UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Molly Spearman
State Superintendent of Education
South Carolina Department of Education
1429 Senate Street
Columbia, SC 29201   August 13, 2020

Dear Superintendent Spearman:

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 South Carolina Department of Education (SCDE) to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in March 2020. Specifically, SCDE submitted evidence regarding its State assessments in reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics in grades 3-8, its science assessments in grades 4 and 6, its mathematics and science assessments in high school, and its alternate assessments for all grades in R/LA, mathematics, and science.

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

- General assessments in mathematics and R/LA for grades 3-8 (SC Ready): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- General assessments in science for grades 4 and 6 (South Carolina Palmetto Assessment of State Standards (SCPASS)): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- General assessments in mathematics and science for high school (End of Course Examination Program (EOCEP) Algebra I and Biology I): **Partially meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- Alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) for grades 3-8 and high school in R/LA, mathematics, and science (SC-Alt): **Partially meets requirements of the ESEA.**

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

Substantially meets requirements means that these assessments meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. Partially meet requirements means that these assessments do not meet a number of the requirements of the statute and regulations and/or the SCDE will need to provide substantial additional information to demonstrate it meets the requirements. The Department expects that the SCDE may not be able to submit all of the required information within one year. Because SCDE must submit substantial additional information, the Department will place a condition on the State's fiscal year 2020 Title I, Part A grant award. This condition will remain until the assessments have been determined to meet all requirements. If the outcome of the re-review by peers indicates full approval, then the condition will be removed. If adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action.

The specific list of items required for the SCDE to submit is enclosed with this letter. I request that the SCDE submit a plan within 30 days outlining when it will submit all required additional documentation for peer review. I recognize the unprecedented situation affecting you and your schools due to widespread and extended school closures caused by the novel coronavirus, COVID-19. As a result, if you need more than 30 days to submit your plan, please let my staff know at ESEA.Assessment@ed.gov. 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.

Sincerely,

/s/
Frank T. Brogan
Assistant Secretary
for Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Elizabeth Jones, Director of Assessment

Critical Elements Where Additional Evidence is Needed to Meet the Requirements for South Carolina's Assessment System

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards	For South Carolina's science content standards: • Evidence that the science standards are aligned with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards.
2.1 – Test Design and Development	For the SC Ready and the EOCEP: • Evidence that the State's test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the depth and breadth of the State's academic content standards for the grade that is being assessed and includes: • Processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State's academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills). This evidence should include a plan and timeline to address issues raised in the independent evaluation of the assessments. For the SCPASS: • Evidence of test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of the State's grade-level academic content standards and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results. • Evidence of processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State's academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills). For the SC-Alt assessments: • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of the State's grade-level academic content standards and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results.
2.2 – Item Development	For the SC Ready: • Evidence that the State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State's academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills. For the SCPASS and EOCEP: • Evidence that the State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State's academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills. For the SC-Alt assessments: • Evidence that the State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State's

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.
2.3 – Test Administration	For SCPASS, EOCEP, and SC-Alt: • Evidence that the State has established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy	For all assessments: • Evidence that procedures are in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information (e.g., vendor agreement or test administrator training).

3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	For the SC Ready:
	• Evidence provided for critical element 2.1 will address this critical element.
	
	For the SCPASS and EOCEP:
	• Evidence requested for critical element 2.1 will address this critical element.
	
	For the SC-Alt assessments:
	• Evidence that the assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State's academic content standards, including:
	  o 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.
	  o Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards.

