



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Kevin Dehmer
Interim Commissioner
New Jersey Department of Education
P.O. Box 500
Trenton, NJ 08625-0500

July 10, 2020

Dear Commissioner Dehmer:

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 New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) to prepare for the assessment peer review, which occurred in March 2020. Specifically, NJDOE submitted evidence regarding its science assessment and alternate science assessments in grades 5, 8, and 11.

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 NJDOE'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:

- General assessments in science for grades 5, 8, and high school (New Jersey Student Learning Assessment – Science (NJSLA-S)): **Partially meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- AA-AAAS for grades 5, 8, and high school in science (Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Science): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**

The assessments that partially meet requirements do not meet a number of the requirements of the statute and regulations and NJDOE will need to provide substantial additional information to demonstrate it meets the requirements. The specific list of items required for NJDOE to submit is enclosed with this letter. Within 30 days, NJDOE must provide a plan and timeline for submitting all required documentation. I recognize the unprecedented situation affecting you and your schools due to widespread and extended school closures caused by the novel coronavirus, COVID-19. As a result, if you need more than 30 days to submit your plan, please let my staff know at

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.

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 Department is placing a condition on NJDOE's Title I, Part A grant award. To satisfy this condition, NJDOE must submit satisfactory evidence to address the items identified in the enclosed list. If adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action.

Additionally, the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) will monitor progress on matters pertaining to requirements in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) related to the participation of students with disabilities in Title I assessments. In particular, OSERS will monitor progress against critical elements 1.4, 4.2, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4, 6.1 and 6.3.

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.

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank T. Brogan
Assistant Secretary for
Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Gilbert Gonzalez, Director, Office of Assessments

Critical Elements Where Additional Evidence is Needed for New Jersey’s Assessment System

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students	<p>For the State’s science content standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students.
2.1 – Test Design and Development	<p>For the NJSLA-S:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of the State’s grade-level academic content standards and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results. • Processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills). <p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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).
2.2 – Item Development	<p>For the NJSLA-S:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State used reasonable and technically sound procedures to 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. <p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that clarifies how the development and review process for Essential Element Concept Maps (EECMs) contributes to a technically sound test item development process.
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	<p>For the NJSLA-S and DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence provided for critical element 2.1 will address this critical element.
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes	<p>For the NJSLA-S:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	<p>For the NJSLA-S:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards (e.g., confirmatory analysis and a plan to address flagged items).

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	<p>For the NJSLA-S and DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the science tests are related as expected with similar variables (e.g., other measures of science achievement).
4.1 – Reliability	<p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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).
4.2 – Fairness and accessibility	<p>For the NJSLA-S:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in their design, development and analysis (e.g., analysis of all subgroups including ELs and students with disabilities). <p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.
4.4 – Scoring	<p>For the NSJLA-S:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 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 academic achievement standards.
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	<p>For the NJSLA-S:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years (e.g., equating results and form construction specifications).
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	<p>For the NJSLA-S:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments. • Evidence that the State documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	<p>For the NJSLA-S:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of adequate technical quality of its assessments that is made public, including on the State’s website.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website.
<p>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</p>	<p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State provides a clear explanation of 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. • Evidence 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. • 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.
<p>5.3 - Accommodations</p>	<p>For the NJSLA-S:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the accommodations it provides do not alter the construct being assessed and 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>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</p>	<p>For the NJSLA-S and DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations. ○ Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered. ○ Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice. ○ 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. ○ Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students	<p>For the NJSLA-S and the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for all students.
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting	<p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	<p>For the NJSLA-S:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the achievement standards 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>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act. NJDOE should provide this evidence by December 31, 2020.
6.4 – Reporting	<p>For the NJSLA-S:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students (e.g., interpretive guides). • Evidence that the State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. <p>For the NJSLA-S and the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the student reports are 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. • Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.

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 ASSESSMENTS4

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

Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content Standards 5

Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments 6

Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments .. 8

Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments..... 10

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS..... 11

Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development 11

Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development 13

Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration..... 14

Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration 16

Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security 17

Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy .. 19

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY20

Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content20

Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes 22

Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure..... 23

Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables..... 24

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER.....25

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability 25

Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility 27

Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum 29

Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring..... 30

Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms..... 31

Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment 32

Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance 33

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS.....34

Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 34

Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments..... 37

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations 38

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.

..... 40

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING.....42

Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students..... 42
Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting 44
Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 45
Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting 47

SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS..50

Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments 50
Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments 52
Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State Assessments 54

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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><u>For academic content standards:</u> 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>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</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"> • [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 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><u>For academic content standards:</u> 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>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</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"> • [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 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 <u>grade-level academic achievement standards</u> or alternate academic achievement standards in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 9-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). <p>AND</p> <p>The State’s <u>academic content assessments</u> must be the same assessments administered to all students in the tested grades, with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may take an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards. • 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. • A State that administers an end-of-course high school mathematics assessment may exempt an 8th grade student from the mathematics assessment typically administered in 	<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. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. </p>		
<p>Section 1.3 Summary Statement</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"> • [list additional evidence needed w/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 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"> • 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; • For ELs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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. ○ 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 	<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"> ○ 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. 		
<p>Section 1.4 Summary Statement</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"> • [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 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 academic standards and assessments, the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education). • Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas). • Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State. • Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents. 	<p>Reviewed by Department Staff Only</p>	<p>Reviewed by Department Staff Only</p>
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement</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"> • [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

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 <u>the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards</u> for the grade that is being assessed and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of <u>the State’s grade-level academic content standards</u> and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results. • Processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <u>the State’s academic content standards</u>, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills). • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design 	<p>SC 01 pp. 45-46 & 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"> • 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. • 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. 		
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</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"> • 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). 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills. 		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.
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</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"> • Evidence that clarifies how the development and review process for Essential Element Concept Maps (EECMs) contributes to a technically sound test item development process. 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • 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. 		
<p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR 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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
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
<p>Section 2.4 Summary Statement</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"> • [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 2.5 – 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"> • 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; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. • Application of test security procedures to all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS. 		
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</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"> • [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

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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"> • To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • 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. 		
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</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"> • [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

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><u>The State’s academic assessments</u> measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; • Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards; • 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 	<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.		
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
<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">• Evidence identified in critical element 2.1 relative to addressing the depth and breadth of the content standards for 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 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: <u>the intended cognitive processes</u> appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.		
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</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"> • [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 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>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</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"> • [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 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.	SC 01 Technical Manual Science 2015-2016 SC 05 Science Alignment Study Response Plan	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.
Section 3.4 Summary Statement		
<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"> • Evidence that the science tests are related as expected with similar variables (e.g., other measures of science achievement). 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s academic achievement. 	<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
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
<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"> • 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). 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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 definition¹).</p> <p>For academic content assessments, 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>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>No additional evidence is required or</p>		

¹ 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

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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 academic assessments, 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>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</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"> • Evidence that clarifies the assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum. 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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 <u>academic achievement standards</u>.</p>		
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</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"> • [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 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 academic assessments within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>		
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</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"> • [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 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; <u>or a native language version of the academic content assessment</u>), grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 		
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</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"> • [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 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"> • 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 • Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website. 	<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>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</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"> • 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. 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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"> • Establish guidelines for determining whether to assess a student with an AA-AAAS, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A State definition of “students with the most significant cognitive disabilities” that addresses factors related to cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior; • Provide information for IEP Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that: 		

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

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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>for the grade in which the student is enrolled; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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).² 		
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
<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"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

² 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)

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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"> • Procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed with a linguistic accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for ELs; • Assistance regarding selection of appropriate linguistic accommodations for ELs, including to the extent practicable, assessments in the language most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what those students know and can do to determine the students’ mastery of skills in academic content areas until the students have achieved English language proficiency. 		
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</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"> • [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 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"> • Ensures that appropriate accommodations, such as, interoperability with, and ability to use, assistive technology, are available to measure the <u>academic achievement</u> of students with disabilities. • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs; • 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; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. • Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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
students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.		
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
<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"> • [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 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"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • 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; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures; • Monitored for administrations of all required academic content assessments and AA-AAAS. 		
<p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR 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"> • [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

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><u>For academic content standards:</u></p> <p>The State formally adopted <u>challenging academic achievement standards</u> in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; • 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; <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>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</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"> • [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 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"> • <u>Academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards.</u> 	<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>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</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"> • 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. 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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><u>For academic achievement standards:</u></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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
postsecondary education or competitive integrated employment.		
Section 6.3 Summary Statement		
<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"> • 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. 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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 <u>student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level³</u></p> <p>For <u>academic content assessments</u>, 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 <u>specific academic needs of students</u>, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: 		

³ 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

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"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a <u>student’s academic achievement</u>; ○ Report the <u>student’s academic achievement</u> in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards; ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific <u>academic needs of students</u>; ○ Are provided in an understandable and uniform format; ○ 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; ○ 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. ● 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. 		

