



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Joy Hofmeister  
State Superintendent of Public Instruction  
Oklahoma State Department of Education  
Oliver Hodge Building  
2500 North Lincoln Boulevard  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105

July 10, 2020

Dear Superintendent Hofmeister:

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 Oklahoma State Department of Education (OSDE) to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in March 2020.

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

External peer reviewers and Department staff carefully evaluated OSDE'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:

- R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (OSTP 3-8 reading/language-mathematics): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- Science general assessments in grades 5 and 8 (OSTP science): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- R/LA, mathematics, and science general assessments in high school (SAT): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- R/LA, mathematics, and science general assessments in high school (ACT) (as a locally selected, nationally recognized high school assessment): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- Science general assessments in high school (CCRA science): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**

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.*

- R/LA, mathematics and science AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- Science AA-AAAS in grades 5, 8 and high school (DLM Science): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**

The assessments that substantially meet requirements of the ESEA, as amended by ESSA, meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. The Department expects that OSDE may be able to provide this additional information within one year. Please note that while your State met many of the requirements related to State administration of its assessments, the Department has significant concerns related to test design and alignment with your State's academic content standards. Alignment to the State's challenging academic standards is critical to having a valid and reliable assessment system. The Department must see that the State has made substantial progress on these critical elements in the next peer review or the Department may take additional enforcement action.

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

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

The Department placed a condition on OSDE's Title I, Part A grant award beginning July 1, 2019. The condition stated that until OSDE provided all of the requested information from assessment peer reviews held in 2018, the condition would remain on the grant. The condition also stipulated that the Department may take further action if the condition was not resolved in a timely manner. The condition will continue until the State provides information that the reviewed assessments met all requirements.

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.

Page 3 – The Honorable Joy Hofmeister

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

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank T. Brogan  
Assistant Secretary  
for Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Craig Walker, Executive Director of State Assessments

## Critical Elements Where Additional Evidence is Needed for Oklahoma’s Assessment System

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<p><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></p>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards for the grade that is being assessed and includes processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (e.g., a plan and a timeline to address and remedy the alignment issues identified in the existing alignment studies, particularly in mathematics).</li> </ul> <p>For the ACT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the test design of the ACT addresses the full depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards, such as test blueprints which indicate the number or percentage of items by depth of knowledge (DOK) classification within each reporting category of the academic content standards.</li> </ul> <p>For the CCRA science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul> <p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of an overall test design and test blueprints that measure the full breadth of the State’s grade-level academic content standards in science (e.g., evidence that the test design adequately samples the essential elements in science).</li> </ul>
<p><b>2.2 – Item Development</b></p>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</li> </ul> <p>For the CCRA science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that clarifies how the development and review process for Essential Element Concept Maps (EECMs) contributes to a technically sound test item development process.</li> </ul>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b>	<p>For the SAT, ACT, CCRA science, and DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence provided for critical element 2.1 will address this critical element.</li> </ul>
<b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for high school as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</li> </ul> <p>For the CCRA science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of validity that the assessment taps the intended cognitive processes as represented in the State’s content standards (e.g., a plan to address issues identified in the cognitive labs).</li> </ul>
<b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</li> </ul> <p>For the ACT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of the ACT writing test are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s content standards (e.g., correlations among domain scores).</li> </ul>
<b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b>	<p>For the OSTP in science, grades 5 and 8, the CCRA science, and the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that science scores are related as expected with other variables (e.g., other measures of science achievement).</li> </ul>
<b>4.1 – Reliability</b>	<p>For the ACT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence for conditional standard error of measurement (CSEM) by student subgroup.</li> </ul> <p>For the CCRA Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of adequate subgroup reliability for English learners.</li> <li>CSEM of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable.</li> <li>Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results.</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of reliability for its assessments for the for the student population overall and each student group once other changes to the assessment have been implemented (e.g., expansion of the item pool, increase of number of items per testlet, increase in the number of linkage levels).</li> </ul>
<b>4.2 – Fairness and accessibility</b>	<p>For DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that the assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments, including additional analysis by student subgroup to analyze test fairness.</li> </ul>
<b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b>	<p>For OSTP and CCRA science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the assessments provide an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students (e.g., plans to improve precision of measurement).</li> </ul>
<b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b>	<p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of a plan to monitor the science test before, during, and after the inclusion of phase II development items to the test item banks, including clear and technically sound criteria.</li> </ul>
<b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b>	<p>For the DLM R/LA, mathematics, and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their students’ achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy.</li> </ul>
<b>5.3 - Accommodations</b>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State has determined that the accommodations it provides do not alter the construct being assessed.</li> </ul>
<b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b>	<p>For the CCRA science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable (e.g., information on the diversity and expertise of panelists).</li> </ul> <p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its alternate academic achievement standards in science to ensure they are valid and reliable.</li> </ul>
<b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b>	<p>For the DLM reading/language arts, mathematics, and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DLM alternate academic achievement standards ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	Succeeds Act. OSDE should provide this evidence by December 31, 2020.
<b>6.4 – Reporting</b>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State reports the student's achievement in terms of the State's grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors).</li> <li>• Evidence that alternate formats are available (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand</li> <li>• Evidence of a process and timeline that student reports are provided to teachers, principals, and parents as soon as practicable.</li> </ul> <p>For the ACT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that student reports: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students.</li> <li>○ To the extent practicable, are available in alternative formats (e.g., oral or written translations and accessible formats as needed).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Evidence of the reliability of each of the subscale scores on score reports, or the addition of confidence intervals reflecting the level of precision.</li> <li>• Evidence of how the State will report mathematics scores consistent with the model it validated through confirmatory factor analysis. Evidence submitted in critical element 3.3 will also address this critical element.</li> </ul>
<b>7.3 – Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State Assessments</b>	<p>For the ACT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence for critical elements 2.1 and 3.1 are needed to address this critical element.</li> </ul>

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## August 2019 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

Contents

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

**Critical Element 1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students ..... 1**

**Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content Standards ..... 2**

**Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments ..... 3**

**Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments .. 5**

**Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments ..... 7**

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS ..... 8**

**Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development ..... 8**

**Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development ..... 10**

**Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration ..... 11**

**Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration ..... 13**

**Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security ..... 14**

**Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy .. 15**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY ..... 16**

**Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content 16**

**Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes ..... 18**

**Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure ..... 19**

**Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables ..... 20**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER ..... 21**

**Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability ..... 21**

**Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility ..... 23**

**Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum ..... 25**

**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring ..... 26**

**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms ..... 27**

**Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment ..... 28**

**Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance ..... 29**

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS ..... 30**

**Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 30**

**Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments ..... 33**

**Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations ..... 34**

**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.

..... 36

**SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING.....38**

**Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students..... 38**  
**Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting ..... 40**  
**Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards ..... 41**  
**Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting ..... 43**

**SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS..46**

**Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments ..... 46**  
**Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments ..... 48**  
**Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State Assessments ..... 49**

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

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b><u>For academic content standards:</u></b>                      The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public schools and public school students in the State.</p>		
<p><b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b><u>For academic content standards:</u></b>                      The State’s challenging academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science are aligned with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards.</p>		
<p><b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

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

**Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments aligned with <b>grade-level academic achievement standards</b> or alternate academic achievement standards in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 9-12);</li> <li>• Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12).</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <p>The State’s <b>academic content assessments</b> must be the same assessments administered to all students in the tested grades, with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may take an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards.</li> <li>• A State may permit an LEA to administer a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in lieu of the State high school assessment if certain conditions are met.</li> <li>• A State that administers an end-of-course high school mathematics assessment may exempt an 8<sup>th</sup> grade student from the mathematics assessment typically administered in eighth grade and allow the student to</li> </ul>	<p>Reviewed by Department Staff Only</p>	<p>Reviewed by Department Staff Only</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

<p>take the State end-of-course mathematics test instead.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Department may have approved the State, under the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority, to permit students in some LEAs to participate in a demonstration assessment system in lieu of participating in the State assessment.</li></ul>		
<b>Section 1.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li></ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For students with disabilities, policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including those children with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system;</li> <li>• For ELs:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Policies state that all ELs must be included in all aspects of the content assessment system, unless the State has chosen the statutory option for recently arrived ELs under which such ELs are exempt from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment.</li> <li>○ If a State has developed native language assessments for ELs in R/LA, ELs must be assessed in R/LA in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except, if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Reviewed by Department Staff Only</p>	<p>Reviewed by Department Staff Only</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

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

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State has developed or amended challenging <b>academic</b> standards and assessments, the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education).</li> <li>• Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas).</li> <li>• Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State.</li> <li>• Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents.</li> </ul>	<p>Reviewed by Department Staff Only</p>	<p>Reviewed by Department Staff Only</p>
<p><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to <b><u>the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards</u></b> for the grade that is being assessed and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of <b><u>the State’s grade-level academic content standards</u></b> and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results.</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <b><u>the State’s academic content standards</u></b>, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills).</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design and intended uses and interpretations of results.</li> </ul>	<p>SC 01 pp. 45-46 &amp; 192-198            SC 03            SC 04 pp. 5-6            SC 05 Alignment Response plan</p>	<p>Peer reviewers recognize the complex psychometric design of DLM Science and commend the work that has been done on the assessment up to this point.</p> <p>Peer reviewers acknowledge that maps were developed and that a timeline is in place. SC 05 Provides an overview of the alignment studies and some of the responses to it and plans going forward.</p> <p>The study noted a few specific areas for follow-up where alignment statistics did not meet the expected threshold. A plan and timeline for follow-up studies has been developed. Additional evidence will be provided in 2019-2020.</p> <p>However, current evidence is not sufficient in that the alignment study still notes gaps in the alignment, as pointed out in the DLM Science submission. Peer reviewers noted that DLM Science will provide additional evidence in 2019-2020.</p> <p>In both a previous review and in this review, SC 03 p. 3 tells us that “...the science state partners did not want to develop EEs for every sub-idea in the Framework, a crosswalk of states’ existing alternate science standards was used to identify the intended foci for students with SCD and the DLM science assessment.” (SC 03, p. 3). Peers would like to understand the rationale for the decision not to develop a complete set of EEs.</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the student is enrolled and uses that determination for all reporting.</li> <li>• If the State administers a content assessment that includes portfolios, such assessment may be partially administered through a portfolio but may not be <i>entirely</i> administered through a portfolio.</li> </ul>		
<b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of an overall test design and test blueprints that measure the full breadth of the State’s grade-level academic content standards in science (e.g., evidence that the test design adequately samples the essential elements in science).</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

### **Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess student achievement based on the <b><u>State’s academic content standards</u></b> in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</li> </ul>		<p>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>
<p><b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that clarifies how the development and review process for Essential Element Concept Maps (EECMs) contributes to a technically sound test item development process.</li> </ul>		

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

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

**Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>• Has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities;</li> <li>• If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

- [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]

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

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

**Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. Monitoring of test administration should be demonstrated for all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS.	Reviewed by Department Staff Only	Reviewed by Department Staff Only
<p><b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

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

**Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> <li>• Application of test security procedures to all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

