measure “state’s academic standards” which the assessment does not appear to be well aligned.</p> <p><b>3.3.b StudentScoreReport_Redacted</b>                      SAT score report is based on the SAT framework. The comment provided in the index by SAT implies that the score reports published by the SAT are based on the SAT’s framework. This would imply that states are left</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 SAT Consortium Resubmission

		<p>with the task of explaining what scores mean in terms of their state standards.</p> <p><b>3.3.c Delaware parent report</b>  This report is a State-specific (Delaware) example of how results and skills are described and includes a scale of the Delaware Achievement Levels in relation to the student’s SAT scores.  DE report is based on the SAT framework with a section that breaks up the SAT scale into proficiency categories. No correspondence from the SAT framework to the DE standards is offered in the report.</p> <p><b>3.3.d skills insight sat suite</b>  SAT documents proficiency categories with descriptors based on specific skills and concepts. The comment in the index implies that educators have access to a mapping from the SAT framework to their state standards in the online reporting system; however, this map was not provided in the evidence and apparently is not available to students or parents.</p> <p>The evidence supplied by the SAT does not illustrate how the reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the state standards.</p> <p>The SAT framework does not correspond well to the CCSS or state standards framework. Domains do not map to CCSS domains. Such mapping is available to teachers, but not parents and students. Inferences cannot be made about a student’s knowledge in relation to CCSS based on SAT scores. Skills are described for different score ranges. However, all of this information is generic and not state-specific.</p> <p>The evidence provided illustrates how well the test can predict college and career readiness. States are using</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 SAT Consortium Resubmission**

		<p>standards that guide instruction to help students become college and career ready.</p> <p>However, the evidence submitted does not provide any information on how well students have mastered the state Standards. There is limited evidence that “State Standards” are being measured by the assessment but the overall notion of college and career readiness is. This is a critical point because this assessment can measure college and career readiness but it is not measuring and providing information on how well students mastered the state standards. As the evidence in this peer review has indicated, these are indeed two separate but equally important measurable aspects that have not been integrated into the assessment.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State's academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</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 SAT Consortium Resubmission**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.	No additional evidence required per August 2018 letter to CSDE for SAT	
<b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<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 SAT Consortium Resubmission

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER

**Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability**

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 reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. If the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, measures of reliability for the assessment overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of <b>a student’s academic achievement</b>.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Evidence Documents:</b>  <b>4.1.b Delaware 2018 SAT SWD TA Report</b> This document has analysis for students that used testing accommodations during the 2018 SAT administration</p> <p>The following documents contain reliability data for students with disabilities, English learners, and students who received accommodations.  <b>4.1.c 2016 Michigan SAT Subgroup Reliability</b>  <b>4.1.d 2018 Connecticut SAT Subgroup Reliability</b>  <b>4.1.e 2018 DE SAT Subgroup Reliability</b></p>	<p><b>Additional evidence requested for the SAT: Reliability data for students with disabilities, English learners, and students who received accommodations.</b></p> <p><b>4.1.b Delaware 2018 SAT SWD TA Report</b>  This document has reliability data for students who used testing accommodations during the 2018 SAT administration. Delaware provided reliabilities for test takers who took test with accommodations and for subgroups, such as gender, race/ethnicity, ELs. The evidence supplies data and analysis for disaggregated groups of students who took the SAT with accommodations. There appears to be reasonable reliability within this group; however, the performance of this group was low as a whole. No information is supplied that compares this group to the general population of students in terms of their performance. If the TA group’s performance is substantially lower than the general population, what does that say, if anything about the appropriateness of the SAT for these students and the information derived from their scores?</p> <p>Evidence provided in the following reports is state specific; thus it cannot be evaluated overall.</p> <p><b>4.1.c 2016 Michigan SAT Subgroup Reliability</b>  Michigan (4.1.c) provided reliabilities by gender, race/ethnicity, ELs, and by accommodations.</p> <p><b>4.1.d 2018 Connecticut SAT Subgroup Reliability</b></p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium Resubmission**

<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>Connecticut (4.1.d) provided reliabilities by gender, race/ethnicity, ELs, and SWDs, but not according to accommodations.</p> <p><b>4.1.e 2018 DE SAT Subgroup Reliability</b>            These reports include ELs and students who received accommodations.            State reports of reliability by subgroups indicate lower reliabilities for blacks, Hispanics, ELLs, and SWDs/TAs.</p> <p>The CB provided the reliability for three subgroups requested. However, the reliability evidence for ELS, students with disabilities and students with disabilities who receive accommodations demonstrates a wide range of reliabilities in comparison with other subgroups. Do states consider this adequate reliability evidence? What concerns do states have about test score interpretations in light of these variable reliabilities? What plans do states have to address the difference in reliabilities across groups?</p>
<b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of adequate reliability for students with disabilities, English learners, and students who received accommodations.</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 SAT Consortium Resubmission