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
<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"> • [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

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 prior to 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"> • Is aligned with the challenging State academic standards; and • Addresses the depth and breadth of those standards. <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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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"> • The opportunity to participate in the assessment; and • Any of the benefits from participation in the assessment that are afforded to students without disabilities or students who are not ELs. 		
<p>Section 7.1 Summary Statement</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"> • [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

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>Before 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"> • 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; • 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 • Of any effect of such request on the instructional program in the district. 	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Section 7.2 Summary Statement</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"> • [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	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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is equivalent to or more rigorous than the statewide assessment, with respect to— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The coverage of academic content; ○ The difficulty of the assessment; ○ The overall quality of the assessment; and ○ Any other aspects of the assessment that the State may establish in its technical criteria; • 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"> ○ 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; ○ Are expressed in terms consistent with the State’s academic achievement standards; and ○ 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. 	<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
Section 7.3 Summary Statement		
<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"> • [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.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

March 2020 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW JERSEY

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS4

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

Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content Standards 5

Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments..... 6

Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments .. 8

Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments..... 10

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS..... 11

Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development 11

Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development 13

Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration..... 14

Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration 16

Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security..... 17

Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy .. 19

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY20

Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content20

Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes 22

Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure..... 23

Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables..... 24

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER.....25

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability 25

Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility 27

Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum 29

Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring..... 30

Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms..... 31

Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment..... 32

Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance 33

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS.....34

Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 34

Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments..... 37

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations 38

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.

..... 40

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING.....42

Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students..... 42
Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting 44
Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 45
Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting 47

SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS..50

Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments 50
Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments 52
Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State Assessments 54

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW JERSEY
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><u>For academic content standards:</u> 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 style="text-align: center;"><u>All Assessments</u></p> <p>CE 1.1a - N.J.A.C. 6A:8, STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT. 6A:8-3.1. Subchapter 3 Implementation of the New Jersey Student Learning Standards (page 14-18)</p> <p>C.E. 1.1a. - N.J.A.C. 6A:8, STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT 6A:8-2.1. Subchapter 2 Authority for educational goals and standards (page 13-14)</p> <p>C.E. 1.1b - Updated July 2014: Resolution to Adopt Core Curriculum Content Standards</p> <p>C.E. 1.1c - Next Generation Science Standards</p> <p>C.E. 1.1d - Broadcast, Nov. 8, 2017: Update on New Jersey’s New Science Assessments</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p>C.E. 1.1e New Jersey State Board of Education Item D Standards and Assessments; NJSLS Comment and Response</p> <p>C.E. 1.1f Broadcast email regarding new NGSS resources 1 13 15</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p><i>See C.E. 1.1a, 6A:8-1.3, Definitions: “Alternative assessment for students with disabilities” means the alternative assessment used to determine cumulative</i></p>	<p><u>NJLSA-S Assessments</u> The Next Generation Science Standards were adopted by the State Board of Education in 2014.</p> <p><u>DLM Assessments</u> There is no reference to adoption of alternate academic content standards, such as the Essential Elements used for the DLM assessments. There is reference in Evidence 5.1a to students being taught the NJSLSS unless otherwise specified in the IEP. It would be helpful to peers if a narrative describing what standards students with significant cognitive disabilities are taught as context to understand the evidence submitted. Without that, peers assumed all students are being taught the NJSLSSs.</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 NEW JERSEY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><i>student achievement of the knowledge and skills specified by the New Jersey Student Learning Standards for students with disabilities who are unable to participate in the Statewide assessment system.” (p.4)</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 5.1a: J6A:14-4.7 Program criteria: special class programs, secondary, and vocational rehabilitation: “Special class programs shall offer instruction in the New Jersey Student Learning Standards unless the IEP specifies a modified curriculum due to the nature or severity of the student's disability. The regular education curriculum and the instructional strategies may be modified based on the student's IEP.”</i></p>	
Section 1.1 Summary Statement		
<u> </u> 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 NEW JERSEY

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><u>For academic content standards:</u> 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 align="center"><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p><i>See C.E. 1.1c - Next Generation Science Standards</i></p> <p>C.E. 1.2a - NGSS Appendices: APPENDIX C, <i>College and Career Readiness</i></p> <p>C.E. 1.2b - National Research Council Review of the Next Generation Science Standards</p> <p>C.E. 1.2c The Common Career Technical Core Alignment Study - State of New Jersey</p> <p align="center"><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p><i>See C.E. 5.1a: 6A:14-3.7 Individualized Education Program: “Where appropriate, a statement of detailed measurable annual academic and functional goals that shall, as appropriate, be related to the New Jersey Student Learning Standards through the general education curriculum unless otherwise required according to the student's educational needs, or appropriate, student specific, functional needs. For all students, the annual academic and functional goals shall be measurable and apprise parents and educational personnel providing special education and related services to the student of the expected level of achievement attendant to each goal.”</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 5.1a 6A:14-4.7 Program criteria: special class programs, secondary, and vocational rehabilitation: “Placement shall be made according to the student's IEP. The IEP shall specify the New Jersey Student Learning Standards to be met and shall address how the instruction will be provided.”</i></p>	<p><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u> NJ adopted NGSS (developed by 26 states) as its science content standards. The evidence provided in CE 1.2b (National Research Council review of the NGSS) indicates that NGSS are consistent with the <i>Framework for K-12 Science Education: Practices, Crosscutting Concepts, and Core Ideas (Framework)</i>.</p> <p>Although the peers appreciate the inclusion of Evidence 1.2c, a narrative explaining the relevance and context of those standards would have been helpful.</p> <p><u>DLM Assessments</u> Because there are opportunities for a modified curriculum, peers noted that it would be appropriate for the state to reference how those modifications still align to college- and career-ready knowledge and skills.</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 NEW JERSEY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 1.2 Summary Statement		
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 NEW JERSEY

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 <u>grade-level academic achievement standards</u> or alternate academic achievement standards in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 9-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). <p>AND</p> <p>The State’s <u>academic content assessments</u> must be the same assessments administered to all students in the tested grades, with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may take an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards. • 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. • A State that administers an end-of-course high school mathematics assessment may exempt an 8th grade student from the mathematics assessment typically administered in eighth grade and allow the student to 	<p>All Assessments C.E. 1.3a Statewide Assessment Testing Schedule 2019 2020 C.E. 1.3b School Performance Report- State-level: DLM and ACCESS participation rates, 2017-2018 C.E. 1.3d Science 2018-2019 Participation Data</p> <p>NJSLA-S Assessments See CE 1.1a - N.J.A.C. 6A:8, STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT. 6A:8-4.1 Subchapter 4 Implementation of Statewide Assessments System (page 21-24) See C.E. 1.1d - Broadcast, Nov. 8, 2017: Update on New Jersey’s New Science Assessments C.E. 1.3c Special Education Code 6A chap14 4.10 Statewide Assessment (p. 111-112)</p>	<p>NJDOE provided evidence that it is testing students with the NJSLA in grades 5, 8, and 11. The State testing schedule indicates that the alternate assessment, DLM science, is offered in grades 3-8 and 11, but other evidence, including state code, indicates that DLM science is given in the same grades as NJSLA.</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 NEW JERSEY

<p>take the State end-of-course mathematics test instead.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 		
<p>Section 1.3 Summary Statement</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 NEW JERSEY

