



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Michael Johnson  
Commissioner  
Alaska Department of Education and Early Development  
P.O. Box 110500  
Juneau, AK 99811-0500

August 13, 2020

Dear Commissioner Johnson:

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 Alaska Department of Education and Early Development (DEED) to prepare for the assessment peer review, which occurred in March 2020. Specifically, DEED submitted evidence regarding its State general and alternate assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics.

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 DEED's submission and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that the components of your assessment system meet some, but not all, of the statutory and regulatory requirements of sections 1111(b)(1) and (2) of the ESEA, as amended by ESSA. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and our own analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

- R/LA and mathematics general assessments for grades 3-8 (PEAKS 3-8): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- R/LA and mathematics general assessments in high school (PEAKS HS): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- R/LA and mathematics AA-AAAS for grades 3-8 and high school (DLM): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**

Substantially meets requirements means that these assessments meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations, but some additional information is required.

The specific list of items required for DEED to submit is enclosed with this letter. I request that the DEED submit a plan within 30 days outlining when it will submit all required additional

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.*

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank T. Brogan  
Assistant Secretary  
for Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Deborah Riddle, Division Operations Manager

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Additional Evidence Needed</b>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b>	<p>For PEAKS grades 3-8 and HS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the 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, and includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the measurement of the depth and breadth of the of the State’s grade-level academic content standards.</li> <li>○ Processes to ensure that each assessment reflects the appropriate inclusion of challenging content and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b>	<p>For all assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the policies and procedures for monitoring have been implemented during test administrations (e.g., a statewide summary report of LEA-reported irregularities and/or observations; a summary of the percentage of LEA staff that received required training out of the total number of LEA staff who administered tests).</li> </ul>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b>	<p>For PEAKS grades 3-8 and HS assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the revised assessments in R/LA demonstrate adequate validity regarding alignment between the assessments and the State’s academic content standards.</li> <li>• Evidence that the mathematics assessments demonstrate adequate validity regarding alignment between the assessments and the State’s academic content standards (e.g., that levels of cognitive complexity are adequately represented in the assessments).</li> </ul>
<b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b>	<p>For PEAKS grades 3-8 and HS assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence demonstrating that the assessments measure the cognitive processes indicated in the State’s academic content standards (e.g., cognitive lab or classroom teacher judgments).</li> </ul>
<b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b>	<p>For PEAKS grades 3-8 and HS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards (e.g., a confirmatory factor analysis or other analysis that supports the validity of the assessment’s internal structure).</li> </ul>
<b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b>	<p>For PEAKS 3-8 and HS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables (e.g., analyses that demonstrate convergent relationships with the tests and measures other than test scores).</li> </ul>

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Additional Evidence Needed</b>
<b>4.1 – Reliability</b>	<p>For PEAKS grades 3-8:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, specifically: a plan to improve model fit in grades 3 and 4 R/LA.</li> </ul>
<b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b>	<p>For PEAKS grades 3-8 and HS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that assessments provide an adequately precise estimate of Student performance across the full performance continuum, including performance for high-and low-achieving students (e.g., more complete item type and content characteristics in data analysis results, plans for review of test items flagged for extreme difficulty and rationale for the limited number of test items classified at depth of knowledge (DOK) level 3 on the R/LA assessments).</li> <li>• Evidence that the revised assessments in R/LA demonstrate adequately precise estimates of student performance across the full performance continuum.</li> </ul>
<b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b>	<p>For the DLM:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards ensure that a student who meets these standards is on track to pursue post-secondary education or employment. The State educational agency should provide this evidence by December 15, 2020.</li> </ul>
<b>6.4 – Reporting</b>	<p>For all assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State ensures LEAs provide alternative formats of score reports, upon request.</li> </ul>

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## March 2020 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALASKA

Contents

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

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

**Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content Standards ..... 5**

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

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

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

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

**Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development ..... 11**

**Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development ..... 13**

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

**Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration ..... 16**

**Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security..... 18**

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

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY .....20**

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

**Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes ..... 22**

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

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

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

**Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability ..... 25**

**Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility ..... 27**

**Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum ..... 28**

**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring..... 29**

**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms..... 30**

**Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment ..... 31**

**Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance ..... 32**

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS.....33**

**Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 33**

**Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments..... 36**

**Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations ..... 37**

**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.

..... 39

**SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING.....40**

**Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students..... 40**  
**Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting ..... 42**  
**Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards ..... 43**  
**Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting ..... 45**

**SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS..48**

**Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments ..... 48**  
**Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments ..... 50**  
**Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State Assessments ..... 51**

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALASKA**

**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>No evidence was requested</p>	
<p><b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALASKA**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b><u>For academic content standards:</u></b>                      The State’s challenging academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science are aligned with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards.</p>	<p>No evidence was requested</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 ALASKA**

**Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments aligned with <b><u>grade-level academic achievement standards</u></b> or alternate academic achievement standards in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 9-12);</li> <li>• Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12).</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <p>The State’s <b><u>academic content assessments</u></b> must be the same assessments administered to all students in the tested grades, with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may take an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards.</li> <li>• A State may permit an LEA to administer a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in lieu of the State high school assessment if certain conditions are met.</li> <li>• A State that administers an end-of-course high school mathematics assessment may exempt an 8<sup>th</sup> grade student from the mathematics assessment typically administered in</li> </ul>	<p>No evidence was requested.</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 ALASKA

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALASKA**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For students with disabilities, policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including those children with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system;</li> <li>• For ELs:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Policies state that all ELs must be included in all aspects of the content assessment system, unless the State has chosen the statutory option for recently arrived ELs under which such ELs are exempt from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment.</li> <li>○ If a State has developed native language assessments for ELs in R/LA, ELs must be assessed in R/LA in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except, if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>No evidence was requested</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 ALASKA

<p>language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If the State uses the flexibility for Native American language schools and programs: (1) the State provides the content assessment in the Native American language to all students in the school or program; (2) the State submits such content assessment for peer review as part of its State assessment system; and (3) the State continues to provide ELP assessments and services for ELs as required by law. The State must assess in English the students' achievement in R/LA in high school.</li> </ul>		
<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 ALASKA**

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>If the State has developed or amended challenging <b>academic</b> standards and assessments, the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education).</li> <li>• Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas).</li> <li>• Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State.</li> <li>• Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents.</li> </ul>	<p>No evidence was provided.</p>	<p>Alaska did not provide evidence for this critical element. Its reading/language arts and mathematics content standards were adopted in 2012, so this critical element does not apply.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>x No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALASKA

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to <b><u>the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards</u></b> for the grade that is being assessed and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of <b><u>the State’s grade-level academic content standards</u></b> and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results.</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <b><u>the State’s academic content standards</u></b>, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills).</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design</li> </ul>	<p><b>File 06</b> PEAKS Third-Party Independent Alignment Study, pages 35-48</p> <p><b>File 134</b> PEAKS Spring 2019 Technical Report; Appendix 1, pages 1 - 62</p> <p><b>The state was asked to provide</b></p> <p><b>For PEAKS grades 3-8 and HS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <b>Evidence that the 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, and includes:</b></li> <li>o <b>Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the measurement of the depth and breadth of the of the State’s grade-level academic content standards.</b></li> <li>o <b>Processes to ensure that each assessment reflects the appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills).</b></li> </ul>	<p>File 134 provides the item specifications instead of the test specifications. File 133 includes number of items per grade. The test specifications should be a two-way table to address the content domains or content standards measured by the cognitive complexity with test length, number of items, format, score points and percentage of each cell to be used to define the test construct and used as a blueprint for test form assembly.</p> <p>The peers noted that there were relatively few DOK 3 items for math across the grades. An improvement plan and timeline should be provided to ensure that each assessment reflects the appropriate inclusion of challenging content and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills.</p> <p>The alignment study was conducted prior to the introduction of the text-dependent items in the ELA assessment. The state must provide evidence related to alignment with the inclusion of these items.</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALASKA

<p>and intended uses and interpretations of results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the student is enrolled and uses that determination for all reporting.</li> <li>• If the State administers a content assessment that includes portfolios, such assessment may be partially administered through a portfolio but may not be <i>entirely</i> administered through a portfolio.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two-way test specifications that include cognitive complexity for both math and ELA</li> <li>• An improvement plan and timeline for increasing DOK on the math assessment</li> <li>• Evidence of alignment for the text-dependent items on the ELA assessment</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALASKA**

**Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess student achievement based on the <b>State’s academic content standards</b> in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</li> </ul>	Evidence meeting requirements is located in the December 2017 submission.	
<b>Section 2.2 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 ALASKA**

**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>Evidence meeting requirements is located in the December 2017 submission.</p>	
<p><b>Section 2.3 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 ALASKA

\_\_\_ 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 ALASKA**

**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>FILE 121 Assessment Monitoring District Notification Letters</p> <p>FILE 122 Alaska Statewide Assessments Monitoring Guide 2019-2020</p> <p>FILE 123 Assessment Observation Form 2020</p> <p>FILE 124 Assessments Monitoring District Response From 2019</p> <p>FILE 125 Assessments Monitoring Schedule</p> <p>FILE 126 2019-2020 Assessment Monitoring Presentation for Districts</p> <p>State notes: In addition to the evidence submitted in December 2017, DEED has developed procedures for monitoring test administration.</p> <p>While the assessment staff are in frequent contact with district staff during the testing window to ensure that standardized procedures are being followed, Alaska’s geography and distance minimizes the opportunity for on-site monitoring. Many sites, especially in rural areas, remain inaccessible during the assessment window.</p> <p>Alaska has opted to perform desk audits of select districts each year in order to ensure that all procedures are being implemented with fidelity.</p> <p>For spring 2019 administrations, the monitoring process consists of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DEED outlines the monitoring process for all districts at fall training</li> </ul>	<p>In the previous peer review, the Department requested: Evidence that the policies and procedures for monitoring have been implemented during test administrations (e.g., a State-wide summary report of LEA-reported irregularities and/or observations; a summary of the percentage of LEA staff that received required training out of the total number of LEA staff who administered tests).</p> <p>In this submission, DEED provided monitoring procedures, training materials, and forms. The evidence included a monitoring schedule for the next ten years. However, not included was evidence that monitoring actually occurred, such as completed LEA reports or a summary of monitoring findings and responses.</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 ALASKA**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DEED notifies the five districts that will be monitored on October 14 (FILE 121)</li> <li>• District gathers and submits evidence from the 2019 administration (FILE 122, FILE 124)</li> <li>• DEED will review evidence submitted by districts and provide feedback at the end of February</li> </ul> <p>Future administrations will also require districts to conduct on-site monitoring, in lieu of on-site monitoring conducted by DEED. Proof of observations will be a component of future monitoring cycles (FILE 123).</p>	
<p><b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:  Evidence that the policies and procedures for monitoring have been implemented during test administrations (e.g., a State-wide summary report of LEA-reported irregularities and/or observations; a summary of the percentage of LEA staff that received required training out of the total number of LEA staff who administered tests).</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 ALASKA**

**Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> <li>• Application of test security procedures to all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS.</li> </ul>	<p><b>FILE 127</b> DEED Test Incident Process</p> <p><b>FILE 128</b> Test Security Incident Log</p> <p><b>FILE 129</b> AK PEAKS 2019 Data Forensics Summary (saved in secure)</p> <p><b>FILE 130</b> AK PEAKS 2019 Data Forensics Time Summary</p> <p><b>FILE 131</b> AK PEAKS 2019 Data Forensics Response Change Maps</p> <p><b>FILE 132</b> AK PEAKS 2019 Data Forensics School Level Summary</p> <p><b>The State was asked to provide For PEAKS grades 3-8 and HS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Evidence of procedures to prevent assessment irregularities (e.g., monitoring for item exposure as items are drawn from a national item bank; steps taken to mitigate risks involved with differing test windows between paper and computer administration).</b></li> </ul> <p><b>For all assessments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Evidence of remediation following test security incidents/breaches.</b></li> </ul>	<p>The state submitted sufficient evidence to address this Critical Element.</p> <p>In the narrative, the state describes the vendor’s process for monitoring the item bank to ensure that items are not exposed. The state is also developing state-specific items to reduce the risk of item exposure.</p> <p>The state should consider additional follow-up processes after test security incidents.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.5 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 ALASKA**