**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>4</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><b>Evidence Documents:</b>  <b>4.1.b Delaware 2018 SAT SWD TA Report</b> This document has analysis for students that used testing accommodations during the 2018 SAT administration  <b>4.1.c 2016 Michigan SAT Subgroup Reliability</b>  <b>4.1.d 2018 CT SAT Subgroup Reliability</b>  <b>4.1.e 2018 DE SAT Subgroup Reliability</b></p> <p><b>4.2.a SAT Suite Universal Design Principles Universal Design Principles</b>                      This document details how the SAT Suite of Assessments is developed according to the following five principles of universal design defined by Thompson, Johnstone, and Thurlow (2002)</p>	<p>Additional evidence requested for the SAT:  <b>Evidence that the assessment is fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments, including data related to students with disabilities and ELs.</b></p> <p><b>4.1.b Delaware 2018 SAT SWD TA Report</b>                      This document has analysis for students that used testing accommodations during the 2018 SAT administration. However, there is no discussion of the implications of the analyses related to the fairness of the assessment for students with disabilities and ELs in relation to students without disabilities and who are not ELs.</p> <p><b>4.1.c 2016 Michigan SAT Subgroup Reliability</b>  <b>4.1.d 2018 CT SAT Subgroup Reliability</b>  <b>4.1.e 2018 DE SAT Subgroup Reliability</b></p> <p>As noted above, this evidence reveals lower scores and lower reliabilities for particular subgroups. According to 4.7.b. the Delaware mean scores were up to a half of a SD higher for the general population than the means reported in the executive summary of 4.1.b for traditionally marginalized subgroups of students (Math 404, ELA 424), and many of these students are not completing sections of the test.                      The state reports indicate that reliabilities are higher for students who are white.</p> <p>No discussion of the reliability scores is provided.</p>

<sup>4</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 SAT Consortium Resubmission**

		<p><b>Evidence that the State supports and enhances the accessibility of the assessments through appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities, and, to the extent practicable, by incorporating principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (section 11 11(b)(2)(B)(xiii) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA).</b></p> <p><b>4.2.a SAT Suite Universal Design Principles</b>  <b>Universal Design Principles</b>          pp. 8-11 indicate the accommodations that may be used and that result in college-reportable scores.</p> <p>pp. 2-3 list five universal design principles that are reportedly used to design test items and support material.          This document includes descriptions of multiple rounds of reviews for content/bias/sensitivity, and fairness.</p> <p>Evidence was provided that test development processes attended to fairness. Sufficient evidence was not provided to show that student test responses for students with disabilities and ELs indicated fairness.</p> <p>Evidence is needed that the states have considered the subgroup reliabilities and other score analyses in relation to fairness issues.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence is needed that the states have considered the subgroup reliabilities and other score analyses in relation to fairness issues.</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 SAT Consortium Resubmission**

**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
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.	No additional evidence required per August 2018 letter to CSDE for SAT	
<b>Section 4.3 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 SAT Consortium Resubmission**

**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
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> .	No additional evidence required per August 2018 letter to CSDE for SAT	
<p><b>Section 4.4 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 SAT Consortium Resubmission**

**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
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.	No additional evidence required per August 2018 letter to CSDE for SAT	
<p><b>Section 4.5 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 SAT Consortium Resubmission**

**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><u>or a native language version of the academic content assessment</u></b>), grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>• Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<p>No additional evidence required per August 2018 letter to CSDE for SAT</p>	
<p><b>Section 4.6 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 SAT Consortium Resubmission

**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><b>Evidence Documents:</b>  <b>4.7.a Connecticut 2018 TA Report</b>  <b>4.7.b Delaware 2018 SAT Total Group TA Report</b>  <b>4.7.c CSDE Debrief Meeting Notes 051818_SAT</b></p>	<p>Additional evidence requested for the SAT:  <b>Evidence of a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system.</b></p> <p><b>4.7.a Connecticut 2018 TA Report</b>  <b>4.7.b Delaware 2018 SAT Total Group TA Report</b>            These reports do not indicate that these are used for monitoring, maintaining, and improving the quality of the assessment system.</p> <p>Documents provide states with appropriate data for judging the performance of their students and subgroups of students on the SAT, which is useful information for states to consider in selecting or developing their assessment systems.</p> <p>None of the evidence provided suggested how the SAT developers plan to maintain or improve the quality of the SAT. The sample reports detail information about the recent test administration, however, a process to improve or make changes, and technically sound criteria for analysis of the assessment are not included. This seems to meet monitoring component, but not maintaining and improving the assessment, e.g., retiring items or lifespan of a test form, revising blueprint, subgroup analyses, etc.</p> <p><b>4.7.c CSDE Debrief Meeting Notes 051818_SAT</b>            The notes from this meeting indicate an opportunity for district test coordinators to provide feedback about various test operational procedures. This feedback, while important to smooth operational procedures, do</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium Resubmission

		not appear to be related to improving the quality of the assessment system.
<b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• System for maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system.</li></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.