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"> • 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; • For ELs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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. ○ 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 language assessments for a 	<p align="center"><u>All Assessments</u></p> <p><i>See CE 1.1a - N.J.A.C. 6A:8, STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT. 6A:8-4.1 Subchapter 4 Implementation of Statewide Assessments System; English Learners: 6A:8 – 4.1(d) (page 23-24)</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 1.1d - Broadcast, Nov. 8, 2017: Update on New Jersey's New Science Assessments</i></p> <p align="center"><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p>C.E. 1.4a - New Jersey Student Learning Assessment (NJSLA) Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual, Seventh Edition</p> <p>C.E. 1.4b - NJSLA-S Test Coordinator Manual Spring 2019 (p. Viii; 54-61)</p> <p align="center"><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3.DLM.a NJ DLM Assessment Coordinator Training Module</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3.DLM.b NJ DLM Data Manager Training Module</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3.DLM.c NJ DLM Teacher Training Module</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3.DLM.d NJ DLM Managing Student Moves</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3.DLM.e NJ DLM Preparation for the DLM Assessment, Part 1</i></p>	<p>The evidence provided by NJDOE indicates clear policies that all students must participate in the State assessment system, including students who are publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services. State code includes appropriate policies for exempting recently arrived English learners from R/LA assessment, and students may be tested in native languages, where those assessments are available.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW JERSEY

<p>period not to exceed two additional consecutive years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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. 	<p><i>See C.E. 2.3.DLM.f NJ DLM Preparation for the DLM Assessment, Part 2</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3.DLM.n NJ DLM Participation Guidelines</i></p>	
<p>Section 1.4 Summary Statement</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 NEW JERSEY

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 academic standards and assessments, the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education). • Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas). • Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State. • Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents. 	<p align="center"><u>All Assessments</u></p> <p><i>See C.E. 1.1b - Updated July 2014: Resolution to Adopt Core Curriculum Content Standards</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.11 Evaluation of Science Assessment Blueprint Training Presentation November 17</i> <i>*Note: This powerpoint was used to consult educators on the development of NJSLA-S.</i></p> <p>C.E. 1.5a - National Research Council 2012. <i>A Framework for K-12 Science Education: Practices, Crosscutting Concepts, and Core Ideas</i>. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. APPENDIX A, pp. 331-345; APPENDIX C-D, pp. 355-367</p> <p>C.E. 1.5b - National Research Council 2012. <i>A Framework for K-12 Science Education: Practices, Crosscutting Concepts, and Core Ideas</i>. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. APPENDIX B pp. 1-9</p> <p>C.E. 1.5c - Lead State Partners- New Jersey <i>note: this document serves to illustrate the NJDOE's involvement in Achieve's robust consultation in developing the NGSS.</i></p> <p align="center"><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p>C.E. 1.5d NJ STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION Comment and Response NJSLA-S</p>	<p>The evidence indicates that the NGSS standards were adopted by the New Jersey Board of Education in 2014, which precedes this requirement.</p>
Section 1.5 Summary Statement		
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 NEW JERSEY

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 <u>the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards</u> for the grade that is being assessed and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of <u>the State’s grade-level academic content standards</u> and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results. • Processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <u>the State’s academic content standards</u>, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills). • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design and intended uses and interpretations of results. 	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p><i>Note: The NJDOE has not yet released scores for the first operational administration of NJSLA-S as of this peer review submission. Score interpretation guides are in draft form and additional resources are actively being developed.</i></p> <p><i>See CE 1.1a - N.J.A.C. 6A:8, STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT. 6A:8-1.1, Purpose (p.1-2); 4-1, Statewide Assessment System (p.21-24); 4.3, Accountability (p.25-26)</i></p> <p>C.E. 2.1a NJSLA-S Testing Blueprint Memo December 2018 New Jersey Student Learning Assessment for Science NJSLA-S Updates</p> <p>C.E. 2.1b NJSLA-S Project Launch Meeting Minutes, Agendas Oct-Nov 2017_evidence of development</p> <p>C.E. 2.1c 2017-18 Assessment Committees NJSLA-S Item Writer Training Letter Package</p> <p>C.E. 2.1d 2017-18 Assessment Committees NJSLA-S Test Specifications Package: Sign-in, Letters</p> <p>C.E. 2.1e Evaluation of Science Assessment Blueprint Training Presentation November 17</p> <p>C.E. 2.1f TestNav item types</p> <p>C.E. 2.1g NJSLA-S Accessibility plan</p>	<p><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u> The state provides sufficient evidence of the purpose and intended interpretations of the assessment results.</p> <p>The evidence related to test blueprints is not sufficient to show that rigorous content is included on the assessments.</p> <p>Because the blueprint does not provide sufficient detail, it is difficult for peers to ensure that the processes used to build forms result in assessments that are tailored to the state’s academic content standards. Without a supporting narrative or an independent alignment study referenced as evidence, peers were unable to confirm that processes are appropriate to ensure a tailored assessment.</p> <p><u>DLM Assessments</u> The state did not provide any evidence of state-specific alignment of standards and assessments or processes to ensure that the DLM assessments are appropriately measuring the content.</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 NEW JERSEY

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. 	<p>C.E. 2.1h NJSLA-S Accessibility item types</p> <p>C.E. 2.1i Middle School Combined Range PLDs December 2019</p> <p>C.E. 2.1j Elementary School Combined Range PLDs December 2019</p> <p>C.E. 2.1k High School Combined Range PLDs December 2019</p> <p>C.E. 2.1l Score Interpretation Guide Draft * <i>Note: Subject to change: final guide scheduled for release in January 2020</i></p> <p align="center"><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p>Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level evidence</p>	
--	--	--

Section 2.1 Summary Statement

- x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
- The state should provide evidence that the test blueprints provide sufficient detail to build tests with the appropriate item difficulty and depth of knowledge to ensure rigorous content is included on test forms.
 - The state should provide evidence of the process to ensure alignment that is tailored to the academic knowledge and skills in the content standards for all assessments. Additionally, for the DLM assessments, the state should provide confirmation of the alignment process for the assessment and its specific content standards, if applicable.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW JERSEY

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"> Assess student achievement based on the <u>State’s academic content standards</u> in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills. 	<p><i>Note: Spring 2019 was the first operational year of NJSLA-S administration and all technical documentation has not yet been finalized.</i></p> <p align="center"><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p>C.E. 2.2a SAC Bias and Sensitivity Training December 2019 Final</p> <p>C.E. 2.2b NJSLA-S Item Development Presentation to Senior Staff August 2019</p> <p>C.E. 2.2c SAC Training Presentation December 2019 Final</p> <p align="center"><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p>Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level evidence</p>	<p><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p>The state has provided sufficient evidence to show that reasonable and technically sound procedures are used to develop items. However, the lack of detail provided in the test blueprint referenced in Critical Element 2.1 does not ensure that items are selected for a form in such a way as to ensure appropriate content, cognitive processes and higher-order thinking skills are included.</p> <p>An example of evidence to show appropriate <i>item selection criteria</i> might include a more detailed blueprint plus any documentation showing when items are selected for a form, how those items meet both content and statistical targets.</p> <p><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p>Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level evidence</p>
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>_x_</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the State used reasonable and technically sound procedures to <i>select</i> items to assess student achievement based on the <u>State’s academic content standards</u> in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW JERSEY

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"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • 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. 	<p><i>*Note: The test monitoring administration procedures for NJSLA-S Test were adopted from the procedures for NJSLA-M and NJSLA-ELA (formerly PARCC), which were peer reviewed in 2017.</i></p> <p align="center"><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p><i>*Note: All of the following documents are available both on the Pearson NJSLA main site and MI Science site which include links to all relevant resources including manuals, test administration policies, and necessary forms:</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 1.3a Statewide Assessment Testing Schedule 2019 2020</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 1.4a - New Jersey Student Learning Assessment (NJSLA) Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual, Seventh Edition</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 1.4b - NJSLA-S Test Coordinator Manual Spring 2019 (p. 54-61)</i></p> <p>C.E. 2.3a.1 2019 Statewide Assessment District Test Coordinator Training</p> <p>C.E. 2.3a.2 2019 Statewide Assessment District Technology Coordinator Training</p> <p>C.E. 2.3b My Pearson Support Screenshot</p> <p>C.E. 2.3c MI Science Site Screenshot</p> <p>C.E. 2.3d.1 NJSLA-S Test Administrator Manual PBT (pgs 27-31)</p>	<p><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u> The state provided sufficient evidence in support of this CE.</p> <p><u>DLM Assessments</u> The state provided sufficient evidence in support of this CE.</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 NEW JERSEY