**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>Evidence meeting requirements is located in the December 2017 submission.</p>	
<p><b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALASKA

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. The State’s validity evidence includes evidence that:</p> <p><b><u>The State’s academic assessments</u></b> measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> <li>• Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards;</li> <li>• If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards and administers alternate assessments aligned with those standards, the assessments show adequate alignment to the State’s academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content</li> </ul>	<p><b>File 06</b> PEAKS Third-Party Independent Alignment Study p. 31-33, 34-48, and Appendix C Summary Tables.</p> <p><b>For PEAKS grades 3-8 and HS: Evidence that the revised assessments in R/LA demonstrate adequate validity regarding alignment between the assessments and the State’s academic content standards.</b></p>	<p>The state has submitted an alignment study; however, the alignment study was conducted prior to the development of the text-dependent items. The state must provide additional evidence to demonstrate alignment for the revised assessments.</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALASKA

and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.		
<b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence that the revised assessments in R/LA demonstrate adequate validity regarding alignment between the revised ELA assessment and the State's academic content standards.</li></ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALASKA**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap: <b><u>the intended cognitive processes</u></b> appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p><b>File 134</b> PEAKS Spring 2017 Technical Report; Appendix 1, pages 1 - 62</p> <p><b>File 06</b> PEAKS Third-Party Independent Alignment Study p. 31-33, 34-48, and Appendix A Depth of Knowledge Levels.</p> <p><b>For PEAKS grades 3-8 and HS R/LA assessments: Evidence demonstrating that the assessments measure the cognitive processes indicated in the State’s academic content standards.</b></p>	<p>The state has submitted an alignment study that included information about cognitive processes; however, the alignment study was conducted prior to the development of the text-dependent items. The state must provide additional evidence (e.g., a cognitive lab or classroom teacher judgments) to demonstrate that the revised assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.2 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>• The state must provide additional evidence (e.g., a cognitive lab or classroom teacher judgments) to demonstrate that the revised assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level.</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 ALASKA**

**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>File 133</b> PEAKS Spring Technical Report, pages 83-93</p> <p><b>File 134</b> PEAKS Spring 2017 Technical Report; Appendix 6, p. 101</p> <p><b>For PEAKS grades 3-8 and HS:</b>  <b>Evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards (e.g., a confirmatory factor analysis or other analysis that supports the validity of the assessment’s internal structure).</b></p>	<p>The state provided a principal component analysis; however, this evidence does not provide sufficient evidence of the sub-domain structure. Instead, a confirmatory approach should be submitted.</p> <p>When submitting additional evidence, the peers would suggest including explanations of the results.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.3 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>• Evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards (e.g., a confirmatory factor analysis or other analysis that supports the validity of the assessment’s internal structure).</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 ALASKA**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.	<b>For PEAKS 3-8 and HS: Evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables (e.g., analyses that demonstrate convergent relationships with the tests and measures other than test scores).</b>	The state noted that this evidence would not be available until the end of January 2020 and was not reviewed.
<b>Section 3.4 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>• Evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables (e.g., analyses that demonstrate convergent relationships with the tests and measures other than test scores).</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 ALASKA