**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><b>Evidence Documents:</b></p> <p><b>5.1.a Test Administration Supplement Final</b> Pages 7-8 identify policies for accommodations and supports As an example of how this policy is presented by states to the testing site coordinators:</p> <p><b>2.3.c CSDE-Test-Day-Training-2272019</b> Pages 17-21 cover changes for the 2018-19 administration; these specific slides show how the policies have been updated since the original peer review submission</p> <p>Pages 37-57 cover the processes necessary to register a student’s accommodations; all students are provided the opportunity to participate and have a college reportable score under these policies</p>	<p>Additional evidence requested for the SAT:  <b>Evidence of the State's process for ensuring that students with disabilities are included in the SAT with clear guidelines for accommodations and the receipt of college-reportable scores.</b></p> <p>Peers commend the College Board for increasing the number of accommodations for students with disabilities.</p> <p><b>5.1.a Test Administration Supplement Final</b> pp. 7-8. “In adhering to the practice of standardization and in keeping with the standards, all accommodated administrations are designed to be comparable to the standard administration (AERA, APA, and NCME, 2014).”</p> <p><b>2.3.a SAT-School Day Accommodated Testing Manual State-Provided</b> pp. 12-13 Lists of allowable accommodations</p> <p>p. 14 CB provides the procedure to follow to ensure that a student with an accommodation receives a reportable college score.</p> <p>p. 18 There is a process whereby states can request college-reportable scores for unique accommodations requested for a student. “State-allowed accommodations (SAAs) may be available depending on your state. If available, SAAs allow students to use defined accommodations or supports; however, they may not result in college- or scholarship-reportable scores.</p> <p><b>2.3.c CSDE-Test-Day-Training-2272019</b></p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium Resubmission**

<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>p. 37 lists accommodations that are "Used for state accountability system and college admission." Evidence that students with disabilities are not denied the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.</p> <p>Since this is a CT document, it is not clear if this policy applies to all states in this consortium.</p> <p>It is recommended that States review the accommodation guidelines for college-reportable scores with IEP teams.</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 SAT Consortium Resubmission**

<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>5</sup></li> </ul>		
<b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed from States</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States follow procedures to request SAA be college-reportable.</li> </ul>		

<sup>5</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 SAT Consortium Resubmission

**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><b>Evidence Document:</b>  <b>2.3.a SAT-School Day Accommodated Testing Manual State-Provided</b>                      Policy from the College Board state user accommodated manual is provided to show College Board policy and procedures are consistent with requirements. This manual, or a state specific one with similar content, is sent to every testing site, weeks before testing, so staff can be trained.                      Page 8 includes an important note about additional time support for EL students and the supports listed for planning purposes                      Page 10 covers the process to “ensure you have plans in place for testing students with accommodations and EL supports” and the procedure to register them in the system for reporting to the state  <b>2.3.c CSDE-Test-Day-Training-2272019</b>                      This presentation from a required training, publication in the state’s assessment newsletter, and inclusion on the states Web site is typical of SAT state users’ communication process.                      Pages 9-13 cover the new processes for accommodation eligibility and selection                      Pages 37-52 cover the procedures for EL participation with supports</p>	<p>Additional evidence requested for the SAT:  <b>Evidence of communicating this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</b>  <b>o Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</b>  <b>o Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</b></p> <p>Peers commend the College Board for increasing the number of supports for English Learners.</p> <p><b>2.3.a SAT-School Day Accommodated Testing Manual State-Provided</b>                      p. 8 “<i>Students using the 50% extended time EL support receive extended time on the entire assessment.</i>”                      p. 10 “Meet with your test coordinator to ensure you have plans in place for testing students with accommodations and EL supports.”</p> <p>pp. 12-14 Lists of allowable accommodations</p> <p><b>5.1.a Test Administration Supplement Final</b>                      p. 8. EL supports include:                      • Translated test directions                      • Use of bilingual word-to-word glossaries                      • 50% extended testing time                      EL students who use supports during SAT School Day will receive scores they can send to colleges.                      Students who meet the following criteria at the time of testing can use EL supports:                      • They are enrolled in an elementary or secondary school in the U.S. or U.S. territories.                      • They are an English learner as defined by their state or by federal policy.</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 SAT Consortium Resubmission**

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>• They use the same supports in class or for other assessments.</li> </ul> <p>2.3.c CSDE-Test-Day-Training-2272019. pp. 49, 52. EL students who use 50% extended time will receive a college reportable score.</p> <p><b>Evidence that English learners are not denied the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.</b> See evidence cited above which supports this component of the critical element.</p>
<b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium Resubmission