	<p>C.E. 2.3d.2 NJSLA-S Test Administrator Manual CBT (pgs 31-35)</p> <p>C.E. 2.3e Sample NJSLA District Security Plan</p> <p>C.E. 2.3f District Technology Coordinator Regional Training</p> <p>C.E. 2.3g Testing Irregularity and Security Breach Form</p> <p>C.E. 2.3h.1 PBT Chain of Custody Form</p> <p>C.E. 2.3h.2 CBT Chain of Custody Forms</p> <p>C.E. 2.3i Form to Report Contaminated, Damaged, or Missing Materials</p> <p>C.E. 2.3j Post-Test Certification</p> <p>C.E. 2.3k Intra-district School to School Chain of Custody Form (PBT)</p> <p>C.E. 2.3l District to District Chain of Custody Form for Transferred PBT Materials</p> <p>C.E. 2.3m District Return Form for PBT Materials</p> <p>C.E. 2.3n District Receipt Form for PBT Materials</p> <p>C.E. 2.3o Guidance for Speech-to-Text</p> <p>C.E. 2.3p.1 PSTG G11</p> <p>C.E. 2.3p.2 PSTG G5</p> <p>C.E. 2.3p.3 PSTG G8</p> <p>C.E. 2.3q.1 NJSLA-S Spring 2019 CBT TAM Script for Administering Science</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 NEW JERSEY

	<p>C.E. 2.3q.2 NJSLA-S Spring 2019 PBT TAM Script for Administering Science</p> <p>C.E. 2.3q.3 NJSLA-S Spring 2019 CBT TAM Script for Administering Science SPANISH</p> <p>C.E. 2.3q.4 NJSLA-S Spring 2019 PBT TAM Script for Administering Science SPANISH</p> <p>C.E. 2.3q.5 NJSLA-S Spring 2019 PBT TAM Script for Administering Science LARGE PRINT</p> <p>C.E. 2.3q.6 NJSLA-S Spring 2019 PBT TAM Script for Administering Science SPANISH LARGE PRINT</p> <p>C.E. 2.3q.7 NJSLA-S Spring 2019 PBT TAM Script for Administering Science BRAILLE</p> <p>C.E. 2.3r Training Modules - PearsonAccess Next Online Support - Screenshot</p> <p align="center"><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p><i>Note: All following relevant documents live on the NJ DLM site</i></p> <p>C.E. 2.3.DLM.a NJ DLM Assessment Coordinator Training Module</p> <p>C.E. 2.3.DLM.b NJ DLM Data Manager Training Module</p> <p>C.E. 2.3.DLM.c NJ DLM Teacher Training Module</p> <p>C.E. 2.3.DLM.d NJ DLM Managing Student Moves</p> <p>C.E. 2.3.DLM.e NJ DLM Preparation for the DLM Assessment, Part 1</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 NEW JERSEY

	<p>C.E. 2.3.DLM.f NJ DLM Preparation for the DLM Assessment, Part 2</p> <p>C.E. 2.3.DLM.g NJ DLM Test Security Agreement for Assessment Coordinators</p> <p>C.E. 2.3.DLM.h NJ DLM Test Security Agreement for Test Administrators</p> <p>C.E. 2.3.DLM.i NJ DLM Test Security Agreement for District Support Staff Present During DLM Test Administration</p> <p>C.E. 2.3.DLM.j NJ DLM Test Irregularity Report</p> <p>C.E. 2.3.DLM.k NJ DLM Test Administrator Observation Form</p> <p>C.E. 2.3.DLM.l NJ DLM Testlet Completion Form</p> <p>C.E. 2.3.DLM.m NJ DLM Sample Testing Checklist for Test Administrators</p> <p>C.E. 2.3.DLM.n NJ DLM Participation Guidelines</p> <p>Refer also to submission of the DLM science consortium-level evidence</p>	
<p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</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 NEW JERSEY

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><i>*Note: The test monitoring administration procedures for NJSLA-S and DLM Assessments are the same procedures implemented for NJSLA-M and NJSLA-ELA (formerly PARCC), as well as DLM ELA and Math, which were peer reviewed in 2017.</i></p> <p align="center"><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p><i>See C.E. 1.4b - NJSLA-S Test Coordinator Manual Spring 2019 (pg 71 section 2.2.1)</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3a.1 2019 Statewide Assessment District Test Coordinator Training</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3a.2 2019 Statewide Assessment District Technology Coordinator Training</i></p> <p>C.E. 2.4a Irregularity Report Sample Redacted</p> <p>C.E 2.4b NJSLA Security Visit Procedures</p> <p>C.E 2.4c NJSLA-S Science Security Visit Checklist</p> <p>C.E 2.4d NJSLA Security Visit List</p> <p>C.E. 2.4e School Assessment Quality Plan</p> <p align="center"><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3.DLM.g NJ DLM Test Security Agreement for Assessment Coordinators</i></p> <p><i>See C E. 2.3.DLM.h NJ DLM Test Security Agreement for Test Administrators</i></p>	<p>For NJSLA-S, the State provided a monitoring checklist, monitoring procedures, and a list of counties monitored in spring 2019. The monitoring checklist addresses whether the test is administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. NJDOE also provided an irregularity form that should be completed if the monitor has any concerns about irregularities. While it would have been helpful to have more information about how districts are selected for monitoring and how the State communicates monitoring requirements to districts, the evidence provided was sufficient to meet this critical element.</p> <p>For DLM, the State notes that it met this critical element for DLM in the previous peer review and that the procedures for DLM science are the same as those for DLM in reading/language arts and mathematics.</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 NEW JERSEY

	<p><i>See C.E. 2.3.DLM.i NJ DLM Test Security Agreement for District Support Staff Present During DLM Test Administration</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3.DLM.j NJ DLM Test Irregularity Report</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3.DLM.f NJ DLM Preparation for the DLM Assessment, Part 2 (slides 39-54)</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.4d NJ DLM Security Visit Procedure and Checklist</i></p> <p><i>See C.E 2.4d DLM Security Visits Site List</i></p> <p>Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level evidence.</p>	
<p>Section 2.4 Summary Statement</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 NEW JERSEY

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"> • 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; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. • Application of test security procedures to all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS. 	<p><i>*Note: The test security procedures for NJSLA-S and DLM Assessments are the same procedures implemented for NJSLA-M and NJSLA-ELA (formerly PARCC), as well as DLM ELA and Math, which were peer reviewed in 2017.</i></p> <p align="center"><u>All Assessments</u></p> <p>C.E 2.5a New Jersey Corrective Action Plan (CAP) Form</p> <p>C.E 2.5b Preliminary Investigation Protocol for Statewide Testing Program</p> <p align="center"><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p><i>See CE 1.1a - N.J.A.C. 6A:8 – 4.1 (e): “District boards of education shall be responsible for ensuring the security of all components of the statewide assessment system.” (pg 26)</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 1.4b - NJSLA-S Test Coordinator Manual Spring 2019 (pg 2) School Test Coordinators must be certified education professionals - Test administrators must be certified education professionals - Proctors (assist test administrators in monitoring students during testing) do not need to be certified education professionals but must be under supervision of test administrator or school test coordinator at all times</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 1.4b - NJSLA-S Test Coordinator Manual Spring 2019 (pgs 7-9)- Testing Irregularities and Security Breaches</i></p>	<p><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p>The state provided a variety of evidence in support of this CE. The evidence provided appears sufficient.</p> <p>There was mention of performance-based items being highly memorable; therefore, the state should consider and document what approaches they are taking to ensure security of those items.</p> <p><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p>The state provided a variety of evidence in support of this CE. The evidence provided appears sufficient.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW JERSEY