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><u>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: Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable; Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results; For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s academic achievement.</u></p>	<p><u>FILE 133 Technical Report PEAKS Spring 2019, p. 87</u></p> <p><u>FILE 134 Technical Report PEAKS Spring 2019, Appendices, p. 101 – 246</u></p> <p><u>For PEAKS grades 3-8 and HS: Evidence that the State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, specifically:</u></p> <p><u>-An analysis of items demonstrating lower than desired item discrimination (e.g., point bi-serials)and plans to improve item discrimination.</u></p> <p><u>-An analysis of lower-than-desired model fit in grades 3 and 4 R/LA and plans to improve model fit in these grades.</u></p>	<p><u>The state provided sufficient information related to the item discrimination analysis. The analysis indicates that the item discrimination is within acceptable ranges.</u></p> <p><u>The evidence related to model fit indicates that there remains lower-than-desired model fit. The state shall provide plans to improve the model fit.</u></p> <p><u>The peers also note that the model fit analysis flags items where the outfit is &gt; +5. The peers recommend including a citation to support the use of that criterion.</u></p>
<p><b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALASKA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The state shall provide plans to improve the model fit.</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 ALASKA**

**Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><i>For all State academic assessments,</i> assessments should be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (see definition<sup>1</sup>).</p> <p><b>For academic content assessments,</b> the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in their design, development and analysis.</p>	<p>Evidence meeting requirements is located in the December 2017 submission.</p>	
<p><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

---

<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 ALASKA

**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>FILE 133</b> Technical Report PEAKS Spring 2019, p.16 – 36</p> <p><b>FILE 134</b> Technical Report PEAKS Spring 2019, Appendices</p> <p><b>For PEAKS grades 3-8 and HS:</b></p> <p><b>-Evidence that assessments provide an adequately precise estimate of Student performance across the full performance continuum, including performance for high-and low-achieving students (e.g., more complete item type and content characteristics in data analysis results, plans for review of test items flagged for extreme difficulty and rationale for the limited number of test items classified at depth of knowledge (DOK) level 3 on the R/LA assessments).</b></p> <p><b>-Evidence that the revised assessments in R/LA demonstrate adequately precise estimates of student performance across the full performance continuum.</b></p>	<p>The state provides the raw to scale scores conversion tables in File 134, Appendix 8 (pp. 184-223) with the standard error of measurement (SEM) across available score points by test form, which do not address the issue of precision across the full performance continuum.</p> <p>The peers suggest providing an analysis of the frequency distributions of estimated person-parameters (theta) and conditional standard error of measurement (CSEM) and the corresponding scatter plots, which would provide additional evidence to examine the precision of estimating student performance across the full continuum for low- and high-achieving students by each test form. Similarly, the state could provide a student-item map.</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 assessments provide an adequately precise estimate of Student performance across the full performance continuum, including performance for high-and low-achieving students (e.g., more complete item type and content characteristics in data analysis results, plans for review of test items flagged for extreme difficulty and rationale for the limited number of test items classified at depth of knowledge (DOK) level 3 on the R/LA assessments).</li> <li>• Evidence that the revised assessments in R/LA demonstrate adequately precise estimates of student performance across the full performance continuum.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALASKA**

**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>FILE 133</b> Technical Report PEAKS Spring 2019, p. 43 – 48</p> <p><b>FILE 134</b> Technical Report PEAKS Spring 2019, Appendices, p. 521</p> <p><b>For PEAKS grades 3-8 and HS: Evidence of standardized scoring procedures and protocols for assessments that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results (e.g., a report of the follow-up analysis recommended by the technical advisory committee regarding extremely difficult items).</b></p>	<p>The state has provided sufficient evidence to satisfy this Critical Element.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALASKA**

**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
If the State administers multiple forms of <b>academic assessments</b> within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s <b>academic content standards</b> and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.	Evidence meeting requirements is located in the December 2017 submission.	
<p><b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALASKA**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>If the State administers any of its assessments in multiple versions within a subject area (e.g., online versus paper-based delivery; <b>or a native language version of the academic content assessment</b>), grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>• Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<p><b>FILE 135</b> Differences in 2019 Student Measures from Computer and Paper-Based Testing with Propensity Score Matching</p> <p><b>For PEAKS grades 3-8 and HS:</b>  <b>-Evidence of a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments.</b>  <b>-Evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results (e.g., additional comparability studies to determine if there are mode effects).</b></p>	<p>The evidence presented in File 135 indicates that there were score differences between matched students who took the assessment on paper vs. computer in the Spring of 2019. The magnitude of the effect size for the differences in means was small (between 0.2 and 0.5), but the differences cannot be attributed solely to the testing mode (p. 16).</p> <p>The peers suggest that additional analyses consider the performance level to estimate the impact on student performance and classification decisions.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.6 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 ALASKA**