**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>academic achievement</b> of students with disabilities.</li> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs;</li> <li>• Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> <li>• Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> <li>• Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny</li> </ul>	<p><b>Evidence Documents:</b>  <b>2.3.a SAT-School Day Accommodated Testing Manual State-Provided</b>                      Policy from College Board state user accommodated testing manual is provided to show College Board policy and procedures are consistent with requirements. This manual, or a state specific one with similar content, is sent to every testing site, weeks before testing, so staff can be trained.                      Page 8 includes a table matching the accommodations with testing conditions so educators can make informed choices about the most appropriate choice for each student                      Pages 12-13 cover the special materials required for each accommodation so educators can make informed choices about the most appropriate choice for each student  <b>2.3.c CSDE-Test-Day-Training-2272019</b>                      This presentation from a required training, publication in the state’s assessment newsletter, and inclusion on the states Web site is typical of SAT state user’s communication process.                      Pages 37-57 cover the processes necessary to select and register the most appropriate accommodations for each student; all students are provided the opportunity to participate and have a college reportable score under these policies</p>	<p>Additional evidence requested for the SAT:  <b>Evidence that the State has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student's need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</b></p> <p>Evidence as described in USED Assessment Peer Review Process, p 64, is not provided.</p> <p>SAT supplies states with appropriate state-level reports to show how students with and without accommodations perform on the SAT. However, none of the evidence supplied for this review showed how states or SAT officials compare results of students receiving and not receiving accommodations performed on the SAT.                      No evidence justifies how states or the College Board conclude that assigned accommodations were effective or not for meeting students’ needs or for interpreting results.</p> <p><b>2.3.a SAT-School Day Accommodated Testing Manual State-Provided</b>, p. 8. Information about accommodations allowed. Notes from College Board about how exceptions are handled – but no real documentation.</p> <p><b>2.3.c CSDE Test Day Training</b> addresses more procedural details, but not how accommodations are appropriate and effective.</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 SAT Consortium Resubmission**

<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>As noted above in elements 5.1 and 5.2, evidence that children with disabilities are not denied the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment (evidence submitted for element 5.1 will address this concern).</b>
<b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  </u> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student's need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</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 SAT Consortium Resubmission**

**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><b>Evidence Document:</b>  <b>5.4.a 2017_18 SAT State Accountability Layout</b>                      This file provides the layout of the final score reporting file for a state’s SAT administration. The SAT Data File Layout provides each element with values and comments; rows 22 &amp; 50-53 allow states to easily monitor performance, access to accommodations, and participation.  <b>2.3.c CSDE-Test-Day-Training-2272019</b>                      Pages 17-21 cover changes for the 2018-19 administration; these specific slides show how the policies have been updated since the original peer review submission                      Pages 37-57 cover the processes necessary to register a student’s accommodations; all students are provided the opportunity to participate and have a college reportable score under these policies. These records are reported along with each student’s testing record.</p>	<p>Additional evidence requested for the SAT:</p> <p>Evidence that it monitors test administration to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State's policies for accommodations;                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Appropriate for addressing a student's disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student's individualized education programs team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; and</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul> <p><b>5.4.a 2017_18 SAT State Accountability Layout</b>                      This final score reporting file does provide rows to indicate student name and accommodations used, SAA indicator, Accommodation type used, and college reportable indicator. However, this evidence does not indicate how schools ensure that students actually receive the accommodations they are supposed to use for testing. States need to provide evidence that this file is used by states to monitor the components of the critical element cited above.</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 SAT Consortium Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>There is no indication that accommodation administration is monitored for fidelity of test administration procedures. 2.3.c CSDE-Test-Day-Training-2272019. There is a slide that indicates monitoring will take place during test administration. However, there is nothing in the Post-administration Test Analysis report or other submitted information to verify this statement.</p> <p>No State Education Agency or CB monitoring documentation is provided for before, during, or post administration.</p> <p>States should provide evidence that all components of this requested evidence are included, e.g., in a monitoring protocol.</p>
<b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required from SAT</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed from States:</p> <p>States monitor test administration to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</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 individualized education programs team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; and</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</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 SAT Consortium Resubmission

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

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

**Critical Element 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>No additional evidence required per August 2018 letter to CSDE for SAT</p>	
<p><b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>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 SAT Consortium Resubmission**

<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 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 SAT Consortium Resubmission**

**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
The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards.</u></b></li> </ul>	No additional evidence required per August 2018 letter to CSDE for SAT	
<b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<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 SAT Consortium Resubmission

**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>States that chose to use the SAT as their high school assessment for Reading, Writing, and Mathematics standards have high school content standards that are explicitly aligned with college and career readiness. The standard setting process for each state varies, but the evidence of predictive validity between the SAT and post-secondary outcomes is critical to each process. The following documents can provide evidence of that validity and the points in the SAT scale that predict college and career readiness.</p> <p><b>Evidence Documents:</b></p> <p><b>6.3.a National sat validity study</b> While the whole document is relevant, the abstract (page 4) and the conclusions (page 20) provide the bottom-line evidence for this element.</p> <p><b>6.3.b SAT score relationships with CTE program performance</b></p>	<p>Additional evidence requested for the SAT: <b>Evidence of how the academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State's academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</b></p> <p><b>6.3.a National SAT Validity Study</b> <b>6.3.b SAT score relationships with CTE program performance</b></p> <p>Evidence provided by College Board demonstrates that level 3 scores and higher relate to being “college and career ready,” in general, but not necessarily aligned with state achievement standards.</p> <p>The evidence provided illustrates how well the test can predict college and career readiness. States are using standards that guide instruction to help students become college and career ready. However, the evidence submitted does not provide any information on how well students have mastered the state Standards. There is limited evidence that “State Standards” are being measured by the assessment but the overall notion of college readiness is. This is a critical point because this assessment can measure college readiness but it is not measuring and providing information on how well students have mastered the state standards. As the evidence in this peer review has indicated, these are indeed two separate but equally important measurable aspects that have not been integrated into the assessment.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium Resubmission**