	<p><i>See C.E. 2.3g Testing Irregularity and Security Breach Form</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3a 2019 Statewide Assessment District Test Coordinator Training</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3b 2019 Statewide Assessment District Technology Coordinator Training</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.4a Irregularity Report Sample Redacted</i></p> <p>C.E. 2.5c Off Hours Testing Monitoring_Sessions_with_Delivery_Schedule_Override</p> <p>C.E. 2.5d Incidence Response Plans</p> <p>C.E. 2.5e Caveon Incident Response Report <i>Note: of the 8 incidences found and listed in this resource, none involved the NJSLA-S.</i></p> <p align="center"><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3.DLM.h NJ DLM Test Security Agreement for Test Administrators</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3.DLM.i NJ DLM Test Security Agreement for Support Staff Present During DLM Test Administration</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3.DLM.g NJ DLM Test Security Agreement Assessment Coordinators and Other Staff</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3.DLM.j NJ DLM Test Irregularity Report</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3.DLM.f NJ DLM Preparation for the DLM Assessment, Part 2 (slides 39-54)</i></p> <p>Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level 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 NEW JERSEY

Section 2.5 Summary Statement

<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 NEW JERSEY

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"> • To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • 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. 	<p><i>*Note: The data integrity and privacy test procedures for NJSLA-S and DLM Assessments are the same procedures implemented for NJSLA-M and NJSLA-ELA (formerly PARCC), as well as DLM ELA and Math, which were peer reviewed in 2017.</i></p> <p align="center"><u>All Assessments</u></p> <p>C.E 2.6a NJDOE Data Security and Privacy Policy</p> <p align="center"><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3g Testing Irregularity and Security Breach Form</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.5c Off Hours Testing Monitoring_Sessions_with_Delivery_Schedule_Override</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.5d Incidence Response Plans</i></p> <p>C.E. 2.6b NJ School Performance Reports Data Privacy Rules 2017-2018</p> <p>C.E. 2.6c PAN Platform User Role Matrix</p> <p>C.E. 2.6d N.J.A.C. 6A:32-7 Student Records (p.16.29) <i>provides strict guidance on the release of student information with and without parental consent. It also provides guidance on the need to suppress data in order to protect student personal identifiable information</i></p> <p align="center"><u>DLM Assessments</u></p>	<p><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u> The state provided sufficient evidence in support of this CE.</p> <p><u>DLM Assessments</u> The state provided sufficient evidence in support of this CE.</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 NEW JERSEY

	<p><i>See C.E. 2.3.DLM.h NJ DLM Test Security Agreement for Test Administrators</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3.DLM.i NJ DLM Test Security Agreement for Support Staff Present During DLM Test Administration</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3.DLM.g NJ DLM Test Security Agreement Assessment Coordinators and Other Staff</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3.DLM.j NJ DLM Test Irregularity Report</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3.DLM.f NJ DLM Preparation for the DLM Assessment, Part 2 (slides 39-54)</i></p> <p>Refer also to submission of the DLM science consortium-level evidence.</p>	
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</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 NEW JERSEY

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><u>The State’s academic assessments</u> measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; • Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards; • If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards and administers alternate assessments aligned with those standards, the assessments show adequate alignment to the State’s academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for 	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p><i>Note: Spring 2019 was the first operational year of NJSLA-S administration and all technical documentation has not yet been finalized.</i></p> <p>C.E. 3.1a Item Calibration and Equating Technical Report Excerpt Draft</p> <p>C.E. 3.1b NJSLA-S Standard Setting Final Report 2019</p> <p>C.E. 3.1c Technical Report Draft Excerpt: Distribution of Assessment Items</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p>Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level evidence</p>	<p><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p>It was unclear to peers how the evidence provided relates to the requirements of this Critical Element, particularly with no narrative providing context. As is, peers found the evidence insufficient to show validity of test score interpretations.</p> <p>Specifically, the state needs to provide evidence of independent alignment analyses. In addition, the submission lacks evidence demonstrating that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards. Examples of this evidence could include alignment studies, cognitive labs, focus groups, etc.</p> <p><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p>The state refers to the DLM submission; however, it is expected that the state would provide some state-specific evidence of validity for this Critical Element. As mentioned in previous Critical Elements, the state should provide evidence of alignment between the DLM and its academic 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 NEW JERSEY

students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.		
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• For the NJSLA-S and DLM, the state should provide evidence of adequate alignment between its assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure as well as evidence demonstrating that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW JERSEY

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: <u>the intended cognitive processes</u> appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p><i>Spring 2019 was the first operational year of NJSLA-S administration and all technical documentation has not yet been finalized.</i></p> <p align="center"><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.1i Middle School Combined Range PLDs December 2019</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.1j Elementary School Combined Range PLDs December 2019</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.1k High School Combined Range PLDs December 2019</i></p> <p align="center"><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p>Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level evidence</p>	<p><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u> The PLDs provide information about the skills associated with each range but do not provide sufficient evidence that the assessment taps the intended cognitive processes. An example of appropriate evidence to address this Critical Element might be results of a cognitive lab study or expert judgments demonstrating that the assessment items require complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills.</p> <p><u>DLM Assessments</u> Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level evidence</p>
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u><u> </u> <u> </u> <u> </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the NJSLA-S, the state should provide evidence (such as, the results of a cognitive lab study or expert judgments) demonstrating that the assessment items require complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW JERSEY

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><i>Note: Spring 2019 was the first operational year of NJSLA-S administration and all technical documentation has not yet been finalized.</i></p> <p align="center"><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p>C.E. 3.3a Assessment Structure Validity Evidence</p> <p align="center"><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p>Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level evidence</p>	<p><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p>Although the evidence provided shows overall unidimensionality using a principal components analysis, it does not show appropriate evidence that the proposed structure is supported by empirical evidence. A confirmatory analysis, such as principal axis factor analysis, of the sub-domain structures would be a more appropriate analysis to provide.</p> <p>Additionally, it was noted by the peers that a number of items were flagged for low item-total correlations; however, there was no indication as to the disposition of those results.</p> <p>Finally, DIF analyses omitted subgroups of interest like ELLs and SWDs. The state should either provide those analyses or a rationale for why they cannot be included.</p> <p><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p>Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level evidence</p>

Section 3.3 Summary Statement

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

- The state should provide evidence showing the subdomain structure is supported, using a confirmatory analysis.
- The state should provide documentation of the consequences of flagged items (e.g., C-flags in evidence 3.3a).
- The state should provide documentation of DIF analyses of all subgroups of interest or a rationale for not including them (e.g., SWDs and ELLs).

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW JERSEY

Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p><i>Note: Spring 2019 was the first operational year of NJSLA-S administration and all technical documentation has not yet been finalized.</i></p> <p align="center"><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p><i>See C.E. 3.1b NJSLA-S Standard Setting Final Report 2019</i></p> <p align="center"><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p>Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level evidence</p>	<p><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u> Impact data used during a standard setting study, particularly when it is limited to the impact of the cut scores on proficiency rates, is insufficient to demonstrate convergent validity as required in this Critical Element. Evidence that would be more appropriate is the relationship of the science test scores to other similar measures or dissimilar measures.</p> <p><u>DLM Assessments</u> Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level evidence</p>
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>_x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence to support the statement that assessment scores are related, as expected, with other variables. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW JERSEY

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"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s academic achievement. 	<p><i>Note: Spring 2019 was the first operational year of NJSLA-S administration and all technical documentation has not yet been finalized.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p>C.E. 4.1a Evidence of Reliability</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p>Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level evidence</p>	<p><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p>The evidence provided is sufficient for this Critical Element.</p> <p>As indicated in a previous Critical Element, the state should consider documenting the disposition of issues like low reliability, poor item fit, etc.</p> <p><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p>Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level evidence</p>
<p>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</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 NEW JERSEY

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, assessments should be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (see definition⁴).</i></p> <p>For academic content assessments, 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><i>Note: Spring 2019 was the first operational year of NJSLA-S administration and all technical documentation has not yet been finalized.</i></p> <p align="center"><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p><i>See C.E. 1.4a - New Jersey Student Learning Assessment (NJSLA) Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual, Seventh Edition</i></p> <p>C.E. 4.2a NJ Science 2020 Bias and Sensitivity Training</p> <p align="center"><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p>Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level evidence</p>	<p><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u> The state has taken reasonable steps to ensure that the assessment is fair across student groups; however, the state should provide results of DIF analyses for all subgroups of interest or a rationale for why they cannot be included.</p> <p><u>DLM Assessments</u> Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level evidence.</p>
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>_x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The state should provide documentation of DIF analyses of all subgroups of interest or a rationale for not including them (e.g., SWDs and ELLs). 		