**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>Evidence meeting requirements is located in the December 2017 submission.</p>	
<p><b>Section 4.7 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 ALASKA

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system. Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, the placement team under Section 504, or the individual or team designated by a district to make that decision under Title II of the ADA, as applicable, based on each student’s individual abilities and needs.</p> <p>If a State adopts alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and administers an alternate assessment aligned with those standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(1)(E) and (b)(2)(D), respectively, the State must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish guidelines for determining whether to assess a student with an AA-AAAS, including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A State definition of “students with the most significant cognitive disabilities” that addresses factors related to cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Provide information for IEP Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</li> </ul>	<p>Evidence meeting requirements is located in the December 2017 submission.</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 ALASKA**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provides a clear explanation of the differences between assessments aligned with grade-level academic achievement standards and those aligned with alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student's education resulting from taking an AA-AAAS, such as how participation in such assessments may delay or otherwise affect the student from completing the requirements for a regular high school diploma;</li> <li>• Ensure that parents of students assessed with an AA-AAAS are informed that their child's achievement will be measured based on alternate academic achievement standards;</li> <li>• Not preclude a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who takes an AA-AAAS from attempting to complete the requirements for a regular high school diploma; and</li> <li>• Promote, consistent with requirements under the IDEA, the involvement and progress of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in the general education curriculum that is based on the State's academic content standards</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALASKA**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>for the grade in which the student is enrolled; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop, disseminate information on, and promote the use of appropriate accommodations to ensure that a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who does not take an AA-AAAS participates in academic instruction and assessments for the grade in which the student is enrolled.</li> <li>• The State has in place and monitors implementation of guidelines for IEP teams to apply in determining, on a case-by-case basis, which students with the most significant cognitive disabilities will be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, if applicable. Such guidelines must be developed in accordance with 34 CFR § 200.6(d).<sup>2</sup></li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

<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 ALASKA**

**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>Evidence meeting requirements is located in the December 2017 submission.</p>	
<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 ALASKA**

**Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and ELs, including ELs with disabilities. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations, such as, interoperability with, and ability to use, assistive technology, are available to measure the <b><u>academic achievement</u></b> of students with disabilities.</li> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs;</li> <li>• Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> <li>• Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> <li>• Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny</li> </ul>	<p><b>FILE 136</b> January 2019 Participation Guidelines for Inclusion of Alaska Students in State Assessments, December 2017 List of approved accommodations- pages 8 -16.</p> <p><b>For all assessments:</b>  <b>-Evidence that accommodations do not alter the construct being measured and that they allow for meaningful interpretations of results and comparisons of scores for students who test with and without accommodations.</b>  <b>-Documentation of a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</b></p>	<p>The state provided Participation Guidelines that include a process for helping IEP teams select accommodations that do not alter the construct being measured and includes a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</p> <p>The peers suggest that the state provide additional support/resources to the IEP teams in selecting appropriate accommodations to ensure that the accommodations do not alter the construct. For example, the state should consider providing to IEP teams: additional training, a decision tree to aid in decision-making, or literature reviews by professional organizations detailing appropriate accommodations.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALASKA**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.		
<b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALASKA**

**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>FILE 121</b> Assessment Monitoring District Notification Letters</p> <p><b>FILE 122</b> Alaska Statewide Assessments Monitoring Guide 2019-2020</p> <p><b>FILE 123</b> Assessment Observation Form 2020</p> <p><b>FILE 124</b> Assessments Monitoring District Response From 2019</p> <p><b>FILE 125</b> Assessments Monitoring Schedule</p> <p><b>FILE 126</b> 2019-2020 Assessment Monitoring Presentation for Districts</p> <p><b>For all assessments: Evidence of State monitoring of the selection and administration of accommodations for students with disabilities and English learners.</b></p>	<p>The state has provided sufficient evidence for this Critical Element.</p>