<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.		Although the evidence confirms predictive validity of the SAT as a predictor of college success, the available evidence does not make explicit how the achievement standards of the SAT align to the states' academic content standards.
<b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of how the academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State's academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school.</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 SAT Consortium Resubmission

**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</u></b><sup>6</sup></p> <p>For <b><u>academic content assessments</u></b>, the State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the <b><u>specific academic needs of students</u></b>, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its academic content assessments that:</li> </ul>	<p>Individual score reports are delivered by College Board to every student tested within weeks of test administration.</p> <p><b>Evidence Documents:</b>  <b>6.4.a understanding sat scores</b>  <b>6.4.b understanding sat scores Spanish</b></p> <p>These documents describe the key elements of the online score reports. Students also have access to video tutorials and other help resources to be able to access and understand their results.</p> <p><b>5.4.a 2017_18 SAT State Accountability Layout</b>  This file provides the layout of the final score reporting file for a state’s SAT administration. It is delivered in June or early July to all state SAT users with one row per student identified as eligible/required to participate in the SAT administration.</p> <p>The SAT Data File Layout tab provides each element with values and comments; student name, school, and other key information (i.e., SSID in row 22) is reported back to the state’s assessment team in the exact format it was provided to identify the student for testing. This is especially important for timely turn-around of this report for state purposes.</p> <p><b>3.3.d skills insight sat suite</b>  Provided as evidence of how College Board presents the students performance in each test section in the context of academic skills. Every student gets this report as part of an individual score report. Educators have a map of these skills to specific state standards available to them, dynamically, through online score reporting tools.</p>	<p>Additional evidence requested for the SAT:  <b>Evidence of reporting that facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</b></p> <p><b>1. The production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that:</b></p> <p><b>1.a. Report the student's achievement in terms of the State's grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</b></p> <p><b>3.3.c Delaware parent report</b>  Includes a sample report based on the state’s achievement levels and broad performance-level descriptors.</p> <p><b>6.4.a Understanding SAT Scores.</b> “The SAT measures the skills and knowledge that research shows are the most important for success in college and career.” There is no mention of student achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards.</p> <p>SAT Reports do not convey student achievement in terms of the state standards. Connections between students’ achievement of particular skills and the state standards are only directly available to teachers, who have access to a</p>

<sup>6</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 SAT Consortium Resubmission**

<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>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a <b><u>student’s academic achievement</u></b>;</li> <li>○ Report the <b><u>student’s academic achievement</u></b> in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards;</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific <b><u>academic needs of students</u></b>;</li> <li>○ Are provided in an understandable and uniform format;</li> <li>○ Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian;</li> <li>○ Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.</li> <li>● The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>		<p>mapping between the SAT framework and the state standards.</p> <p>That said, it appears that teachers have to do the work of interpreting each student’s score in terms of the standards. The evidence indicates that individual reports are interpretive and descriptive of students’ overall domain competence, according to the SAT framework. The evidence does not indicate that individual reports may be easily interpreted in terms of the state standards nor may they assist in diagnosing students’ particular strengths or weaknesses.</p> <p>Some state reports include four achievement levels with performance descriptors per domain as a reference for students and parents to interpret individual scores. However, such information is insufficient for identifying how to support student continued progress.</p> <p><b>3.3.d Skills Insight SAT Suite</b></p> <p>Provides lists of skills and concepts associated with each score range. These lists are not presented in terms of the state content standards. Furthermore, the lists represent typically the skills that a particular score indicates, not the skills a particular student has or lacks based on their item responses. This document does not refer to student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards.</p> <p>States must provide this evidence.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p><b>1.b Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand; and</b></p> <p><b>6.4.a Understanding SAT Scores</b> This document indicates that students have access to videos and other resources to help them understand their scores, but there is no mention of alternate formats. Not everyone has internet access.</p> <p><b>6.4.b Understanding SAT Scores Spanish</b> The actual student report is in English although other information is in Spanish. It is not indicated in the evidence that reports are available in other languages or are translated orally to parents/guardians upon request.</p> <p>There is no information on availability of alternate formats of the reports available upon request.</p> <p>It is not clear if all students and parents receive the skills insight and how do they receive it if it is only online access? Not all families have online access and not all students have SAT access. Although the CB provides a list of students without SAT access so the school may assist in setting this up, there is no verification process to ensure that the student has online access.</p> <p><b>2. A process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration</b></p> <p><b>5.4.a 2017_18 SAT State Accountability Layout</b> This data file is provided to state SAT users in June or early July with one row per student identified as</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SAT Consortium Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>eligible/required to participate in the SAT administration. This file provides the layout of the final score reporting file for a state’s SAT administration. However, no information is provided related to how States use this data file to report or deliver scores to parents, teachers, and principals.</p> <p>Although SAT asserts that they deliver individual score reports within 4 weeks of the test administration date, whether the state processes reports for more time before sending them to families is not available for review with this evidence.</p> <p>The submission states that “Individual score reports are delivered by College Board to every student tested within weeks of test administration.” However, there is no process or timeline for delivery to parents of their child’s individual report. CB may have the information available online within 4 weeks, but that does not ensure parental delivery.</p> <p>Evidence of a process and timeline is needed from states that student reports are provided to teachers, principals and parents as soon as practicable.</p>
<b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required of SAT</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed:</p> <p>States must provide</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report the student's achievement in terms of the State's grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors) (except Delaware-already submitted);</li> <li>• Alternate formats are available (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand</li> <li>• Evidence of process and timeline is needed from states that student reports are provided to teachers, principals and parents as soon as practicable.</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 SAT Consortium Resubmission