⁴ 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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW JERSEY

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 academic assessments, including performance for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p><i>Note: Spring 2019 was the first operational year of NJSLA-S administration and all technical documentation has not yet been finalized.</i></p> <p align="center"><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p>C.E. 4.3a Evidence of Full Performance Continuum</p> <p align="center"><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p>Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level evidence</p>	<p><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p>The state has provided sufficient evidence to show that items are measuring across the ability distribution. However, there does appear to be gaps in coverage at both the low and/or high end of the scale, depending on the grade level. Having test blueprints showing sufficient detail to address how items are selected to cover these areas of the scale would have been appropriate to include in this Critical Element.</p> <p><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p>Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level evidence</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</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 NEW JERSEY

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 <u>academic achievement standards</u>.</p>	<p><i>Note: Spring 2019 was the first operational year of NJSLA-S administration and all technical documentation has not yet been finalized.</i></p> <p align="center"><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p><i>See C.E. 1.4b - NJSLA-S Test Coordinator Manual Spring 2019 (p. 39-43)</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.11 Score Interpretation Guide Draft</i></p> <p>C.E. 4.4a NJSLA-S Overview of Handscoring, Rangefinding Processes</p> <p>C.E. 4.4b G5 Anchor Sets and Rubrics (SECURE MATERIAL)</p> <p>C.E. 4.4c G8 Anchor Sets and Rubrics (SECURE MATERIAL)</p> <p>C.E. 4.4d G11 Anchor Sets and Rubrics (SECURE MATERIAL)</p> <p>C.E. 4.4e Scoring Procedures and Protocols</p> <p align="center"><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p>Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level evidence</p>	<p><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p>The state has provided evidence of rangefinding and rubrics for handscoring of performance-based items. The evidence of an evaluation of inter-rater reliability of scores produced by human scorers on performance-based items is lacking.</p> <p>The state should provide evidence of procedures to ensure accuracy of selected-response item scoring, such as keychecks after the administration. It would have also been appropriate to include the scale score CSEM to help evaluate the scale.</p> <p><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p>Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level evidence.</p>
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>_x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The state should provide evidence that the scoring of constructed-response items is done with a high degree of inter-rater reliability. • The state should provide evidence of procedures related to selected-response scoring accuracy. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW JERSEY

- The state should provide evidence of scale score CSEMs.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW JERSEY

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 academic assessments within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p><i>Note: Spring 2019 was the first operational year of NJSLA-S administration and all technical documentation has not yet been finalized.</i></p> <p align="center"><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.1a NJSLA-S Testing Blueprint Memo December 2018 New Jersey Student Learning Assessment for Science NJSLA-S Updates</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.1e Evaluation of Science Assessment Blueprint Training Presentation November 17</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.1l Score Interpretation Guide Draft</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 3.1a Item Calibration and Equating Technical Report Excerpt Draft</i></p> <p align="center"><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p>Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level evidence</p>	<p><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p>The state should provide a final technical report describing the results of equating different forms within and/or across years.</p> <p>This section should also include a reference to test construction specifications and form construction procedures that produce parallel forms – what are the statistical targets for form construction; content targets; evidence that these targets were met. Equating cannot adjust for large variations between forms that occur during form construction.</p> <p><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p>Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level evidence.</p>
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>_x_</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The state should provide a technical report describing the results of equating different forms within and/or across years. • The state should provide evidence that forms construction results in parallel forms from a content and statistical perspective. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW JERSEY

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; or a native language version of the academic content assessment), grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<p><i>Note: Spring 2019 was the first operational year of NJSLA-S administration and all technical documentation has not yet been finalized.</i></p> <p align="center"><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.1a NJSLA-S Testing Blueprint Memo December 2018 New Jersey Student Learning Assessment for Science NJSLA-S Updates</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.1e Evaluation of Science Assessment Blueprint Training Presentation November 17</i></p> <p>C.E. 4.6a Vendor Accessibility and Translation Proposal Excerpt SECURE</p> <p>C.E. 4.6b High School Test Maps</p> <p>C.E. 4.6c Elementary School Test Maps</p> <p>C.E. 4.6d Middle School Test Maps</p> <p align="center"><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p>Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level evidence</p>	<p><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p>There is insufficient evidence to support the comparability of the paper and pencil/computer as well as the Spanish language versions of the assessment.</p> <p>For example, the evidence provided for the Spanish language version of the assessments shows what the vendor proposed to ensure comparability but sufficient evidence would include demonstration of what was actually done to create the Spanish version of the assessments. Furthermore, there is no evidence demonstrating how the state ensured that rendering of paper items was comparable on computer or if there were differences in student performance on paper versus computer and how those were addressed (e.g., mode adjustments).</p> <p><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p>Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level evidence</p>

Section 4.6 Summary Statement

<p><u>_x_</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The state should submit evidence that the state followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments (i.e., paper and pencil versus computer and Spanish versus English versions) The state should provide documentation of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.
--

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW JERSEY

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"> 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 Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website. 	<p><i>Note: Spring 2019 was the first operational year of NJSLA-S administration and all technical documentation has not yet been finalized.</i></p> <p align="center"><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p><i>See C.E. 3.1a Item Calibration and Equating Technical Report Excerpt Draft</i></p> <p>C.E. 4.7a RFP bid sections on reliability validity and fairness requirements</p> <p>C.E. 4.7b Technical Advisory Committee TAC Agenda Minutes Recommendations February 2018- December 2019 <i>*Note: Content related to other assessment programs were redacted to clarify which topics apply to NJSLA-S.</i></p> <p>C.E. 4.7c New Jersey Science Assessment Standard Setting Plan November 2018</p> <p>C.E. 4.7d New Jersey Science Assessment Standard Setting Readiness Form</p> <p>C.E. 4.7e Individual Score Report Resource TAC</p> <p align="center"><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p>Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level evidence</p>	<p><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p>There appears to be a significant gap in the availability of information showing a comprehensive system of monitoring, maintaining, and improving the quality of the assessment system. The individual pieces of evidence show a single point in time, single piece of evidence for very specific elements of the quality of the program. There is no evidence of a complete system (e.g., action plan, timelines, annual work plan, etc.).</p> <p><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p>Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level evidence</p>

<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>
<p><u>_x_</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The state should provide evidence of a complete system of monitoring the quality of the assessment system that includes timelines and action plans. The state should provide evidence of adequate technical quality of its assessments that is made public, including on the State’s website.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW JERSEY

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"> • Establish guidelines for determining whether to assess a student with an AA-AAAS, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A State definition of “students with the most significant cognitive disabilities” that addresses factors related to cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior; • Provide information for IEP Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that: 	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p><i>See C.E. 1.4a - New Jersey Student Learning Assessment (NJSLA) Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual, Seventh Edition</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3.DLM.n NJ DLM Participation Guidelines</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3a.1 2019 Statewide Assessment District Test Coordinator Training</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3a.2 2019 Statewide Assessment District Technology Coordinator Training</i></p> <p>C.E. 5.1a N.J.A.C. 6A:14- 3.7(e)7A- statement of any individual modifications in the administration of Statewide or districtwide assessments of student achievement needed for the student to participate in such assessment.</p> <p><i>“i. If the IEP team determines that the student shall not participate in a particular general Statewide or districtwide assessment of student achievement (or part of such an assessment), a statement of why that assessment is not appropriate for the student according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-4.10 and a statement of how that student shall be assessed and which assessment methodology is appropriate for the student”</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 5.1a:</i> C.E. 5.1.a.2, N.J.A.C. 6A:14-4.10(a) Statewide Assessment: Students with disabilities shall participate</p>	<p><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p>The evidence provided by the state addresses this Critical Element sufficiently.</p> <p>However, the state’s submission could benefit from addressing the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation that students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who take an AA-AAAS are not precluded from attempting to complete the requirements for a regular high school diploma • Documentation that the state promotes, consistent with requirements under the IDEA, the involvement and progress of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in the general education curriculum that is based on the State’s academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled <p><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p>Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level 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 NEW JERSEY