**Section 5.4 Summary Statement**

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 ALASKA

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b><u>For academic content standards:</u></b></p> <p>The State formally adopted <b><u>challenging academic achievement standards</u></b> in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities;</li> <li>• The State applies its academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply;</li> </ul> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include:</p> <p>(1) at least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third for lower achievement; (2) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (3) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</p>	<p>Evidence meeting requirements is located in the December 2017 submission.</p>	
<p><b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALASKA

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALASKA**

**Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards.</u></b></li> </ul>	Evidence meeting requirements is located in the December 2017 submission.	
<p><b>Section 6.2 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 ALASKA

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b><u>For academic achievement standards:</u></b></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards and with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards such that a student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards (1) are aligned with the State’s challenging academic content standards for the grade in which a student is enrolled; (2) promote access to the general curriculum consistent with the IDEA; (3) reflect professional judgment as to the highest possible standards achievable for such students; (4) are designated in the IEP for each student for whom alternate academic achievement standards apply; and (5) are aligned to ensure that a student who meets the alternate academic achievement standards is on track to pursue</p>	<p>Please see DLM submission.</p> <p><b>FILE 110</b> CCSSO Review of Alaska ELA and Mathematics Standards.</p> <p><b>File 137</b> DLM 2014-2015 Technical Manual Year End</p> <p><b>For the DLM:</b>  <b>Evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards ensure that a student who meets these standards is on track to pursue post-secondary education or employment. The State educational agency should provide this evidence by December 15, 2020.</b></p>	<p>The state-provided evidence is insufficient to support that the alternate academic achievement standards ensure that a student who meets these standards is on track to pursue post-secondary education or employment.</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 ALASKA**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
postsecondary education or competitive integrated employment.		
<b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards ensure that a student who meets these standards is on track to pursue post-secondary education or employment. The State educational agency should provide this evidence by December 15, 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 ALASKA**

**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:</li> </ul>	<p><b>FILE 122</b> Alaska Statewide Assessments Monitoring Guide 2019-2020</p> <p><b>FILE 124</b> Assessments Monitoring District Response From 2019</p> <p><b>For all assessments: Evidence that the State ensures LEAs provide alternative formats of score reports, upon request.</b></p>	<p>The state must provide evidence that the State ensures LEAs provide alternative formats of score reports, upon request.</p>

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALASKA**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a <b><u>student’s academic achievement</u></b>;</li> <li>○ Report the <b><u>student’s academic achievement</u></b> in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards;</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific <b><u>academic needs of students</u></b>;</li> <li>○ Are provided in an understandable and uniform format;</li> <li>○ Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian;</li> <li>○ Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.</li> <li>● The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALASKA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state must provide evidence that the State ensures LEAs provide alternative formats of score reports, upon request.</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 ALASKA**

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

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

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

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALASKA**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>cognitive disabilities who may be assessed with an AA-AAAS.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The technical criteria established by the State in reviewing a locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment must ensure that the use of appropriate accommodations does not deny a student with a disability or an EL—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The opportunity to participate in the assessment; and</li> <li>• Any of the benefits from participation in the assessment that are afforded to students without disabilities or students who are not ELs.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 7.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALASKA**

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

**Academic Assessments**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALASKA**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is equivalent to or more rigorous than the statewide assessment, with respect to—               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The coverage of academic content;</li> <li>○ The difficulty of the assessment;</li> <li>○ The overall quality of the assessment; and</li> <li>○ Any other aspects of the assessment that the State may establish in its technical criteria;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Produces valid and reliable data on student academic achievement with respect to all high school students and each subgroup of high school students in the district that—               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Are comparable to student academic achievement data for all high school students and each subgroup of high school students produced by the statewide assessment at each academic achievement level;</li> <li>○ Are expressed in terms consistent with the State’s academic achievement standards; and</li> <li>○ Provide unbiased, rational, and consistent differentiation among schools within the State for the purpose of the State determined accountability system including calculating the Academic Achievement indicator and annually meaningfully differentiating between schools.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ALASKA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 7.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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