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

(if applicable; evidence for this section would be submitted in ADDITION to evidence for sections 1 through 6)

**Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has established technical criteria to use in its review of any submission of a locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment. The State has completed this review using its established technical criteria and has found the assessment meets its criteria <b>prior to</b> submitting for the Department’s assessment peer review.</p> <p>The State’s technical criteria include a determination that the assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is aligned with the challenging State academic standards; and</li> <li>• Addresses the depth and breadth of those standards.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <p>The State has procedures in place to ensure that a district that chooses to use a nationally recognized high school academic assessment administers the same assessment to all high school students in the district except for students with the most significant</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</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 SAT Consortium Resubmission**

<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>cognitive disabilities who may be assessed with an AA-AAAS.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The technical criteria established by the State in reviewing a locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment must ensure that the use of appropriate accommodations does not deny a student with a disability or an EL—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The opportunity to participate in the assessment; and</li> <li>• Any of the benefits from participation in the assessment that are afforded to students without disabilities or students who are not ELs.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 7.1 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 SAT Consortium Resubmission

**Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School**

**Academic Assessments**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State must have procedures in place to ensure that:</p> <p><b>Before</b> a district requests approval from the State to use a nationally recognized high school academic assessment, the district notifies all parents of high school students it serves—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the district intends to request approval from the State to use a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in place of the statewide academic assessment;</li> <li>• Of how parents and, as appropriate, students may provide meaningful input regarding the district’s request (includes students in public charter schools who would be included in such assessments); and</li> <li>• Of any effect of such request on the instructional program in the district.</li> </ul>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>Section 7.2 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 SAT Consortium Resubmission**

<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>

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

**Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State 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 locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is equivalent to or more rigorous than the statewide assessment, with respect to—               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The coverage of academic content;</li> <li>○ The difficulty of the assessment;</li> <li>○ The overall quality of the assessment; and</li> <li>○ Any other aspects of the assessment that the State may establish in its technical criteria;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Produces valid and reliable data on student academic achievement with respect to all high school students and each subgroup of high school students in the district that—               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Are comparable to student academic achievement data for all high school students and each subgroup of high school students produced by the statewide assessment at each academic achievement level;</li> <li>○ Are expressed in terms consistent with the State’s academic achievement standards; and</li> <li>○ Provide unbiased, rational, and consistent differentiation among schools within the State for the purpose of the State determined accountability system including calculating the Academic Achievement indicator and annually meaningfully differentiating between schools.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</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 SAT Consortium Resubmission**

<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>
<b>Section 7.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<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.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## August 2019 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

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..... 9**

**Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments 11**

**Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments..... 13**

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS.....14**

**Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development ..... 14**

**Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development ..... 18**

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

**Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration ..... 23**

**Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security..... 25**

**Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy .. 28**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY .....30**

**Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content30**

**Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes ..... 32**

**Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure..... 33**

**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 ..... 39**

**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring..... 40**

**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms..... 41**

**Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment ..... 42**

**Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance ..... 43**

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS.....45**

**Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 45**

**Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments..... 49**

**Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations ..... 51**

**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.

..... 54

**SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING.....57**

**Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students ..... 57**  
**Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting ..... 59**  
**Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards ..... 60**  
**Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting ..... 62**

**SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS..65**

**Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments ..... 65**  
**Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments ..... 67**  
**Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State Assessments ..... 69**

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

**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><b>Section 1.1 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 DLM SCIENCE**

**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><b>Section 1.2 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 DLM SCIENCE**

**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 DLM SCIENCE**

<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 DLM SCIENCE**

**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 DLM SCIENCE**

<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 DLM SCIENCE**

**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 DLM SCIENCE

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>SC 01 pp. 45-46 &amp; 192-198            SC 03            SC 04 pp. 5-6            SC 05 Alignment Response plan</p>	<p>Peer reviewers recognize the complex psychometric design of DLM Science and commend the work that has been done on the assessment up to this point.</p> <p>Peer reviewers acknowledge that maps were developed and that a timeline is in place. SC 05 Provides an overview of the alignment studies and some of the responses to it and plans going forward.</p> <p>The study noted a few specific areas for follow-up where alignment statistics did not meet the expected threshold. A plan and timeline for follow-up studies has been developed. Additional evidence will be provided in 2019-2020.</p> <p>However, current evidence is not sufficient in that the alignment study still notes gaps in the alignment, as pointed out in the DLM Science submission. Peer reviewers noted that DLM Science will provide additional evidence in 2019-2020.</p> <p>In both a previous review and in this review, SC 03 p. 3 tells us that “...the science state partners did not want to develop EEs for every sub-idea in the Framework, a crosswalk of states’ existing alternate science standards was used to identify the intended foci for students with SCD and the DLM science assessment.” (SC 03, p. 3). Peers would like to understand the rationale for the decision not to develop a complete set of EEs.</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 DLM SCIENCE**