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"> ○ 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; ● 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; ● 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 ● Promote, consistent with requirements under the IDEA, the involvement and progress of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in the general education curriculum that is based on the State's academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled; and 	<p>in the Statewide assessment system according to the following:</p> <p><i>“1. Except as provided in (a)2 below, students with disabilities shall participate in each content area of the general Statewide assessment for their grade. Accommodations and modifications approved by the Department of Education shall be provided when determined necessary by the IEP team to students with disabilities who participate in the general Statewide assessments.</i></p> <p><i>2. Students with disabilities shall participate in the Alternate Proficiency Assessment (APA) in each content area where the nature of the student's disability is so severe that the student is not receiving instruction in any of the knowledge and skills measured by the general Statewide assessment and the student cannot complete any of the types of questions on the assessment in the content area(s) even with accommodations and modifications.”</i></p> <p>C.E. 5.1b Broadcast Memo October 10 2019 Preparation for the 2019-20 Dynamic Learning Maps Alternate Assessment for Students with the Most Significant Intellectual Disabilities <i>note: this memo contains the DLM participation guidelines link.</i></p> <p>C.E. 5.1c DLM Accessibility Manual 2019-2020</p> <p>C.E. 5.1d Broadcast Memo September 9 2019 Parental Notification of Standardized Assessments</p> <p>C.E. 5.1e - 2019 NJSLA Assessment Assistive Technology Guidelines</p> <p><i>*Note: Listed guidelines apply to all assessments under the NJSLA assessment system.</i></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 NEW JERSEY

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"> 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. 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).⁵ 	<p align="center"><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3.DLM.m NJ DLM Sample Testing Checklist for Test Administrators</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3.DLM.n NJ DLM Participation Guidelines</i></p> <p>Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level evidence.</p>	
<p>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>x No additional evidence is required</p>		

⁵ 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)

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW JERSEY

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"> • Procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed with a linguistic accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for ELs; • Assistance regarding selection of appropriate linguistic accommodations for ELs, including to the extent practicable, assessments in the language most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what those students know and can do to determine the students’ mastery of skills in academic content areas until the students have achieved English language proficiency. 	<p align="center"><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p><i>See C.E. 1.4a - New Jersey Student Learning Assessment (NJSLA) Accessibility Features and Accommodations Manual, Seventh Edition (p. 41-49, 92-100)</i></p> <p><i>See the following Parent, Student and Teacher Guides: Note, these are in English and Spanish</i></p> <p><i>C.E. 2.3p.1 PSTG G11</i> <i>C.E. 2.3p.2 PSTG G5</i> <i>C.E. 2.3p.3 PSTG G8</i></p> <p>C.E. 5.2a 2019-20 Statewide Assessments Accessibility Presentation</p> <p>C.E. 5.2b NJ English Language Learner Identification and Placement Guidance Document</p> <p>C.E. 5.2c NJ 2019 Personal Needs Profile (PNP) Guidance-Managing Incorrect Accessibility Features and Accommodation PNP Data <i>*Note: Listed guidelines apply to all assessments under the NJSLA assessment system.</i></p> <p>C.E. 5.2d NJSLA-S Online Practice Test Answer and Alignment Document Science Grade 11 SPANISH</p> <p>C.E. 5.2e NJSLA-S Online Practice Test Answer and Alignment Document Science Grade 8 SPANISH</p> <p>C.E. 5.2f NJSLA-S Online Practice Test Answer and Alignment Document Science Grade 5 SPANISH</p> <p align="center"><u>DLM Assessments</u></p>	<p><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u> The evidence provided by the state addresses this Critical Element sufficiently.</p> <p><u>DLM Assessments</u> Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level 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 NEW JERSEY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level evidence	
Section 5.2 Summary Statement		
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 NEW JERSEY

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"> • Ensures that appropriate accommodations, such as, interoperability with, and ability to use, assistive technology, are available to measure the academic achievement of students with disabilities. • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs; • 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; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. • Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the 	<p align="center"><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p><i>See C.E. 1.4a - New Jersey Student Learning Assessment NJSLA Accessibility and Accommodations Manual Seventh Edition 2019; Section 3 Accommodations for Students with Disabilities and ELs (p. 20-42); Section 4 Decision-Making Process for Selecting, Using, and Evaluating (p.42-66); p.111 Appendix F Unique Accommodation Request Form, p. 113 Appendix G Use of Emergency Accommodations on the NJSLA; p. 114, Appendix H, Student Accommodation Refusal Form</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3a.1 2019 Statewide Assessment District Test Coordinator Training</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3a.1 2019 Statewide Assessment District Technology Coordinator Training</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 5.2a 2019-20 Statewide Assessments Accessibility Presentation</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 5.2b NJ English Language Learner Identification and Placement Guidance Document</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 5.2c NJ 2019 Personal Needs Profile (PNP) Guidance-Managing Incorrect Accessibility Features and Accommodation PNP Data</i></p> <p>C.E. 5.3a NJSLA-S NJ State Performance Level Summary Spring 2019 Grade 5</p> <p>C.E. 5.3b NJSLA-S NJ State Performance Level Summary Spring 2019 Grade 8</p>	<p><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p>The state has not shown sufficient evidence to determine that the accommodations it provides do not alter the construct being assessed. Evidence is also insufficient to show that meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores can be made for students who use and do not use accommodations.</p> <p>For example, the state could consider providing DIF analyses for accommodated students in support of this Critical Element.</p> <p><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p>Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level 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 NEW JERSEY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.	C.E. 5.3c NJSLA-S NJ State Performance Level Summary Spring 2019 Grade 11 <p align="center"><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level evidence	
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
x The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The state should provide documentation showing that the state has determined that the accommodations it provides do not alter the construct being assessed and 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 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW JERSEY

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"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • 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; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures; • Monitored for administrations of all required academic content assessments and AA-AAAS. 	<p><i>*Note: The test monitoring for special populations procedures for NJSLA-S and DLM Assessments are the same procedures implemented for NJSLA-M and NJSLA-ELA (formerly PARCC), as well as DLM ELA and Math, which were peer reviewed in 2017.</i></p> <p align="center"><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p><i>Note: The Office of Assessments in collaboration with the Office of Special Education sends staff to districts to monitor and provide coaching for the appropriate implementation of the DLM assessment.</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 1.4b NJSLA-S Test Coordinator Manual Spring 2019</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3g Testing Irregularity and Security Breach Form</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3q.1 NJSLA-S Spring 2019 CBT TAM Script for Administering Science</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3q.2 NJSLA-S Spring 2019 PBT TAM Script for Administering Science</i></p> <p><i>See C.E 2.5a New Jersey Corrective Action Plan (CAP) Form</i></p> <p><i>See C.E 2.5b Preliminary Investigation Protocol for Statewide Testing Program</i></p> <p align="center"><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3.DLM.g NJ DLM Test Security Agreement for Assessment Coordinators</i></p>	<p><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p>The evidence presented by the state addresses certain issues about providing students with appropriate accommodations, creating testing scripts, checking for testing irregularities (including those regarding accommodations).</p> <p>The submission is lacking evidence of the state monitoring that the appropriate testing accommodations are selected by appropriate personnel and provided with fidelity to test administration procedures.</p> <p><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p>Although all the evidence represents the steps needed to meet this Critical Element, without a narrative, it is unclear how these pieces are connected and how they form a cohesive system.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW JERSEY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><i>See C.E. 2.3.DLM.h NJ DLM Test Security Agreement for Test Administrators</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3.DLM.i NJ DLM Test Security Agreement for District Support Staff Present During DLM Test Administration</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3.DLM.j NJ DLM Test Irregularity Report</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.3.DLM.f NJ DLM Preparation for the DLM Assessment, Part 2 (slides 39-54)</i></p> <p><i>See C.E 2.4c DLM Security Visits Site List</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.4d NJ DLM Security Visit Procedure and Checklist</i></p> <p>Refer also to submission of the DLM science consortium-level evidence.</p>	
Section 5.4 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For both assessments, the state should provide evidence of monitoring that the appropriate testing accommodations are selected by appropriate personnel and provided with fidelity to test administration procedures. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW JERSEY