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

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

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. The State’s validity evidence includes evidence that:</p> <p><b><u>The State’s academic assessments</u></b> measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), , balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> <li>• Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards;</li> <li>• If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards and administers alternate assessments aligned with those standards, the assessments show adequate alignment to the State’s academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for</li> </ul>	<p>SC 05 Science Alignment Response Plan            SC 03 Technical Manual Update – Science 2017-2018            SC 01 Technical Manual Science 2015-16 (pp. 192-198)</p>	<p>A plan and timeline to address the results of a 2017 alignment study has been provided (SC 05).</p> <p>As noted in response to critical element 2.1, additional evidence will be submitted for DLM Science in June 2020.</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

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

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

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap: <b>the intended cognitive processes</b> appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.		
<b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s <b><u>academic content standards</u></b>.</p>		
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

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

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.
<b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the science tests are related as expected with similar variables (e.g., other measures of science achievement).</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER

**Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. If the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, measures of reliability for the assessment overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of <b><u>a student’s academic achievement.</u></b></li> </ul>	<p>SC-04</p>	<p>As noted in response to critical element 4.1, additional evidence will be submitted for DLM Science in June 2020.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b></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><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence of updated reliability estimates for its assessments for the student population overall and each student group once evidence identified in critical element 2.1 relative to addressing the depth and breadth of the content standards have been addressed (e.g., expansion of the item pool, increase in number of items per testlet, increase in the number of linkage levels).</li></ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

### **Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><i>For all State academic assessments,</i> assessments should be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (see definition<sup>1</sup>).</p> <p><b><u>For academic content assessments,</u></b> the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in their design, development and analysis.</p>	<p>SC 03, pp. 6, 8-11, 57-61            SC 01, pp. 63, 64, 114-121, 46-63            SC Section 4 – Technical Quality – Other</p>	<p>Submitted evidence is sufficient for the request of evidence ensuring that assessments are accessible to all students in the design, development, and analysis of its assessments, as well as ensuring fairness of the assessments. Additional results will be summarized in the corresponding technical manual update in the 2020 submission.</p> <p>In the Technical Manual Update – Science 2017-18 (SC 03, pp. 61-65) DIF and other analyses revealed no bias in items; however, gender was the only subgroup large enough for a DIF analysis. The peer reviewers expect that additional analyses will be provided in the DLM Science submission in 2020.</p> <p>The Consortium appears to have addressed previous concerns regarding item writer training. Other issues, particularly with regard to fairness, seem to have been answered by providing the same documentation that was available in the 2017 review.</p> <p>The addition of additional items to the teacher survey in Spring 2019 is noted; more specificity about these items would have been appreciated, as would a promise to report on what additional insights – if any – were provided by adding the items.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><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>		

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

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

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

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

### **Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for <b><u>academic assessments</u></b>, including performance for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>SC 01 pp. 187-189 SC 03 pp. 50-52</p>	<p>The DLM Science submission states that: “The correlations and correct classification rates generally indicate that all three linkage levels provide reliable classifications of student mastery (95% of all reported indices were .6 or greater).</p> <p>However, peer reviewers felt that there were some relatively low indices. About 8% of the tetrachoric correlations were below .80 and more than 50% of Cohen’s <i>kappas</i> were below .80. In the June 2020 submission, updated numbers should be provided.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that clarifies the assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum.</li> </ul>		

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

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

**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s <b><u>academic achievement standards</u></b>.</p>		
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

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

**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State administers multiple forms of <b>academic assessments</b> within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s <b>academic content standards</b> and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>		
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State administers any of its assessments in multiple versions within a subject area (e.g., online versus paper-based delivery; <b>or a native language version of the academic content assessment</b>), grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>• Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>		

**Section 4.6 Summary Statement**

- \_\_\_ No additional evidence is required or
- \_\_\_ 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 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments), and</li> <li>• Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website.</li> </ul>	<p>SC 01 Technical Manual Science 2015-2016            SC 03 Technical Manual Update - Science 2017-2018            SC 05, p. 5: Alignment Study Response Plan</p>	<p>Peer reviewers note that the Consortium intends to provide evidence for this critical element as part of the DLM Science June 2020 submission.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a plan to monitor the science test before, during, and after the inclusion of phase II development items to the test item banks, including clear and technically sound criteria.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system. Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, the placement team under Section 504, or the individual or team designated by a district to make that decision under Title II of the ADA, as applicable, based on each student’s individual abilities and needs.</p> <p>If a State adopts alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and administers an alternate assessment aligned with those standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(1)(E) and (b)(2)(D), respectively, the State must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish guidelines for determining whether to assess a student with an AA-AAAS, including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A State definition of “students with the most significant cognitive disabilities” that addresses factors related to cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Provide information for IEP Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provides a clear explanation of the differences between</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that parents of students assessed with an AA-AAAS are informed that their child's achievement will be measured based on alternate academic achievement standards;</li> <li>• Not preclude a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who takes an AA-AAAS from attempting to complete the requirements for a regular high school diploma; and</li> <li>• Promote, consistent with requirements under the IDEA, the involvement and progress of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in the general education curriculum that is based on the State's academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled; and</li> <li>• Develop, disseminate information on, and promote the use of appropriate accommodations to ensure that a</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State has in place and monitors implementation of guidelines for IEP teams to apply in determining, on a case-by-case basis, which students with the most significant cognitive disabilities will be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, if applicable. Such guidelines must be developed in accordance with 34 CFR § 200.6(d).<sup>2</sup></li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

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

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all ELs in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s academic content assessments and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed with a linguistic accommodation(s);</li> <li>• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for ELs;</li> <li>• Assistance regarding selection of appropriate linguistic accommodations for ELs, including to the extent practicable, assessments in the language most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what those students know and can do to determine the students’ mastery of skills in academic content areas until the students have achieved English language proficiency.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

**Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and ELs, including ELs with disabilities. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations, such as, interoperability with, and ability to use, assistive technology, are available to measure the <b><u>academic achievement</u></b> of students with disabilities.</li> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs;</li> <li>• Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> <li>• Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> <li>• Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.		
<b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures;</li> <li>• Monitored for administrations of all required academic content assessments and AA-AAAS.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>For academic content standards:</b>                      The State formally adopted <b>challenging academic achievement standards</b> in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities;</li> <li>• The State applies its academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply;</li> </ul> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include:                      (1) at least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third for lower achievement; (2) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (3) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</p>		
<p><b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li></ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

### **Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards.</u></b></li> </ul>	<p>SC 01 Technical Manual Science 2015-2016 (pp. 192-198)            SC 03 Technical Manual Update - Science 2017-2018</p>	<p>Peer reviewers acknowledge the Alignment Response Plan (SC 05) and note that additional evidence will be submitted in June 2020. The proposed work appears that it will satisfy the requirements of this critical element, pending completion of the steps described in the plan.</p> <p>Peer reviewers commend the Consortium’s commitment to ensuring that future standard setting panels will be demographically representative of the state.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting alternate academic achievement standards in science to ensure they are valid and reliable.</li> </ul>		

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

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b><u>For academic achievement standards:</u></b></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards and with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards such that a student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards (1) are aligned with the State’s challenging academic content standards for the grade in which a student is enrolled; (2) promote access to the general curriculum consistent with the IDEA; (3) reflect professional judgment as to the highest possible standards achievable for such students; (4) are designated in the IEP for each student for whom alternate academic achievement standards apply; and (5) are aligned to ensure that a student who meets the alternate academic achievement standards is on track to pursue postsecondary education or competitive integrated employment.</p>		<p>Peer reviewers acknowledge that there is a plan to address this critical element with state partners, and understand that results will be reported by December 2020.</p>

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the DLM alternate academic achievement standards ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. Oklahoma State Department of Education should provide this evidence by December 31, 2020.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

**Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State reports its assessment results for all students assessed, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public.</p> <p>The State reports to the public its assessment results on <b><u>student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level<sup>3</sup></u></b></p> <p>For <b><u>academic content assessments</u></b>, the State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the <b><u>specific academic needs of students</u></b>, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its academic content assessments that:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

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

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b><u>student’s academic achievement;</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Report the <b><u>student’s academic achievement</u></b> in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards;</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific <b><u>academic needs of students;</u></b></li> <li>○ Are provided in an understandable and uniform format;</li> <li>○ Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian;</li> <li>○ Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.</li> <li>● The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>		
<b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li></ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

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

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has established technical criteria to use in its review of any submission of a locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment. The State has completed this review using its established technical criteria and has found the assessment meets its criteria <b>prior to</b> submitting for the Department’s assessment peer review.</p> <p>The State’s technical criteria include a determination that the assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is aligned with the challenging State academic standards; and</li> <li>• Addresses the depth and breadth of those standards.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <p>The State has procedures in place to ensure that a district that chooses to use a nationally recognized high school academic assessment administers the same assessment to all high school students in the district except for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who may be assessed with an AA-AAAS.</p> <p>AND</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>The technical criteria established by the State in reviewing a locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment must ensure that the use of appropriate accommodations does not deny a student with a disability or an EL—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The opportunity to participate in the assessment; and</li> <li>• Any of the benefits from participation in the assessment that are afforded to students without disabilities or students who are not ELs.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 7.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State must have procedures in place to ensure that:</p> <p><b>Before</b> a district requests approval from the State to use a nationally recognized high school academic assessment, the district notifies all parents of high school students it serves—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the district intends to request approval from the State to use a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in place of the statewide academic assessment;</li> <li>• Of how parents and, as appropriate, students may provide meaningful input regarding the district’s request (includes students in public charter schools who would be included in such assessments); and</li> <li>• Of any effect of such request on the instructional program in the district.</li> </ul>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>Section 7.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

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

**Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State Assessments**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is equivalent to or more rigorous than the statewide assessment, with respect to—               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The coverage of academic content;</li> <li>○ The difficulty of the assessment;</li> <li>○ The overall quality of the assessment; and</li> <li>○ Any other aspects of the assessment that the State may establish in its technical criteria;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Produces valid and reliable data on student academic achievement with respect to all high school students and each subgroup of high school students in the district that—               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Are comparable to student academic achievement data for all high school students and each subgroup of high school students produced by the statewide assessment at each academic achievement level;</li> <li>○ Are expressed in terms consistent with the State’s academic achievement standards; and</li> <li>○ Provide unbiased, rational, and consistent differentiation among schools within the State for the purpose of the State determined accountability system including calculating the Academic Achievement indicator and annually meaningfully differentiating between schools.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>Section 7.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>No additional evidence is required or</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

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 OKLAHOMA

Contents

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

**Critical Element 1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students ..... 1**

**Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content Standards ..... 2**

**Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments ..... 3**

**Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments .. 5**

**Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments ..... 7**

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS ..... 8**

**Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development ..... 8**

**Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development ..... 10**

**Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration ..... 11**

**Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration ..... 13**

**Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security ..... 14**

**Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy .. 15**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY ..... 16**

**Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content 16**

**Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes ..... 18**

**Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure ..... 19**

**Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables ..... 20**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER ..... 21**

**Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability ..... 21**

**Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility ..... 23**

**Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum ..... 25**

**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring ..... 26**

**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms ..... 27**

**Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment ..... 28**

**Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance ..... 29**

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS ..... 30**

**Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 30**

**Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments ..... 33**

**Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations ..... 34**

**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.

..... 36

**SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING.....38**

**Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students..... 38**  
**Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting ..... 40**  
**Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards ..... 41**  
**Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting ..... 43**

**SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS..46**

**Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments ..... 46**  
**Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments ..... 48**  
**Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State Assessments ..... 49**

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b><u>For academic content standards:</u></b>                      The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public schools and public school students in the State.</p>		<p><b>OSTP</b>                      Not Applicable</p> <p><b>CCRA SCIENCE</b>                      Not Applicable</p> <p><b>SAT</b>                      Not Applicable</p> <p><b>DLM</b>                      Not Applicable</p> <p><b>ACT</b>                      Not Applicable</p>
<p><b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b><u>For academic content standards:</u></b>                      The State’s challenging academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science are aligned with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards.</p>		<p><b>OSTP</b>                       Not Applicable</p> <p><b>CCRA SCIENCE</b>                       Not Applicable</p> <p><b>SAT</b>                       Not Applicable</p> <p><b>DLM</b>                       Not Applicable</p> <p><b>ACT</b>                       Not Applicable</p>
<p><b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>x No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA**

**Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments aligned with <b><u>grade-level academic achievement standards</u></b> or alternate academic achievement standards in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 9-12);</li> <li>• Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12).</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <p>The State’s <b><u>academic content assessments</u></b> must be the same assessments administered to all students in the tested grades, with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may take an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards.</li> <li>• A State may permit an LEA to administer a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in lieu of the State high school assessment if certain conditions are met.</li> <li>• A State that administers an end-of-course high school mathematics assessment may exempt an 8<sup>th</sup> grade student from the mathematics assessment typically administered in eighth grade and allow the student to</li> </ul>		<p><b>OSTP</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>CCRA SCIENCE</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>SAT</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</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 OKLAHOMA

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For students with disabilities, policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including those children with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system;</li> <li>• For ELs:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Policies state that all ELs must be included in all aspects of the content assessment system, unless the State has chosen the statutory option for recently arrived ELs under which such ELs are exempt from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment.</li> <li>○ If a State has developed native language assessments for ELs in R/LA, ELs must be assessed in R/LA in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except, if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Reviewed by Department Staff Only</p>	<p><b>OSTP</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>CCRA SCIENCE</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>SAT</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</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 OKLAHOMA

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

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State has developed or amended challenging <b>academic</b> standards and assessments, the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education).</li> <li>• Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas).</li> <li>• Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State.</li> <li>• Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents.</li> </ul>	<p>Applies to all OSTP ELA/Math standards concerning conducting meaningful and timely consultation with Indian tribes. Science standards were adopted in 2014:</p> <p>See previous Oklahoma Peer Review February 2018, CE 1.2 ELA/Math Stakeholder Involvement</p> <p>CE 1.5 Academic Standards Tribal Consultation</p>	<p>In the previous peer review, the Department requested evidence that that the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with representatives of Indian tribes located in the State in developing the academic content standards adopted in 2016.</p> <p>OSDE provided sign-in sheets from standards development feedback groups in 2015 that included representatives from three different tribal school systems.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to <b><u>the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards</u></b> for the grade that is being assessed and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of <b><u>the State’s grade-level academic content standards</u></b> and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results.</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <b><u>the State’s academic content standards</u></b>, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills).</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design and intended uses and interpretations of results.</li> </ul>	<p><b>CCRA Grade 11 Science</b> (not computer adaptive)            CE 2.1a Statement of Purpose            CE 2.1b OAC 210_10-13-2            CE 2.1c Test and Item Specifications Science G11, p. 4            CE 2.1d 19-20 PSTG G11 Science            CE 2.1e OSTP CCRA Technology Guidelines 2019</p> <p><b>CCRA Grade 11 ELA/Math</b> (neither assessment is computer adaptive)  <i>SAT Consortia Provided Evidence</i></p> <p><i>State Provided SAT Evidence:</i>            CE 2.1f SAT_ACT WCER OK Alignment Study</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DOK percentage within each reporting category of the academic content standards               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ELA Standards: p. 20, Table 2</li> <li>○ Math Standards: p. 31, Table 12</li> <li>○ SAT Form April 2017: p.92, Table 3.1</li> <li>○ SAT Form Oct. 2017: p. 165, Table 4.1</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><i>State Provided ACT Evidence:</i>            CE 2.1f SAT_ACT WCER Alignment Study</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DOK percentage within each reporting category of the academic content standards               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ELA Standards: p. 20, Table 2</li> <li>○ Math Standards: p. 31, Table 12</li> <li>○ ACT Form C, ELA: p. 58, Table 1.1</li> <li>○ ACT Form 10, ELA: p.92, Table 2.1</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>OSTP</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>CCRA SCIENCE</b></p> <p>The state provided evidence of the assessment’s purpose (CE 2.1a), but not enough information about the test blueprints (CE 2.1c, p. 4) to ensure that each test form is comparable and covers the depth and breadth of the state’s academic content standards, as well as the inclusion of challenging content based on these (CE 2.1c, CE 2.1e), e.g. how the different performance expectations are sampled.</p> <p><b>SAT</b></p> <p>The evidence presented (CE 2.1f) shows that there remain gaps in the coverage of the state’s standards. Adjustments/augmentation to the test would be necessary for it to be used to assess the state’s students.</p> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <p>No evidence presented. Critical element addressed by coordinated evidence for all States administering the same assessments.</p> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <p>For ELA, the evidence presented (CE 2.1f) shows that, even excluding the research-related standard, which can’t feasibly be included in a summative assessment, the ACT does not sufficiently cover the state’s standards. Revisions to the test would be necessary for it to be used to assess the state’s students. There is also evidence (CE 3.1j) that</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 OKLAHOMA

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the student is enrolled and uses that determination for all reporting.</li> <li>• If the State administers a content assessment that includes portfolios, such assessment may be partially administered through a portfolio but may not be <i>entirely</i> administered through a portfolio.</li> </ul>		<p>changes are being made to include the research-related standard.</p> <p>For mathematics, the evidence presented (CE 2.1f) shows that geometry-related standards were not appropriately covered in the ACT. Adjustments/augmentation to the test would be necessary for it to be used to assess the state's students.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ACT: Evidence of plans and a timeline to address the issues identified in the alignment study</li> <li>• SAT: Evidence of plans and a timeline to address the issues identified in the alignment study</li> <li>• CCRA Science: Evidence of more detailed blueprints that ensures construction of comparable test forms</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA**

**Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess student achievement based on the <b><u>State’s academic content standards</u></b> in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</li> </ul>	<p><b>CCRA Grade 11 Science</b>            CE 2.2a Item Bias Accessibility Review Guidelines            CE 2.2b OK June 2019 Science IRC Presentation            CE 2.2c Criteria for Alignment and Cognitive Complexity of Science Items</p>	<p><b>OSTP</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>CCRA SCIENCE</b></p> <p>The panel located the document identified as the technical manual (CE 3.1a). While this provides evidence that supports item development, there is no narrative that describes the test development process in its entirety. The Test Development chapter of a Technical Manual is commonly a good source of this information.</p> <p><b>SAT</b></p> <p>No evidence presented. Critical element addressed by coordinated evidence for all States administering the same assessments.</p> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <p>No evidence presented. Critical element addressed by coordinated evidence for all States administering the same assessments.</p> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p>
<p><b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>x</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CCRA Science: More detailed information about the test development process</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA**

**Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>• Has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities;</li> <li>• If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>	<p><b>CCRA Grade 11 Science</b>            CE 2.3a CCRA 2019-20 TAM G11            CE 2.3b CCRA 2019-20 TPM            CE 2.3c DTC Required Training Presentation            CE 5.1 OSTP CCRA IEP 504 Accommodations Manual            CE 5.2 2019-20 EL State Testing Accommodations            CE 2.3d Testing Irregularities Form            CE 2.3e Testing Irregularities Response – Sample 1            CE 2.3f Testing Irregularities Response – Sample 2            CE 2.3g Testing Irregularities Response – Sample 3            CE 2.3h Kiosk User Guide            CE 2.3i Kiosk Installation Guide            CE 2.3j Portal User Guide            CE 2.3k Site Technology Capacity Tool            CE 2.3l OSTP Online Testing Communication and Contingency Plan</p> <p><b>CCRA Grade 11 ELA/Math</b></p> <p><i>State Provided SAT Evidence:</i>            See previous Oklahoma Peer Review February 2018, CE 2.3            CE 2.3m EngageOK Administrators &amp; Data Newsletter            CE 2.3n Preparation for the SAT_ACT Spring 2019 Test Administration.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oklahoma Test Administration policies require District Test Coordinators, Test Administrators, and Test Proctors undergo additional training and documentation that is beyond the College Board required training.</li> </ul>	<p><b>OSTP</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>CCRA SCIENCE</b></p> <p>The state has established (CE 2.3a, CE 2.3b) and communicates standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations (CE 5.1, CE 5.2). It has training for test administrators (CE 2.3b, CE 2.3c). It has also defined technology requirements for computer delivered assessment (CE 2.3h, CE 2.3i, CE 2.3j, CE 2.3k, CE 2.3l).</p> <p><b>SAT</b></p> <p>Apart from any submission from the consortium, the state provided evidence of communication about the administration of the SAT, including the technology requirements for this (CE 2.3m, CE 2.3n).</p> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p>
<p><b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>x No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA**

**Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. Monitoring of test administration should be demonstrated for all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS.</p>	<p>CCRA Grade 11 Science See previous Oklahoma Peer Review February 2018, CE 2.4 CE 2.4a Broken Arrow Desk Monitoring Letter 15015 CE 2.4b Broken Arrow HS Assessment Monitoring Checklist CE 2.4c Broken Arrow High School Monitoring Compliance Letter</p> <p>CCRA Grade 11 ELA/Math SAT Consortia Provided Evidence</p> <p>State Provided SAT Evidence: See previous Oklahoma Peer Review February 2018, CE 2.4 CE 2.4a Broken Arrow Desk Monitoring Letter15015 CE 2.4b Broken Arrow HS Assessment Monitoring Checklist CE 2.4c Broken Arrow High School Monitoring Compliance Letter</p>	<p>OSDE provided a sample desk monitoring letter, checklist, and compliance letter, demonstrating a comprehensive desk monitoring process for school districts. While OSDE did not provide evidence of on-site monitoring, this evidence was provided in 2018 and was deemed to meet the critical element. Department staff offer a suggestion to OSDE that monitoring forms specify the specific tests included in the monitoring review.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>x No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA**

**Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> <li>• Application of test security procedures to all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS.</li> </ul>		<p><b>OSTP</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>CCRA SCIENCE</b></p> <p>No evidence presented. State should provide evidence related to this, including remediation processes.</p> <p><b>SAT</b></p> <p>No evidence presented. State should provide evidence related to this, including remediation processes.</p> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p>
<b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>_x_</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SAT: Evidence the State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results.</li> <li>• CCRA Science: Evidence the State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results;</li> <li>• To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> <li>• To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.</li> </ul>		<p><b>OSTP</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>CCRA SCIENCE</b></p> <p>No evidence presented. State should provide evidence related to this, including remediation processes.</p> <p><b>SAT</b></p> <p>The state should provide evidence for this critical element independent of that submitted by SAT.</p> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p>
<p><b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u> <u>  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SAT: Evidence 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</li> <li>• CCRA Science: Evidence 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</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. The State’s validity evidence includes evidence that:</p> <p><b><u>The State’s academic assessments</u></b> measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> <li>• Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards;</li> <li>• If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards and administers alternate assessments aligned with those standards, the assessments show adequate alignment to the State’s academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for</li> </ul>	<p><b>OSTP Grades 3-8 ELA/Math/Science</b>            CE 3.1a Oklahoma OSTP_CCRA 2018-19 Technical Report, Chapter 3, pages 19-21, 29-31, 34-38            CE 3.1b OSTP ELA Standard Tracking List            CE 3.1c OSTP Math Standard Tracking List            CE 3.1d OSTP Science Standard Tracking List</p> <p><b>CCRA Grade 11 Science</b>            CE 3.1a Oklahoma OSTP_CCRA 2018-19 Technical Report, pages 39-42; 99-102            CE 2.1c Test and Item Specifications Science G11, page 4</p> <p>The following documents show the tool used by our committee members to verify alignment between assessment items and the assessed standard. The members use the tool to determine the overall representation of a given dimension of the standard within the assessment item. Additionally, the determination of the committee is further used to assess the cognitive complexity of the item through the depth of engagement, required by the student, with each dimension of the standard:</p> <p>CE 3.1e Cognitive Complexity and Alignment Tool IRC committees            CE 3.1f Cognitive Complexity and Alignment Screener Example            CE 3.1g Cognitive Complexity and Alignment Committee Determinations</p> <p><b>CCRA Grade 11 ELA/Math</b>            The reporting categories in Mathematics for both the ACT and SAT are collapsed into the following categories:</p>	<p><b>OSTP</b></p> <p>The state provided evidence that the assessment is built to a blueprint to ensure coverage of content, depth, and breadth of the state’s academic content standards, as well as the cognitive complexity of test content (CE 3.1a), but there is no independent evidence that adequate coverage is achieved.</p> <p><b>CCRA SCIENCE</b></p> <p>The state provided some evidence around the development and construction of the test (CE 3.1a, CE 2.1c). In light of the test not measuring adequately across the ability continuum (see Critical Element 4.1), sufficient evidence of alignment should be provided to determine alignment between the items and the standards.</p> <p><b>SAT</b></p> <p>The evidence submitted (CE 2.1f) suggests that alignment between the test and the state’s math standards can be further improved. Collapsing the geometry-related standards is not appropriate given the test only covering a minority of those sub-standards. A plan and a timeline to address the alignment issues as identified in the existing alignment studies is needed.</p> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <p>No evidence presented. Critical element addressed by coordinated evidence for all States administering the same assessments.</p> <p><b>ACT</b></p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA

<p>students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number and Operations</li> <li>• Algebraic Reasoning and Algebra</li> <li>• Functions</li> <li>• Data and Probability</li> <li>• Geometry</li> </ul> <p>These categories are reflective of the categories used in the CE 2.1f SAT_ACT WCER OK Alignment Study: see Table 17 (pg. 36), Table 19 (pg. 38) for ACT evidence and Table 21 (pg. 40), and Table 23 (pg. 42) for SAT evidence.</p> <p><i>SAT Consortia provided evidence</i></p> <p><i>State Provided SAT Evidence:</i>            CE 2.1f SAT_ACT WCER OK Alignment Study            CE 3.1h Appendix A-D OK Math 2018 Final            CE 3.1i Appendix A-D OK ELA 2018 Final</p> <p><i>State Provided ACT Evidence:</i>            CE 2.1f SAT_ACT WCER OK Alignment Study            CE 3.1j OSTP CCRA Assessing ELA Standard 6, Research in Grade 11            CE 3.1k TAC Minutes May 2019, section 6</p>	<p>The evidence provided (CE 3.1j) indicated steps for addressing the concerns raised by the previous peer review panel, but no specific evidence was provided that these have been implemented. Steps suggested by the TAC (CE 3.1k, p. 8) included submitting the item specification documents for ELA, which was not done. In addition, the evidence submitted (CE 2.1f) suggests that alignment between the test and the state’s math standards can be further improved. Collapsing the geometry-related standards is not appropriate given the test only covering a minority of those sub-standards.</p>
---	--	---

### Section 3.1 Summary Statement

<p><u>x</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSTP: Independent alignment study showing the assessment adequately covers state standards’ content, depth, breadth, and complexity</li> <li>• ACT: Documentation of adequate alignment between the ACT and the full breadth and depth of the State’s academic content standards its assessments are designed to measure, specifically that:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The ACT assesses all of the academic content standards in reading/language arts.</li> <li>o The ACT reporting categories align with the State’s academic content standards (e.g., there is a coherent relationship between the State’s mathematics standards and the mathematics standards represented by the ACT’s reporting categories).</li> <li>o The State has confirmed that all planned changes /updates to ACT forms based upon findings of the alignment evaluation have been implemented.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• SAT: Evidence of a plan and timeline for addressing alignment issues identified.</li> <li>• CCRA Science: Provide evidence of sufficient alignment and measurement between the test and the standards</li> </ul>
---

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap: <b>the intended cognitive processes</b> appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p><b>OSTP Grades 3-8 ELA/Math</b>  CE 3.2 OSTP Cog Labs Final Report &amp; Appendices [Folder]  CE 3.2a OSTP Cog Labs Final Report  CE 3.2b OSTP Cog Labs Appendix A  CE 3.2c OSTP Cog Labs Appendix B  CE 3.2d OSTP Cog Labs Appendix C  CE 3.2e OSTP Cog Labs Appendix D  CE 3.2f OSTP Cog Labs Appendix E  CE 3.2g OSTP Cog Labs Appendix F [Folder]</p> <p><b>CCRA Grade 11 Science</b>  CE 3.2 Science Cog Lab [Folder]  CE 3.2h Science Cog Lab Global Debrief Report  CE 3.2i HS Science Cog Lab Protocol &amp; Script  CE 3.2j Science Cognitive Lab Electronic application  CE 3.2k Science Cog Lab Recommended Actions  CE 3.2l Science Cog Lab Paper Application  CE 3.2m Science Cog Lab Participating Schools  CE 3.2n Science Cog Lab Parent Permission  CE 3.2o Science Cog Lab Student Informed Consent  CE 3.2p Science Cog Lab-survey</p> <p><b>CCRA Grade 11 ELA/Math</b></p> <p><i>ACT Consortia Provided Evidence:</i>  CE 3.2q Cognitive Process Narrative  CE 3.2r ACT CogLab June19</p>	<p><b>OSTP</b></p> <p>The state conducted cognitive labs (CE 3.2a) which show that the assessment taps the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level. It would be good if the state ensures that the findings of the study inform future test development.</p> <p><b>CCRA SCIENCE</b></p> <p>The evidence presented suggests that improvements can be made to the test in order for them to better tap the intended cognitive processes (CE 3.2h). Can the state provide information regarding how the information gained during the cognitive labs was utilized to update/improve the assessment?</p> <p><b>SAT</b></p> <p>See SAT peer review notes for additional evidence required.</p> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <p>The cognitive labs presented suggests that the ACT ELA and Math tests are tapping the intended cognitive processes (CE 3.2r).</p>
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SAT: See SAT peer review notes for additional evidence required.</li> <li>• CCRA Science: Information on how the findings of the cognitive labs were incorporated into subsequent test development</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA

--

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s <b><u>academic content standards</u></b>.</p>	<p><b>CCRA Grade 11 Science</b>  CE 3.1a Oklahoma OSTP_CCRA 2018-19 Technical Report, pages 70-74  CE 3.1a Oklahoma OSTP_CCRA 2018-19 Technical Report, Appendix J, pages 478-479  CE 3.1a Oklahoma OSTP_CCRA 2018-19 Technical Report, Sec 9.5, pages 94-98  CE 3.1a Oklahoma OSTP_CCRA 2018-19 Technical Report, Appendix M, pages 793 &amp; 796</p> <p><b>CCRA Grade 11 ELA/Math</b></p> <p><i>ACT Consortia Provided Evidence:</i>  CE 3.3 Peer review report for Oklahoma</p>	<p><b>OSTP</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>CCRA SCIENCE</b></p> <p>CE 3.1a shows that the state reports according to the performance categories it has itself determined.</p> <p><b>SAT</b></p> <p>See SAT peer review notes for additional evidence required.</p> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <p>The panel acknowledges the submission of the correlations between writing sub-domains (CE 3.3); however, evidence is needed to show that the scoring and reporting structures are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the state’s academic content standards.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>_x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ACT: Evidence that the reporting categories for Writing are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the state’s academic content standards.</li> <li>• SAT: See SAT peer review notes for additional evidence required.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA**

**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><b>OSTP 5 &amp; 8 Science</b>                      An Exploratory Factor Analysis was conducted to determine correlation between the Oklahoma Science assessments and assessments for other subjects. For grades 5 and 8 Science, the correlation between OK ELA and Math assessments indicates a convergence and very little discriminance.</p> <p>CE 3.4 Science Alignment Correlations</p> <p><b>CCRA Grade 11 Science</b>                      CE 3.4 Science Alignment Correlations</p>	<p><b>OSTP</b></p> <p>The state needs to address the “as expected” element of this critical element. The evidence submitted (CE 3.4) investigates the relationship between science scores on the one hand, and ELA and math scores on the other. In order to demonstrate ‘as expected’ relationship, the state needs to show, for example, that correlations with other science scores is higher than correlations with ELA and math, or that the correlations observed are at the same level as in other national assessments such as NAEP.</p> <p><b>CCRA SCIENCE</b></p> <p>The evidence submitted (CE 3.4) shows that the correlation between CCRA science scores and ACT science scores is 0.67, which is lower than the correlation between CCRA science and ELA scores (0.71). It therefore raises doubt about what the test is actually measuring. Coupled with the information presented in CE 3.2, it would appear that the complicated language used in the science test (CE 3.2h) is impacting upon performance on the test more than it should, is a construct irrelevant factor, and is making the science test more of a language test than a science test. The state needs to provide evidence to show that this is not in fact the case.</p> <p>In order to demonstrate ‘as expected’ relationship, the state needs to show, for example, that correlations with other science scores is higher than correlations with ELA and math, or that the correlations observed are at the same level as in other national assessments such as NAEP.</p> <p><b>SAT</b></p> <p>Not applicable</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 OKLAHOMA

		<p><b>DLM</b></p> <p>No evidence presented. Critical element addressed by coordinated evidence for all States administering the same assessments.</p> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p>
<p><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>_x_</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSTP: Evidence that science scores are related as expected with other variables.</li> <li>• CCRA Science: Evidence that CCRA science scores are related as expected with other measures of science ability, and that scores on the test are more an indicator of science ability than of language ability</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER

**Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. If the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, measures of reliability for the assessment overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a <b><u>student’s academic achievement.</u></b></li> </ul>	<p><b>CCRA Grade 11 Science</b> CE 3.1a Oklahoma OSTP_CCRA 2018-19 Technical Report, pages 83-88, 696-698, 793, 796, and 798</p> <p><b>CCRA Grade 11 ELA/Math</b></p> <p><i>ACT Consortia Provided Evidence:</i> CE 3.3 Peer review report for Oklahoma CE 4.1a ACT Technical Manual CE 4.1b Fall 2014 Writing Generalizability Study CE 4.1c ACT Writing Test Reliability and Standard Error of Measurement</p>	<p><b>OSTP</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>CCRA SCIENCE</b></p> <p>The evidence submitted (CE 3.1a) provides reliability estimates for the state’s population, including overall and conditional figures for different domains and for categorical classification decisions. However, we note on p. 796 that the number of items per reporting category on which the reliability estimates were calculated exceeds the maximum raw score for live test items and the number of items on the form. It can also be seen (p. 87) that decision consistency figures at the key decision levels (basic/proficient) are quite low. Were a student to take the test again, it’s almost 50-50 whether they get placed in the same classification again. This indicates that the test is not measuring sensitively enough in the key regions, and changes are necessary to rectify this. Subgroup reliability for ELs is equally low (p. 793). CSEM was not provided either.</p> <p><b>SAT</b></p> <p>See SAT peer review notes for additional evidence required.</p> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <p>No evidence presented. Critical element addressed by coordinated evidence for all States administering the same assessments.</p> <p><b>ACT</b></p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		The evidence presented (CE 4.1a, CE 4.1b, CE 4.1c) provides overall reliability and conditional standard errors of measurement for the test, including for the writing sub-test, (though for writing the data presented was collected in 2014). CSEM for sub-groups was not provided however.
<b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ACT: Provide CSEM for sub-groups.</li> <li>• SAT: See SAT peer review notes for additional evidence required.</li> <li>• CCRA Science: Evidence of plan and timeline to address poor reliability and decision consistency figures.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA

### **Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><i>For all State academic assessments,</i> assessments should be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (see definition<sup>4</sup>).</p> <p><b><u>For academic content assessments,</u></b> the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in their design, development and analysis.</p>	<p><b>CCRA Grade 11 Science</b>            CE 4.2a Item Bias Accessibility Review Guidelines            CE 2.2b OK June 2019 Science IRC Presentation            CE 4.2b Universally Designed Assessment Science Items            CE 4.2c Data Review Presentation</p>	<p><b>OSTP</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>CCRA Science</b></p> <p>In the development of the assessment, the state takes into consideration universal design for learning principles (CE 4.2b) as well as possible bias (CE 4.2a, CE 4.2c).</p> <p><b>SAT</b></p> <p>See SAT peer review notes for additional evidence required.</p> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <p>No evidence presented. Critical element addressed by coordinated evidence for all States administering the same assessments.</p> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p>
<p><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u> <u>  </u> <u>  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See SAT peer review notes for additional evidence required.</li> </ul>		

<sup>4</sup> see page 28 of “*A State’s Guide to the U.S. Department of Education’s Assessment Peer Review Process*”, September 24, 2018 available at: [www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html](http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html)

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA**

**Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for <b>academic assessments</b>, including performance for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p><b>OSTP Grades 3-8 ELA/Math/Science</b> CE 3.1a Oklahoma OSTP_CCRA 2018-19 Technical Report, Chapter 8, pages 83-88</p> <p><b>CCRA Grade 11 Science</b> CE 3.1a Oklahoma OSTP_CCRA 2018-19 Technical Report, pages 75-82, 83-88,542-543, and 603-604</p>	<p><b>OSTP</b></p> <p>The evidence presented (CE 3.1a, p. 87) shows that measurement is not adequately precise at certain points of the ability continuum at certain grade levels. Modifications to the tests are needed to address this.</p> <p><b>CCRA Science</b></p> <p>The evidence presented (CE 3.1a) shows that measurement is not adequately precise at certain points of the ability continuum at certain grade levels. CSEM information was not provided. Modifications to the tests are needed to address the issues raised by this.</p> <p><b>SAT</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <p>No evidence presented. Critical element addressed by coordinated evidence for all States administering the same assessments.</p> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p>
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSTP: Evidence of plans to improve precision of measurement across the ability continuum</li> <li>• CCRA Science: Evidence of plan and timeline to address the lack of precision at points along the ability continuum</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA**

**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s <b><u>academic achievement standards</u></b>.</p>	<p><b>CCRA Grade 11 Science</b>                      CE 3.1a Oklahoma OSTP_CCRA 2018-19 Technical Report, pages 55 and 85-88                      CE 4.4a Test Preparation Manual Breach Procedures                      CE 4.4b Breach Tests &amp; Irregularities Presentation                      CE 4.4c Processing and Reporting Business Requirements</p>	<p><b>OSTP</b>                       Not Applicable</p> <p><b>CCRA Science</b>                       Scoring and data processing rules (CE 4.4c) help to ensure that results are reliable.</p> <p><b>SAT</b>                       Not Applicable</p> <p><b>DLM</b>                       Not Applicable</p> <p><b>ACT</b>                       Not Applicable</p>
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>x No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA**

**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State administers multiple forms of <b>academic assessments</b> within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s <b>academic content standards</b> and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p><b>CCRA Grade 11 Science</b> CE 3.1a Oklahoma OSTP_CCRA 2018-19 Technical Report, pages 39-40 and 78-79</p>	<p><b>OSTP</b> Not Applicable</p> <p><b>CCRA Science</b></p> <p><b>SAT</b> Not Applicable</p> <p><b>DLM</b> Not Applicable</p> <p><b>ACT</b> Not Applicable</p>
<p><b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>x No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State administers any of its assessments in multiple versions within a subject area (e.g., online versus paper-based delivery; <b><u>or a native language version of the academic content assessment</u></b>), grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<p><b>OSTP Grades 3-8 ELA/Math/Science</b> CE 3.1a OSTP-CCRA Technical Report 2018-2019, pages 70-72 and 464-479</p> <p><b>CCRA Grade 11 Science</b> CE 3.1a Oklahoma OSTP_CCRA 2018-19 Technical Report, pages 39-40, 44, 69-74, and 476-479</p>	<p><b>OSTP</b></p> <p>The evidence submitted (CE 3.1a) shows that assessments delivered across different systems and for different student groups are comparable.</p> <p><b>CCRA SCIENCE</b></p> <p>The evidence submitted (CE 3.1a, p. 70) shows that assessments delivered across different systems and for different student groups are comparable.</p> <p><b>SAT</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p>
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>x No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments), and</li> <li>Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website.</li> </ul>	<p><b>OSTP 3-8 ELA/Math/Science</b>            CE 3.1a OSTP-CCRA Technical Report 2018-2019, pages 24-27, 32-34, 35-37, 52-54, 888-905            CE 4.7a OSTP Grades 3-8 State Assessment Results 2019            CE 4.7i 2019 OSTP-CCRA Testing Irregularity Form            2019 OSTP-CCRA Testing Irregularity Form            CE 4.7j Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance Narrative OSTP 3-8</p> <p><b>CCRA Grade 11 Science</b>            CE 3.1a Oklahoma OSTP_CCRA 2018-19 Technical Report            CE 4.7b Oklahoma OSTP_CCRA Technical Report Website Upload Screenshots            CE 4.7c DTC Training Registration</p> <p><b>CCRA Grade 11 ELA/Math</b></p> <p><i>State Provided SAT Evidence:</i>            CE 3.1k TAC Minutes May 2019            CE 4.7d TAC Meeting March 2018            CE 4.7e TAC Meeting September 2018            CE 4.7f Technical Manual Archive of SAT Technical Report Screenshot</p> <p><i>State Provided ACT Evidence:</i>            CE 3.1k TAC Minutes May 2019            CE 4.7g OSDE - ACT Meeting Minutes 4.11.19            CE 4.7h Final DTC Meeting May 2019, slides 58-70</p>	<p><b>OSTP</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>CCRA SCIENCE</b></p> <p>The state has a system for monitoring and improving its assessment system (CE 3.1a), including a TAC that discusses possible improvements (e.g. CE 3.1k, CE 4.7d, CE 4.7e) and makes information about technical quality available on its website (CE 4.7b).</p> <p><b>SAT</b></p> <p>The state has a system for monitoring and improving its assessment system, including an Oklahoma TAC that discusses possible improvements (e.g. CE 3.1k, CE 4.7g). However, the state should demonstrate their process for involvement in SAT’s ongoing development and improvement activities (i.e. the SAT TAC).</p> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <p>No evidence presented. Critical element addressed by coordinated evidence for all States administering the same assessments.</p> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <p>The state has a system for monitoring and improving its assessment system, including an Oklahoma TAC that discusses possible improvements (e.g. CE 3.1k, CE 4.7g). However, the state should demonstrate their process for involvement in ACT’s ongoing development and improvement activities (i.e. the ACT TAC).</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 OKLAHOMA

### Section 4.7 Summary Statement

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- ACT: Evidence of state's involvement in ACT's ongoing development and improvement activities (so that needed improvements are accounted for).
- SAT: Evidence of state's involvement in SAT's ongoing development and improvement activities (so that needed improvements are accounted for).