<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>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>• Evidence of an overall test design and test blueprints that measure the full breadth of the State’s grade-level academic content standards in science (e.g., evidence that the test design adequately samples the essential elements in science).</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 DLM SCIENCE**

**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>
The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to: <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>		Note from DLM Science submission: Additional consortium-level evidence will be provided for this portion of the critical element. It will be included in the June 2020 submission.
<b>Section 2.2 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>• Evidence that clarifies how the development and review process for Essential Element Concept Maps (EECMs) contributes to a technically sound test item development process.</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 DLM SCIENCE**

**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 other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ 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 DLM SCIENCE

\_\_\_ 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 DLM SCIENCE**

**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 DLM SCIENCE**

**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><b>Section 2.5 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 DLM SCIENCE

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

**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><b>Section 2.6 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 DLM SCIENCE**

**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>SC 05 Science Alignment Response Plan                      SC 03 Technical Manual Update – Science 2017-2018                      SC 01 Technical Manual Science 2015-16 (pp. 192-198)</p>	<p>A plan and timeline to address the results of a 2017 alignment study has been provided (SC 05).</p> <p>As noted in response to critical element 2.1, additional evidence will be submitted for DLM Science in June 2020.</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 DLM SCIENCE

and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.		
<b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence identified in critical element 2.1 relative to addressing the depth and breadth of the content standards for science.</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 DLM SCIENCE**

**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
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.		
<b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<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 DLM SCIENCE**

**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
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><b>Section 3.3 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 DLM SCIENCE**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>SC 01 Technical Manual Science 2015-2016 SC 05 Science Alignment Study Response Plan</p>	<p>Peer reviewers note that a three-year validity study will start in spring 2020, expanding on a process piloted in spring 2019 to survey teachers about students’ skills. Correlational data from the first year of the study will be submitted in June 2020.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.4 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>• Evidence that the science tests are related as expected with similar variables (e.g., other measures of science achievement).</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 DLM SCIENCE

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER**

**Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability**

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 reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. If the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, measures of reliability for the assessment overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of <b>a student’s academic achievement</b>.</li> </ul>	<p>SC-01</p>	<p>As noted in response to critical element 4.1, additional evidence will be submitted for DLM Science in June 2020.</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 DLM SCIENCE**

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>• Evidence of updated reliability estimates for its assessments for the student population overall and each student group once evidence identified in critical element 2.1 relative to addressing the depth and breadth of the content standards have been addressed (e.g., expansion of the item pool, increase in number of items per testlet, increase in the number of linkage levels).</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 DLM SCIENCE**

**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>7</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>SC 03, pp. 6, 8-11, 57-61                      SC 01, pp. 63, 64, 114-121, 46-63                      SC Section 4 – Technical Quality – Other</p>	<p>Submitted evidence is sufficient for the request of evidence ensuring that assessments are accessible to all students in the design, development, and analysis of its assessments, as well as ensuring fairness of the assessments. Additional results will be summarized in the corresponding technical manual update in the 2020 submission.</p> <p>In the Technical Manual Update – Science 2017-18 (SC 03, pp. 61-65) DIF and other analyses revealed no bias in items; however, gender was the only subgroup large enough for a DIF analysis. The peer reviewers expect that additional analyses will be provided in the DLM Science submission in 2020.</p> <p>The Consortium appears to have addressed previous concerns regarding item writer training. Other issues, particularly with regard to fairness, seem to have been answered by providing the same documentation that was available in the 2017 review.</p> <p>The addition of additional items to the teacher survey in Spring 2019 is noted; more specificity about these items would have been appreciated, as would a promise to report on what additional insights – if any – were provided by adding the items.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>No additional evidence is required or</p>		

<sup>7</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 DLM SCIENCE

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

- Evidence of reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that the assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development, and analysis of its assessments, based on the updated version of the assessment. Such evidence may include the following
  - Once sufficient data exists, additional analysis by student subgroup to analyze test fairness.
  - Once sufficient data exists, additional item analysis to examine the effects of certain stimuli (e.g., “fictionalized” science stories) and item response characteristics (response order) on test fairness.
  - Specific criteria used for external test reviewers and test item writers regarding fairness and accessibility.