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>For academic content standards:</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 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; <p>The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include:</p> <p>(1) at least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third for lower achievement; (2) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (3) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p><i>See C.E. 1.5d NJ STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION Comment and Response NJSLA-S</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.1i Middle School Combined Range PLDs December 2019</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.1j Elementary School Combined Range PLDs December 2019</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.1k High School Combined Range PLDs December 2019</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 3.1b NJSLA-S Standard Setting Final Report 2019, Appendix B (p. 12)</i></p> <p>C.E. 6.1a NJSLA-S Agenda for Standard Setting July 2019</p> <p>C.E. 6.1b Science Standard Setting Navigating the Performance Level Setting Online Tool</p> <p>C.E. 6.1c NJSLA-S Standard Setting Committee Acceptance Letter APPROVED</p> <p>C.E. 6.1d Standard Setting Evaluation Form</p> <p>C.E. 6.1e NJ State Board_Minutes_Resolution to Discuss New Proficient Level Cut Scores for NJSLA-S_ September 4, 2019</p>	<p><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p>The evidence is insufficient to show the state <i>formally</i> adopted academic achievement standards. For example, evidence 6.1e shows the standards were discussed but not formally voted on or approved by the State Board of Education.</p> <p><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p>The evidence is insufficient to show the state <i>formally</i> adopted alternate academic achievement standards. None of the evidence provided for the state submission shows that the state set standards or that the State Board of Education reviewed or approved.</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 NEW JERSEY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>C.E. 6.1f New Jersey State Board of Education Presentation September 2019 NJSLA-S Performance Level Standard Setting</p> <p align="center"><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p><i>See C.E. 5.1a: 6A:14-3.7 Individualized Education Program: “Where appropriate, a statement of detailed measurable annual academic and functional goals that shall, as appropriate, be related to the New Jersey Student Learning Standards through the general education curriculum unless otherwise required according to the student's educational needs, or appropriate, student specific, functional needs. For all students, the annual academic and functional goals shall be measurable and apprise parents and educational personnel providing special education and related services to the student of the expected level of achievement attendant to each goal.”</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 5.1a 6A:14-4.7 Program criteria: special class programs, secondary, and vocational rehabilitation: “Placement shall be made according to the student's IEP. The IEP shall specify the New Jersey Student Learning Standards to be met and shall address how the instruction will be provided.”</i></p> <p><i>*See DLM Submission evidence for Critical Element 6.4.</i></p>	
Section 6.1 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>_x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The state should provide evidence of formal adoption of the NJSLA-S assessments academic achievement standards. • The state should provide evidence of standard setting and adoption of DLM-specific academic achievement standards and PLDs. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW JERSEY

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"> • <u>Academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards.</u> 	<p align="center"><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.1i Middle School Combined Range PLDs December 2019</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.1j Elementary School Combined Range PLDs December 2019</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.1k High School Combined Range PLDs December 2019</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 3.1b NJSLA-S Standard Setting Final Report 2019</i></p> <p>C.E. 6.2a Independent Evaluation of the Standard Setting Study Designed to Set Cut Scores for the New Jersey Student Learning Assessment– Science (NJSLA–S)</p> <p>C.E. 6.2b 2020 New Jersey Student Learning Assessment- Science Crosswalk to the Model Curriculum DRAFT</p> <p align="center"><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p>Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level evidence</p>	<p><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u> The evidence presented by the state addressed this Critical Element sufficiently.</p> <p><u>DLM Assessments</u> It was unclear to peers if the state is using alternate academic achievement standards set by the DLM Consortium. Some narrative giving that context is required to determine if this critical element has been satisfied.</p>

Section 6.2 Summary Statement

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- The state should provide clear documentation of the academic achievement standards aligned to the DLM assessment.
- If those standards were set by the state, additional evidence should be provided showing the methodology and outcomes of those workshops.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW JERSEY

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><u>For academic achievement standards:</u></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 align="center"><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.1i Middle School Combined Range PLDs December 2019</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.1j Elementary School Combined Range PLDs December 2019</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.1k High School Combined Range PLDs December 2019</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 6.2c 2020 New Jersey Student Learning Assessment- Science Crosswalk to the Model Curriculum</i></p> <p align="center"><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p>Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level evidence</p>	<p><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p>The state has created PLDs but has not provided sufficient information about how these PLDs were created or that they 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><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p>Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level 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 NEW JERSEY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
postsecondary education or competitive integrated employment.		
Section 6.3 Summary Statement		
<p data-bbox="107 331 877 358">_x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul data-bbox="155 363 1793 420" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="155 363 1793 420">• The state should provide evidence that the achievement standards 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. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW JERSEY

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 <u>student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level</u>⁶</p> <p>For <u>academic content assessments</u>, 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 <u>specific academic needs of students</u>, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a 	<p align="center"><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p><i>Note: The NJDOE has not yet released scores for the first operational administration of NJSLA-S as of this peer review submission. Score interpretation guides are in draft form and additional resources are actively being developed.</i></p> <p><i>See CE 1.1 - N.J.A.C. 6A:8, STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT. 6A:8-4.2, 4.5. Subchapter 4 Implementation of the Statewide Assessment System, Documentation of Student Achievement; Public Reporting. (p. 24-27)</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 2.11 Score Interpretation Guide Draft</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 4.7e Individual Score Report Resource TAC</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 5.3a NJSLA-S NJ State Performance Level Summary Spring 2019 Grade 5</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 5.3b NJSLA-S NJ State Performance Level Summary Spring 2019 Grade 8</i></p> <p><i>See C.E. 5.3c NJSLA-S NJ State Performance Level Summary Spring 2019 Grade 11</i></p> <p>C.E. 6.4a Broadcast 11/8/2017 Update on New Jersey’s New Science Assessments</p>	<p><u>NJSLA-S Assessments</u></p> <p>The evidence provided by the state contains various draft reports and templates. The state should provide those in the operational form once they become available.</p> <p>The state should provide additional evidence about the general timeline (e.g., 4 weeks after administration) and process for score reporting and delivery.</p> <p>The state should provide additional evidence that the student reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will have interpretive guides appropriate for parents; • 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; and • 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. <p><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p>The state refers to the DLM submission; however, the DLM submission provided to the peers has no evidence submitted and no disposition by peers as to the passing of this critical element.</p> <p>The state should provide additional evidence about the general timeline (e.g., 4 weeks after administration) and process for reporting.</p>

⁶ 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 NEW JERSEY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>student’s academic achievement;</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Report the <u>student’s academic achievement</u> in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards; ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific <u>academic needs of students;</u> ○ Are provided in an understandable and uniform format; ○ 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; ○ 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. • 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. 	<p>C.E. 6.4b NJSLA-S Spring 2018 Field Test Memo</p> <p>C.E. 6.4c NJSLA-S 2019 Key Dates and Registration_Vendor Memo and Key Dates</p> <p>C.E. 6.4d Broadcast_NJDOE Provides Testing Calendars School Years 2018, 2019 and 2020</p> <p>C.E. 6.4e Sci Spring 2019 Final Reporting List</p> <p>C.E. 6.4f 2019_0920 NJSLA-S Labels</p> <p>C.E. 6.4g 2019_1007 NJ Science Performance Level Summary Templates</p> <p>C.E. 6.4h 2019_1007 NJ Science Domains Practices</p> <p>C.E. 6.4i 2019_1004 NJ Science Student Roster Template</p> <p>C.E. 6.4j 2019_1004 NJ Science Individual Student Report Template</p> <p align="center"><u>DLM Assessments</u></p> <p>C.E. 6.4.DLM.a Results for the 2019 Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Assessment Broadcast July 26, 2019</p> <p>*Refer to submission of the DLM science consortium-level evidence.</p>	<p>The state should provide additional evidence that the student reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; • 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.
<p>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For both assessments, the state should provide evidence of a general timeline and process for score reporting and delivery. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW JERSEY

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"> For both assessments the state should provide evidence that the student reports are 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; 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.

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