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system. Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, the placement team under Section 504, or the individual or team designated by a district to make that decision under Title II of the ADA, as applicable, based on each student’s individual abilities and needs.</p> <p>If a State adopts alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and administers an alternate assessment aligned with those standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(1)(E) and (b)(2)(D), respectively, the State must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish guidelines for determining whether to assess a student with an AA-AAAS, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A State definition of “students with the most significant cognitive disabilities” that addresses factors related to cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Provide information for IEP Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provides a clear explanation of the differences between</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>CCRA Grade 11 Science</b>  CE 2.1e OSTP CCRA Technology Guidelines 2019  CE 5.1a OSTP CCRA IEP_504 Accommodations Manual  CE 5.1b OSTP CCRA Paper Testing Checklist  CE 5.1c Accommodations Communication  CE 5.1d Oklahoma Accommodations Guide, pages 8-52</p> <p><b>CCRA Grade 11 ELA/Math</b>  <i>SAT Consortia Provided Evidence</i></p> <p><i>State Provided SAT Evidence:</i>  CE 5.1a CCRA IEP_504 Accommodations Manual, pages 2-3 and 10  CE 5.1c Accommodations Communication  CE 5.1d Oklahoma Accommodations Guide, pages 8-52  CE 5.1e SAT Accommodations Webinar Invitation  CE 5.1f 2019 SAT Accommodations Webinar slide deck</p> <p><i>State Provided ACT Evidence:</i>  CE 4.1a ACT Technical Manual, Chapter 4  CE 5.1a CCRA IEP_504 Accommodations Manual, pages 2-3 and 10  CE 5.1c Accommodations Communication  CE 4.1 ACT Technical Manual, Chapter 4  CE 5.1d Oklahoma Accommodations Guide, pages 8-52  CE 5.1g The ACT Test Testing Accommodations and Supports  CE 5.1h ACT Policy for Documentation</p> <p><b>DLM ELA/Math/Science</b>  The Oklahoma State Department of Education, Special Education Services (OSDE-SES) requires IEP teams to</p>	<p><b>OSTP</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>CCRA Science</b></p> <p>The state has procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public school students in assessment, and decisions about the assessment of students with disabilities is made by the student’s IEP team (CE 5.1, CE 5.1a, CE 5.1d).</p> <p><b>SAT</b></p> <p>So as not to deny equal benefit, additional evidence is needed to provide clarity around the way current state procedures around accommodations are enacted (cf. CE 5.1a, p. 3), (e.g. why allow a student to take a test with a non-approved accommodation if they will not get a score?)</p> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <p>The state, through the student’s IEP team, informs students of some of the implications of being tested using alternate academic achievement standards (CE 5.1j, CE 5.1k), but it’s unclear whether this affects students’ ability to receive a regular high school diploma.</p> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <p>So as not to deny equal benefit, additional evidence is needed to provide clarity around the way current state procedures around accommodations are enacted (cf. CE 5.1a, p. 3), (e.g. why allow a student to take a test with a non-approved accommodation if they will not get a score?)</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>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;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that parents of students assessed with an AA-AAAS are informed that their child's achievement will be measured based on alternate academic achievement standards;</li> <li>• Not preclude a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who takes an AA-AAAS from attempting to complete the requirements for a regular high school diploma; and</li> <li>• Promote, consistent with requirements under the IDEA, the involvement and progress of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in the general education curriculum that is based on the State's academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled; and</li> <li>• Develop, disseminate information on, and promote the use of appropriate accommodations to ensure that a</li> </ul>	<p>inform parents about the Oklahoma Alternate Assessment Program. IEP teams must annually document on the IEP that the OAAP Parent Brochure was provided. OSDE-SES makes available the DLM Parent Brochure as an additional resource for parents on the OAAP webpage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CE 5.1j 2019-20 OAAP Parent Brochure</li> <li>• CE 5.1k ExternalComms_Parents_YE_SciOnly</li> </ul>	

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State has in place and monitors implementation of guidelines for IEP teams to apply in determining, on a case-by-case basis, which students with the most significant cognitive disabilities will be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, if applicable. Such guidelines must be developed in accordance with 34 CFR § 200.6(d).<sup>5</sup></li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u><sub>x</sub> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DLM: Evidence to show that parents are made aware about students' ability to receive/not receive a regular high school diploma given their participation in this test.</li> <li>ACT: Evidence providing clarity around the way current state procedures around accommodations are enacted (cf. CE 5.1a, p. 3), (e.g. why allow a student to take a test with a non-approved accommodation if they will not get a score?)</li> <li>SAT: Evidence providing clarity around the way current state procedures around accommodations are enacted (cf. CE 5.1a, p. 3), (e.g. why allow a student to take a test with a non-approved accommodation if they will not get a score?)</li> </ul>		

<sup>5</sup> See the full regulation at 34 CFR § 200.6(d) (online at [https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=07e168e9e7a6c5931b4549cc15547ee9&mc=true&node=se34.1.200\\_16&rgn=div8](https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=07e168e9e7a6c5931b4549cc15547ee9&mc=true&node=se34.1.200_16&rgn=div8))

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all ELs in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s academic content assessments and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed with a linguistic accommodation(s);</li> <li>• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for ELs;</li> <li>• Assistance regarding selection of appropriate linguistic accommodations for ELs, including to the extent practicable, assessments in the language most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what those students know and can do to determine the students’ mastery of skills in academic content areas until the students have achieved English language proficiency.</li> </ul>	<p><b>CCRA Grade 11 Science</b>            CE 2.1d 19-20 PSTG G11 Science            CE 2.3b CCRA 2019-20 TAM G11, pages 10-11            CE 5.2a 2019-20 EL State Testing Accommodations            CE 5.3a Allow Accessibility Mode Testing Quick Guide 2019, page 4            CE 5.2e English Language Academic Plan (ELAP)</p> <p><b>CCRA Grade 11 ELA/Math</b>  <i>SAT Consortia Provided Evidence</i></p> <p><i>State Provided SAT Evidence:</i>            CE 5.2a 19-20 EL State Testing Accommodations, page 8</p> <p><i>ACT Consortia Provided Evidence:</i>            CE 5.2b Testing Supports for English Learners            CE 5.2c ACT Approved EL Supports Guide CE 5.2d            ACT Policy for English Learner Supports            Documentation</p> <p><i>State Provided ACT Evidence:</i>            CE 5.2a 2019-20 EL State Testing Accommodations, page 8            CE 5.2e English Language Academic Plan (ELAP)</p> <p><b>DLM Science</b>            The OSDE’s statewide longitudinal data system precodes all students for participation in either the OSTP or DLM/OAAP for all statewide academic content assessments. Once districts certify student demographic information, including EL status, the state submits a bulk file to the respective assessment vendors.</p> <p>CE 5.2f Precode Training</p>	<p><b>OSTP</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>CCRA Science</b></p> <p>The state has procedures for including ELs in assessment, including determining the need for and selection of appropriate linguistic accommodation, as well as options for accessibility tools where necessary (CE 5.2a, CE 5.2e).</p> <p><b>SAT</b></p> <p>The state has procedures for including ELs in assessment, including determining the need for and selection of appropriate linguistic accommodation, as well as options for accessibility tools where necessary (CE 5.2a, CE 5.2e).</p> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <p>The state has a system for accurately recording English learner status of students participating in the assessment (CE 5.2f).</p> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <p>The state has procedures for including ELs in assessment, including determining the need for and selection of appropriate linguistic accommodation, as well as options for accessibility tools where necessary (CE 5.2a, CE 5.2e).</p>
<p><b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>x No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA

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

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA

### Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and ELs, including ELs with disabilities. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations, such as, interoperability with, and ability to use, assistive technology, are available to measure the <b>academic achievement</b> of students with disabilities.</li> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs;</li> <li>Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> <li>Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> <li>Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the</li> </ul>	<p><b>OSTP Grades 3-8 ELA/Math/Science</b>            CE 3.1a Oklahoma OSTP_CCRA 2018-19 Technical Report, Chapter 6.2, pages 70-72            CE 3.1a OSTP-CCRA Technical Report 2018-2019, Appendix J, pages 464-479            CE 5.3k Accommodations Narrative OSTP 3-8, CCRA Grade 11 Science</p> <p><b>CCRA Grade 11 Science</b>            CE 3.1a Oklahoma OSTP_CCRA 2018-19 Technical Report, pages 45-54, 70-72, and 476-479            CE 5.1a OSTP CCRA IEP_504 Accommodations Manual, pages 4-9            CE 5.2a 2019-20 EL State Testing Accommodations            CE 5.3a Allow Accessibility Mode Testing Quick Guide 2019            CE 5.3b Emergency Accommodation Form            CE 5.3c Form U            CE 5.3d OSTP Tools and Accommodations Quick Guide 2019            CE 5.3e Accommodations forms for DTC access screenshot help and support            CE 5.3f OSTP CCRA PT Sci G11 screenshots            CE 5.3k Accommodations Narrative OSTP 3-8, CCRA Grade 11 Science</p> <p><b>CCRA Grade 11 ELA/Math</b>  <i>SAT Evidence:</i></p> <p><i>State Provided SAT Evidence:</i>            CE 5.1a CCRA IEP_504 Accommodations Manual, pages 2-3 and 10            CE 5.2a 2019-20 EL State Testing Accommodations, page 8</p> <p><i>ACT Consortia Provided Evidence:</i>            CE 4.1a ACT Technical Manual, Chapter 4</p>	<p><b>OSTP</b></p> <p>The state has analysis to show that assessments perform similarly for ELs as they do for the rest of the population, thereby allowing for the meaningful interpretation of results (CE 3.1a).</p> <p>(For assessments with accommodations, the categories used for DIF analysis aggregated a number of different accommodations, but on the other hand it is hard to disaggregate given the small n sizes involved.)</p> <p><b>CCRA Science</b></p> <p>Accommodations are available for students with disabilities and ELs (CE 3.1a, CE 5.3d, CE 5.3e), including the use of assistive technology (CE 5.3a). However, there is minimal evidence provided regarding these accommodations being appropriate and/or effective. One way to address this might be to cite the body of research evidence around these accommodations.</p> <p>Requests for accommodations are individually reviewed (CE 5.1a, CE 5.2a). In light of that, students are not denied participation in assessment and its benefits. The evidence (CE 3.1a) suggests that these accommodations meets their needs, thereby allowing for meaningful interpretation of assessment outcomes.</p> <p><b>SAT</b></p> <p>Appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities and ELs (CE 3.1a, CE 5.3d, CE 5.3e), including the use of assistive technology (CE 5.3a). Requests for accommodations are individually reviewed (CE 5.1a, CE 5.2a).</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 OKLAHOMA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.</p>	<p>CE 5.1g The ACT Test Testing Accommodations and Supports  CE 5.3g ACT Test Accessibility and Accommodations System User Guide  CE 5.3h Oklahoma ACT Validity Analysis  CE 5.3i Examining the Validity of ACT Composite  CE 5.3j Differential Item Functioning Analysis</p> <p><i>State Provided ACT Evidence:</i>  CE 5.1a CCRA IEP_504 Accommodations Manual, pages 2-3 and 10  CE 5.2a 2019-20 EL State Testing Accommodations, page 8</p>	<p>So as not to deny equal benefit, additional evidence is needed to provide clarity around the way current state procedures around accommodations are enacted (cf. CE 5.1a, p. 3), (e.g. why allow a student to take a test with a non-approved accommodation if they will not get a score?)</p> <p>The evidence (CE 3.1a) suggests that these accommodations meets their needs, thereby allowing for meaningful interpretation of assessment outcomes.</p> <p>See also SAT peer review notes.</p> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <p>For those opting for the ACT, there is a process for individually reviewing accommodation requests, and there is a menu of accommodations that still allows for reportable college scores (CE 5.1a, CE 5.2a).</p> <p>Evidence that the accommodations do not alter the construct was not provided.</p> <p>So as not to deny equal benefit, additional evidence is needed to provide clarity around the way current state procedures around accommodations are enacted (cf. CE 5.1a, p. 3), (e.g. why allow a student to take a test with a non-approved accommodation if they will not get a score?)</p>
<p><b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>_x_</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ACT: Evidence that the accommodations provided do not alter the construct being assessed and allow meaningful interpretation of results.</li> <li>• ACT: Evidence providing clarity around the way current state procedures around accommodations are enacted (cf. CE 5.1a, p. 3), (e.g. why allow a student to take a test with a non-approved accommodation if they will not get a score?)</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SAT: Evidence providing clarity around the way current state procedures around accommodations are enacted (cf. CE 5.1a, p. 3), (e.g. why allow a student to take a test with a non-approved accommodation if they will not get a score?)</li> <li>• SAT: See SAT peer review notes</li> <li>• CCRA Science: Evidence that accommodations are appropriate</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures;</li> <li>• Monitored for administrations of all required academic content assessments and AA-AAAS.</li> </ul>	<p><b>CCRA Grade 11 Science</b>            CE 2.4 and CE 5.4 Oklahoma Peer Review February 2018            CE 2.4a Broken Arrow Desk Monitoring Letter15015            CE 2.4b Broken Arrow HS Assessment Monitoring Checklist            CE 2.4c Broken Arrow High School Monitoring Compliance Letter</p> <p><b>CCRA Grade 11 ELA/Math</b></p> <p><i>State Provided SAT Evidence:</i>            CE 2.4 Oklahoma Peer Review February 2018            CE 2.4a Broken Arrow Desk Monitoring Letter15015            CE 2.4b Broken Arrow HS Assessment Monitoring Checklist            CE 2.4c Broken Arrow High School Monitoring Compliance Letter</p> <p><i>State Provided ACT Evidence:</i>            CE 2.4 Oklahoma Peer Review February 2018</p>	<p><b>OSTP</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>CCRA Science</b></p> <p>In addition to previously submitted evidence, the state submitted other materials showing that monitoring of test administration for special populations is being conducted to ensure that assessment is done consistent with policies and procedures (CE 2.4a, CE 2.4b, CE 2.4c). Can the state provide evidence regarding the how many schools/districts are monitored annually and how these schools/districts are selected for monitoring? What evidence does the school/district to provide to comply with the requirements of this critical element?</p> <p><b>SAT</b></p> <p>In addition to previously submitted evidence, the state submitted other materials showing that monitoring of test administration for special populations is being conducted to ensure that assessment is done consistent with policies and procedures (CE 2.4a, CE 2.4b, CE 2.4c). Can the state provide evidence regarding the how many schools/districts are monitored annually and how these schools/districts are selected for monitoring? What evidence does the school/district to provide to comply with the requirements of this critical element?</p> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</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 OKLAHOMA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SAT: Evidence regarding how many schools/districts are monitored, the criteria for selection into monitoring, and what actions follow monitoring.</li> <li>• CCRA Science: Evidence regarding how many schools/districts are monitored, the criteria for selection into monitoring, and what actions follow monitoring.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>For academic content standards:</b>                      The State formally adopted <b>challenging academic achievement standards</b> in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities;</li> <li>The State applies its academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply;</li> </ul> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (1) at least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third for lower achievement; (2) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (3) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</p>	<p><b>CCRA Grade 11 Science</b> [OSTP 3-8_CCRA Science folder]                      CE 6.1a Statute on Performance Levels and Cut Scores                      CE 6.1b Performance Level Descriptors Sci G11                      CE 6.1c CEQA PLD presentation Sci G11                      CE 6.1d CEQA Agenda 12-11-19                      CE 6.1e CEQA Minutes 12-11-19</p> <p><b>CCRA Grade 11 ELA/Math</b> [SAT_ACT folder]  <i>State Provided SAT Evidence:</i>                      On August 15, 2018, the Commission for Educational Quality Accountability (CEQA) formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in English Language Arts and Mathematics for high school students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CE 6.1a CEQA agenda 8-15-18, CE 6.1b CEQA Meeting Minutes 8-15-18, and CE 6.1c HS ELA-Math Academic Achievement Standards Presentation</li> <li>CE 6.1d State Statute vesting the power of the CEQA to set cut scores and define the four performance levels: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, and Below Basic</li> </ul> <p>CE 6.4c (pp. 4-6) Performance Level look up tables and conversion tables that provide achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</p> <p><b>DLM Science</b>                      Science Cut Scores were approved by the Commission for Educational Quality and Accountability in July 2016.</p> <p>CE 6.1f DLM Science CEQA Minutes 07-20-16</p>	<p><b>OSTP</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>CCRA Science</b></p> <p>The state submitted evidence to show that challenging academic achievement standards (CE 6.1a) and associated performance level descriptors (CE 6.1b, CE 6.1c, CE 6.1d, CE 6.1e), including for learners with the most significant cognitive disabilities (CE 6.1f).</p> <p><b>SAT</b></p> <p>The state submitted evidence to show that challenging academic achievement standards (CE 6.1a, CE 6.4c) and associated performance level descriptors (CE 6.1b, CE 6.1c, CE 6.1d, CE 6.1e), including for learners with the most significant cognitive disabilities (CE 6.1f).</p> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <p>The state submitted evidence to show that standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities were adopted (CE 6.1f).</p> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p>
<p><b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>x No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA**

**Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards.</u></b></li> </ul>	<p><b>CCRA Grade 11 Science</b> [OSTP 3-8_CCRA Science folder]            CE 6.2a Standard Setting Process Sci G11            CE 6.2b Standard Setting Presentation Sci G11            CE 6.2c Standard Setting Report Sci G11            CE 6.2d Standard Setting Report Appendices_Sci_G11</p> <p><b>CCRA Grade 11 ELA/Math</b> [SAT_ACT folder]  <i>State Provided SAT Evidence:</i>            CE 6.2a SAT-ACT Standard Setting Tech Report            CE 6.2b CCRA (ACT/SAT) Standard Setting Participant List            CE 6.2c Standard Setting Agenda            CE 6.2d Standard Setting Invitation</p>	<p><b>OSTP</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>CCRA Science</b></p> <p>The state used a technically sound method and process involving expert panelists to set academic achievement standards (CCRA CE 6.2a, CCRA CE6.2b, CCRA CE 6.2c, CCRA CE 6.2d), though more detail regarding panelists would have been helpful.</p> <p><b>SAT</b></p> <p>The state used a technically sound method and process involving expert panelists (SAT CE 6.2b) to set academic achievement standards (SAT CE 6.2a, SAT CE 6.2c, SAT CE 6.2d).</p> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <p>No evidence presented. Critical element addressed by coordinated evidence for all States administering the same assessments.</p> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p>
<p><b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>x No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b><u>For academic achievement standards:</u></b></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards and with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards such that a student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards (1) are aligned with the State’s challenging academic content standards for the grade in which a student is enrolled; (2) promote access to the general curriculum consistent with the IDEA; (3) reflect professional judgment as to the highest possible standards achievable for such students; (4) are designated in the IEP for each student for whom alternate academic achievement standards apply; and (5) are aligned to ensure that a student who meets the alternate academic achievement standards is on track to pursue postsecondary education or competitive integrated employment.</p>	<p><b>CCRA Grade 11 Science</b> [OSTP 3-8_CCRA Science folder]</p> <p>CE 6.1b Performance Level Descriptors Sci G11  CE 6.3 Standard Setting Report, Section 2.1  CE 6.1c CEQA PLD presentation Sci G11  CE 6.1d CEQA Agenda 12-11-19  CE 6.1e CEQA Minutes 12-11-19</p> <p><b>CCRA Grade 11 ELA/Math</b> [SAT_ACT folder]</p> <p><i>State Provided SAT Evidence:</i>  CE 6.2a SAT-ACT Standard Setting Tech Report  CE 6.3a SAT Math PLD Training  CE 6.3b SAT ELA PLD Training  CE 6.3c SAT PLD Participant List  CE 6.3d CCRA Math PLDs  CE 6.3e CCRA ELA PLDs</p> <p><i>ACT Consortia Provided Evidence:</i>  CE 6.3f ACT Narrative for CE 6.3 Evidence  CE 4.1: ACT Technical Manual  -National Curriculum Survey: pp. 2.2-2.4  -Statistical relationships between ACT scores and first-year college GPA: pp. 11.36-11.39  -Decision-Based Statistics: pp. 11.39-11.49  CE 6.3g Oklahoma ACT Validity Analysis</p>	<p><b>OSTP</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>CCRA Science</b></p> <p>The state’s “proficient” performance level descriptor was defined as college and career ready, and panelists in standard setting, who work in education in the state, worked with that in mind, ergo, the standards are aligned with college requirements in the state (CCRA CE 6.1b, CCRA CE 6.1c, CCRA CE 6.1d, CCRA CE 6.1e). However, evidence was not provided in relation to technical education standards and workforce readiness.</p> <p><b>SAT</b></p> <p>The state’s “proficient” performance level descriptor was defined as college and career ready, and panelists in standard setting, who work in education in the state, worked with that in mind, ergo, the standards are aligned with college requirements in the state (SAT CE 6.2a, SAT CE 6.3a, SAT CE 6.3b, SAT CE 6.3c, SAT CE 6.3d, SAT CE 6.3e). However, evidence was not provided in relation to technical education standards and workforce readiness.</p> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <p>No evidence presented. Critical element addressed by coordinated evidence for all States administering the same assessments.</p> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <p>The ACT test was developed using a number of methods to ascertain that it covered college readiness (ACT CE 6.3f,</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 OKLAHOMA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		CE 4.1), and analysis of results with regard to the state's students shows that the cut score on the test relates to a GPA of ~2.25, which is passing performance in college (ACT CE 6.3g). Evidence was not provided in relation to technical education standards and workforce readiness.
<b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ACT: Evidence that standards on the test align to technical education standards ensuring that students are ready to participate in the workforce</li> <li>• SAT: Evidence that standards on the test align to technical education standards ensuring that students are ready to participate in the workforce</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA**

**Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State reports its assessment results for all students assessed, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public.</p> <p>The State reports to the public its assessment results on <b><u>student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level</u></b><sup>6</sup></p> <p>For <b>academic content assessments</b>, the State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the <b><u>specific academic needs of students</u></b>, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its academic content assessments that:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>OSTP Grades 3-8 ELA/Math/Science</b> [OSTP 3-8_CCRA Science folder]            CE 6.4a Parent Portal Reporting and Accessibility Guidelines            CE 6.4b 2019 OSTP Spring Reporting Memo            CE 6.4c 2019 Spanish Parent Portal Directions            CE 6.4d 2019-2020 Oklahoma OSTP Key Dates- Grades 3-8, page 2            CE 6.4e 70 O.S. § 1210.508 (OSCN 2019), Oklahoma School Testing Program Act, page 2</p> <p><b>CCRA Grade 11 Science</b> [OSTP 3-8_CCRA Science folder]            CE 6.4a Parent Portal Reporting and Accessibility Guidelines            CE 6.4b 2019 OSTP Spring Reporting Memo            CE 6.4c 2019 Spanish Parent Portal Directions            CE 6.4e 70 O.S. § 1210.508 (OSCN 2019), Oklahoma School Testing Program Act, page 2            CE 6.4f 2019-2020 Oklahoma OSTP Key Dates- CCRA Grade 11 Science, page 2            CE 6.4f [SAT_ACT folder] CCRA ALL student Performance            CE 6.4g State Reporting Subgroup Science Academic Achievement</p> <p><b>CCRA Grade 11 ELA/Math</b> [SAT_ACT folder]            The reporting categories in Mathematics for both the ACT and SAT are collapsed into the following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number and Operations</li> <li>• Algebraic Reasoning and Algebra</li> <li>• Functions</li> </ul>	<p><b>OSTP</b></p> <p>The state provided evidence that reports are available in alternate formats (OSTP CE 6.4a) and in the state’s main non-English language (OSTP CE 6.4c). Evidence was also provided of a timeline for the reporting of results (OSTP CE 6.4d).</p> <p><b>CCRA</b></p> <p>The state provided evidence that reports are available that provide information about assessment results in a clear and understandable manner (OSTP CE 6.4c). This information is also available in alternate formats (OSTP CE 6.4a) and in the state’s main non-English language (OSTP CE 6.4c). Evidence was also provided of a timeline for the reporting of results (OSTP CE 6.4d).</p> <p><b>SAT</b></p> <p>The state provided evidence that reports for the assessments are provided on a timeline (OSTP CE 6.4d). At least some of the information is presented clearly in a manner that lay audiences might be able to engage with (SAT CE 6.4i, SAT CE 6.4j). It is unclear from the submission whether the portal used for OSTP/CCRA (OSTP CE 6.4a) also reports SAT scores. Dependent on that, there is either evidence or no evidence that reports are made available in alternate formats or languages.</p>

<sup>6</sup> Although all students with disabilities must be included in a State’s assessment system, requirements for public reporting in ESEA section 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) apply only to children with disabilities as defined in section 602(3) of the IDEA.