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE**

**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>SC 01 pp. 187-189 SC 03 pp. 50-52</p>	<p>The DLM Science submission states that: “The correlations and correct classification rates generally indicate that all three linkage levels provide reliable classifications of student mastery (95% of all reported indices were .6 or greater).</p> <p>However, peer reviewers felt that there were some relatively low indices. About 8% of the tetrachoric correlations were below .80 and more than 50% of Cohen’s <i>kappas</i> were below .80. In the June 2020 submission, updated numbers should be provided.</p>
<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>• Evidence that clarifies the assessment provides an adequately precise estimate 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 DLM SCIENCE**

**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><b>Section 4.4 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 DLM SCIENCE**

**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><b>Section 4.4 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 DLM SCIENCE**

**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><u>or a native language version of the academic content assessment</u></b>), grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>• Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 4.6 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 DLM SCIENCE**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments), and</li> <li>• Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website.</li> </ul>	<p>SC 01 Technical Manual Science 2015-2016            SC 03 Technical Manual Update - Science 2017-2018            SC 05, p. 5: Alignment Study Response Plan</p>	<p>Peer reviewers note that the Consortium intends to provide evidence for this critical element as part of the DLM Science June 2020 submission.</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>• Evidence of a plan to monitor the science test before, during, and after the inclusion of phase II development items to the test item banks, including clear and technically sound criteria.</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 DLM SCIENCE

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>		

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

<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>		

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

<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>8</sup></li> </ul>		
<b>Section 5.1 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>		

<sup>8</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 DLM SCIENCE**

**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><b>Section 5.2 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 DLM SCIENCE**

**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>		

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

<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>___ 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 DLM SCIENCE**

**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><b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>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 DLM SCIENCE

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>• [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 DLM SCIENCE

**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><b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>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 DLM SCIENCE

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

**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>SC 01 Technical Manual Science 2015-2016 (pp. 192-198)                      SC 03 Technical Manual Update - Science 2017-2018</p>	<p>Peer reviewers acknowledge the Alignment Response Plan (SC 05) and note that additional evidence will be submitted in June 2020. The proposed work appears that it will satisfy the requirements of this critical element, pending completion of the steps described in the plan.</p> <p>Peer reviewers commend the Consortium’s commitment to ensuring that future standard setting panels will be demographically representative of the state.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.2 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>• Evidence of a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting alternate academic achievement standards in science to ensure they are valid and reliable.</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 DLM SCIENCE

**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>Peer reviewers acknowledge that there is a plan to address this critical element with state partners, and understand that results will be reported by December 2020.</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 DLM SCIENCE**

<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>• Evidence that the DLM alternate academic achievement standards ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. Oklahoma State Department of Education should provide this evidence by December 31, 2020.</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 DLM SCIENCE**

**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>2</sup></u></b></p> <p>For <b><u>academic content assessments</u></b>, the State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the <b><u>specific academic needs of students</u></b>, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its academic content assessments that:</li> </ul>		

<sup>9</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 DLM SCIENCE**

<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>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a <b><u>student’s academic achievement</u></b>;</li> <li>○ Report the <b><u>student’s academic achievement</u></b> in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards;</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific <b><u>academic needs of students</u></b>;</li> <li>○ Are provided in an understandable and uniform format;</li> <li>○ Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian;</li> <li>○ Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.</li> <li>● The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<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 DLM SCIENCE**

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

(if applicable; evidence for this section would be submitted in ADDITION to evidence for sections 1 through 6)

**Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has established technical criteria to use in its review of any submission of a locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment. The State has completed this review using its established technical criteria and has found the assessment meets its criteria <b>prior to</b> submitting for the Department’s assessment peer review.</p> <p>The State’s technical criteria include a determination that the assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is aligned with the challenging State academic standards; and</li> <li>• Addresses the depth and breadth of those standards.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <p>The State has procedures in place to ensure that a district that chooses to use a nationally recognized high school academic assessment administers the same assessment to all high school students in the district except for students with the most significant</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</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 DLM SCIENCE**

<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>cognitive disabilities who may be assessed with an AA-AAAS.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The technical criteria established by the State in reviewing a locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment must ensure that the use of appropriate accommodations does not deny a student with a disability or an EL—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The opportunity to participate in the assessment; and</li> <li>• Any of the benefits from participation in the assessment that are afforded to students without disabilities or students who are not ELs.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 7.1 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 DLM SCIENCE**

**Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School**

**Academic Assessments**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State must have procedures in place to ensure that:</p> <p><b>Before</b> a district requests approval from the State to use a nationally recognized high school academic assessment, the district notifies all parents of high school students it serves—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the district intends to request approval from the State to use a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in place of the statewide academic assessment;</li> <li>• Of how parents and, as appropriate, students may provide meaningful input regarding the district’s request (includes students in public charter schools who would be included in such assessments); and</li> <li>• Of any effect of such request on the instructional program in the district.</li> </ul>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>Section 7.2 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 DLM SCIENCE

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

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

**Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State 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 locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is equivalent to or more rigorous than the statewide assessment, with respect to—               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The coverage of academic content;</li> <li>○ The difficulty of the assessment;</li> <li>○ The overall quality of the assessment; and</li> <li>○ Any other aspects of the assessment that the State may establish in its technical criteria;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Produces valid and reliable data on student academic achievement with respect to all high school students and each subgroup of high school students in the district that—               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Are comparable to student academic achievement data for all high school students and each subgroup of high school students produced by the statewide assessment at each academic achievement level;</li> <li>○ Are expressed in terms consistent with the State’s academic achievement standards; and</li> <li>○ Provide unbiased, rational, and consistent differentiation among schools within the State for the purpose of the State determined accountability system including calculating the Academic Achievement indicator and annually meaningfully differentiating between schools.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</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 DLM SCIENCE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 7.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<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.