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b><u>student’s academic achievement;</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Report the <b><u>student’s academic achievement</u></b> in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards;</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific <b><u>academic needs of students;</u></b></li> <li>○ Are provided in an understandable and uniform format;</li> <li>○ Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian;</li> <li>○ Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.</li> <li>● The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Data and Probability</li> <li>● Geometry</li> </ul> <p>These categories are reflective of the categories used in the CE 2.1f SAT_ACT WCER OK Alignment Study: see Table 17 (pg. 36), Table 19 (pg. 38) for ACT evidence and Table 21 (pg. 40), and Table 23 (pg. 42) for SAT evidence.</p> <p><i>State Provided SAT Evidence:</i></p> <p>6.4a CCRA Performance Level Descriptors Math-ELA Communication</p> <p>6.4b CCRA webpage snapshot</p> <p>6.4c SAT-ACT Standard Setting and Conversion Tables</p> <p>6.4d SAT-ACT Standard Setting Conversion Tables Public Communication</p> <p>6.4e CCRA Performance Level Ranges and Percentages webpage</p> <p>CE 6.4f CCRA ALL student Performance</p> <p>CE 6.4g CCRA Performance Level Look-up Tables communication</p> <p>CE 6.4h 70 O.S. § 1210.508 (OSCN 2019), Oklahoma School Testing Program Act, page 2</p> <p>Upon request, LEAs are required to provide individuals with a disability an alternative means of accessing and interpreting information from score reports.</p> <p>Student-level reports are provided to students approximately 3-8 weeks after they take the ACT or SAT test. State, district, and site-level student results and aggregates are typically provided in August of each year.</p> <p>See public reporting evidence excerpted from Oklaschools.com and sde.ok.gov:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● CE 6.4f CCRA ALL student Performance</li> </ul>	<p>How does the state communicate the availability of alternate formats of score reports? This should be a process in public-facing, parent-friendly language.</p> <p>Does the state communicate about reporting deadlines or have some other evidence to show a commitment to timely reporting?</p> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <p>The state provided evidence that reports for the assessments are provided on a timeline (OSTP CE 6.4d). At least some of the information is presented clearly in a manner that lay audiences might be able to engage with (ACT CE 6.4i, ACT CE 6.4j). It is unclear from the submission whether the portal used for OSTP/CCRA (OSTP CE 6.4a) also reports ACT scores. Dependent on that, there is either evidence or no evidence that reports are made available in alternate formats or languages.</p> <p>Evidence is needed that student reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students.</li> <li>● To the extent practicable, are available in alternative formats (e.g., oral or written translations and accessible formats as needed).</li> </ul> <p>Evidence was also made available about the reliability of subscale scores (CE 4.1b, CE 4.1c), but there was no evidence submitted about the availability of this information in individual score reports.</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 OKLAHOMA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CE 6.4i State Reporting Subgroup ELA Academic Achievement.pdf</li> <li>• CE 6.4j State Reporting Subgroup Math Academic Achievement</li> </ul> <p><i>ACT Consortia Provided Evidence:</i>            CE 4.1b Fall 2014 Writing Generalizability Study            CE 4.1c ACT Writing Test Reliability and Standard Error of Measurement            CE 3.3 Peer review report for Oklahoma</p> <p><i>State Provided ACT Evidence:</i>            Student-level reports are provided to students approximately 3-8 weeks after they take the ACT or SAT test. State, district, and site-level student results and aggregates are typically provided in August of each year.</p> <p>See public reporting evidence excerpted from Oklaschools.com and sde.ok.gov:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CE 6.4f CCRA ALL student Performance</li> <li>• CE 6.4i State Reporting Subgroup ELA Academic Achievement.pdf</li> <li>• CE 6.4j State Reporting Subgroup Math Academic Achievement</li> </ul>	<p>An example of an individual score report is needed to evaluate whether or not mathematics scores are reported in a way consistent with the validated model.</p>
<b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  </u>x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ACT: Evidence is needed that student reports:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students.</li> <li>• To the extent practicable, are available in alternative formats (e.g., oral or written translations and accessible formats as needed).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• ACT: Evidence about the availability of subscale reliability in individual score reports</li> <li>• ACT: Evidence that mathematics scores are reported in a way consistent with the validated model.</li> <li>• SAT: Evidence that availability of reports in an alternate format is communicated to parents</li> <li>• SAT: Evidence of timeline for making SAT reports available</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA

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

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has established technical criteria to use in its review of any submission of a locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment. The State has completed this review using its established technical criteria and has found the assessment meets its criteria <b>prior to</b> submitting for the Department’s assessment peer review.</p> <p>The State’s technical criteria include a determination that the assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is aligned with the challenging State academic standards; and</li> <li>• Addresses the depth and breadth of those standards.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <p>The State has procedures in place to ensure that a district that chooses to use a nationally recognized high school academic assessment administers the same assessment to all high school students in the district except for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who may be assessed with an AA-AAAS.</p> <p>AND</p>	<p><b>ACT Evidence:</b></p> <p><i>ACT Consortia Provided Evidence:</i>            CE 5.3h Oklahoma ACT Validity Analysis            CE 5.3i Examining the Validity of ACT Composite            CE 5.3j Differential Item Functioning Analysis            CE 5.1g The ACT Test Testing Accommodations and Supports            CE 4.1a ACT Technical Manual, Chapter 4            CE 5.3g ACT Test Accessibility and Accommodations System User Guide</p> <p><i>State Provided ACT Evidence:</i>            CE 7.1a 2650000332CCRA- RFP-SDE Criteria            CE 7.1b 2650000332 CCRA RFP Evaluator 7            CE 7.1c CCRA RFP Response MEMO            CE 5.1a (Pages 2-3 &amp; 10) CCRA IEP_504 Accommodations Manual            CE 5.2a 2019-20 EL State Testing Accommodations, (Pages 7-8)</p>	<p><b>OSTP</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>CCRA/SAT</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <p>There are minimal requirements that are scored that relate to the technical quality of the assessments. There are scores assigned to the various technical aspects, but no criteria to determine “good enough.” Criteria also aren’t specifically related to the state’s academic 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 OKLAHOMA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The technical criteria established by the State in reviewing a locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment must ensure that the use of appropriate accommodations does not deny a student with a disability or an EL—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The opportunity to participate in the assessment; and</li> <li>• Any of the benefits from participation in the assessment that are afforded to students without disabilities or students who are not ELs.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 7.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ACT: Evidence that the State has established technical criteria (including alignment to state standards) to review any selection of a nationally recognized high school assessment. Evidence that the State has completed this review of the ACT using its established technical criteria and has found the use of the locally selected assessment meets its criteria.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State must have procedures in place to ensure that:</p> <p><b>Before</b> a district requests approval from the State to use a nationally recognized high school academic assessment, the district notifies all parents of high school students it serves—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the district intends to request approval from the State to use a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in place of the statewide academic assessment;</li> <li>• Of how parents and, as appropriate, students may provide meaningful input regarding the district’s request (includes students in public charter schools who would be included in such assessments); and</li> <li>• Of any effect of such request on the instructional program in the district.</li> </ul>	<p><b>State Provided ACT Evidence</b>            CE 7.2a Narrative Describing the Technical Criteria for Review of Locally Selected ACT            CE 7.2b Assessment Update, Slide 10            CE 7.2c CCRA Informed Consent Forms &amp; ACT (locally-selected option) Evidence Upload            CE 7.2d ACT Additional Documentation Status            CE 4.7h Final DTC Meeting May 2019, slide 52</p>	<p><b>OSTP</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>CCRA/SAT</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <p>The state provided evidence that LEAs using the ACT need to obtain input from parents and students on the one hand, and consent from the state department of education to use the test (CE 7.2a, CE 7.2b, CE 7.2c, CE 7.2d). However, effects on instructional programs were not described.</p>
<p><b>Section 7.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>_x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ACT: Information on the effects of selecting the test on instructional programs in the LEA</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA**

**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"> <li>• Is equivalent to or more rigorous than the statewide assessment, with respect to—               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The coverage of academic content;</li> <li>○ The difficulty of the assessment;</li> <li>○ The overall quality of the assessment; and</li> <li>○ Any other aspects of the assessment that the State may establish in its technical criteria;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Produces valid and reliable data on student academic achievement with respect to all high school students and each subgroup of high school students in the district that—               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Are comparable to student academic achievement data for all high school students and each subgroup of high school students produced by the statewide assessment at each academic achievement level;</li> <li>○ Are expressed in terms consistent with the State’s academic achievement standards; and</li> <li>○ Provide unbiased, rational, and consistent differentiation among schools within the State for the purpose of the State determined accountability system including calculating the Academic Achievement indicator and annually meaningfully differentiating between schools.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>State Provided ACT Evidence</b>            CE 7.3 ACT_SAT Comparability            CE 2.1a SAT_ACT WCER Alignment Study</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DOK percentage within each reporting category of the academic content standards               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ELA Standards: p. 20, Table 2</li> <li>○ Math Standards: p. 31, Table 12</li> <li>○ ACT Form C, ELA: p. 58, Table 1.1</li> <li>○ ACT Form 10, ELA: p.92, Table 2.1</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>CE 3.1j OSTP CCRA Assessing ELA Standard 6, Research in Grade 11            CE 3.1k TAC Minutes May 2019, section 6</p> <p>The reporting categories in Mathematics for both the ACT and SAT are collapsed into the following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number and Operations</li> <li>• Algebraic Reasoning and Algebra</li> <li>• Functions</li> <li>• Data and Probability</li> <li>• Geometry</li> </ul> <p>These categories are reflective of the categories used in the CE 2.1f SAT_ACT WCER OK Alignment Study: see Table 17 (pg. 36), Table 19 (pg. 38) for ACT evidence and Table 21 (pg. 40), and Table 23 (pg. 42) for ACT evidence.</p>	<p><b>OSTP</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>CCRA/SAT</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p><b>ACT</b></p> <p>The state provided evidence (CE 7.3) showing a high level of correlation between ACT and SAT scores.</p>
<p><b>Section 7.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>x No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OKLAHOMA

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