3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes	For the SC Ready: • Evidence provided for critical element 2.1 will address this critical element. For the SCPASS, EOCEP and SC-Alt: • Adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State's academic content standards.
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	For the SC Ready: • Adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State's academic content standards. For the EOCEP: • Adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State's academic content standards.
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	For the SC Ready and the EOCEP: • Adequate validity evidence that the State's assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.
4.1 – Reliability	For the SCPASS, EOCEP and the SC-Alt: • Evidence of adequate reliability for its assessments for measures of reliability for the State's student population overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. For the SCPASS and EOCEP: • Evidence of overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State's assessments domain or component sub-tests, as applicable.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
4.2 – Fairness and accessibility	For the EOCEP: • Evidence that 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 (e.g., response to DIF analysis). For the SC-Alt: • Evidence that the assessments were developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL). • Evidence that 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 (e.g., DIF analysis).
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum	For the SCPASS and the EOCEP: • Evidence that the State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for academic assessments, including performance for high- and low-achieving students. For the SC-Alt: • Evidence that the assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for academic assessments, including performance for high- and low-achieving students.
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	For the EOCEP: • Evidence that the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State's academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years. For the SC-Alt: • Evidence that all forms adequately represent the State's academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years (e.g., comparability across years of the computer adaptive test (CAT) program).
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	For the SCPASS, EOCEP and SC-Alt: • Evidence that the State followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments.
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	For the SCPASS and EOCEP: • Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State's website.
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	For the SC-Alt: • Evidence that the State does not preclude a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who takes an AA-AAAS from attempting to complete the requirements for a regular high school diploma.
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting	For the SCPASS: • Evidence that the State used a technically sound method and process for setting academic achievement standards (e.g., evidence that the policy adjustments did not impact the validity of the standard setting process). For the EOCEP: • Evidence that the State used a technically sound method and process for setting academic achievement standards (e.g., clarification regarding the number of performance levels and a plan to address concerns raised by participant surveys).

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	For the SCPASS: • Evidence that 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. For the SC-Alt: • Evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards are aligned to ensure that a student who meets the alternate academic achievement standards is on track to pursue postsecondary education or competitive integrated employment.
6.4 – Reporting	For the SC Ready: • Evidence that, upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, reports are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent (e.g., how this information is communicated to parents). For the SCPASS and EOCEP: • Evidence that the reports are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian; and upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent. For the SC-Alt: • Evidence that the reports are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian; and upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent. • Evidence of a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.

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

Contents

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

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

SECTION 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
For academic content standards: 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.	AL1.1A State Board approval for science standards AL1.1B State Board approval for math & ELA AL1.1C Superintendent's press release for new ELA & Math standards State's notes The State of South Carolina approved state academic content standards for science on January 8, 2014, math and ELA on March 11, 2015: Evidence of the adoption of the State's academic content standards: • State Board of Education minutes, memo announcing formal approval from the Chief State School Officer to districts, legislation, regulations, or other binding approval of a particular set of academic content standards (AL 1.1A, pg. 5, AL 1.1B, pg 7-8). Documentation that the State's academic content standards apply to all public elementary and secondary school students in the State can be found in the state superintendent's press release (AL 1.1C).	AL1.1A shows board approval of the 2014 science standards AL1.1B shows board approval of the math and ELA standards No additional information is required at this time. The state meets the criteria for this element.
Section 1.1 Summary Statement		
_X_ No additional evidence is required		

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

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
For academic content standards: 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.	AL1.2 A Certification letter from the University of South Carolina AL1.2 B Certification letter from Lander University AL1.2 C Certification letter from Clemson University AL1.2 D Certification letter from Coastal Carolina University AL1.2E Tool used for standards writing AL1.2F Standards writing committee members demographic AL1.2G Summary Report State's notes Multiple institutes of higher learning reviewed the state of South Carolina content standards to ensure they were rigorous and build toward college and career readiness. Evidence that the State's academic content standards are aligned with entrance requirement for public higher education: • Evidence is found in certifications by state colleges and universities following their review of the standards (AL1.2A-D). Evidence specifically includes letters from the four largest state colleges including University of South Carolina, Lander University, Clemson University, and Coastal Carolina University. Rigor and coherence within and across grades was also ensured, during the standards writing process a committee was used. The tools and training they received are included, find the rubric used by participants (AL1.2E), by multiple reviews by carefully	AL1.2.F shows a website screenshot that describes the involvement of community, parents, business leaders, and educators in the standards development for math and ELA. No similar evidence was found for Science. Peers could not find detailed documentation of the strategies used to ensure the standards adequately specified what students should know and be able to do, nor was evidence found of what feedback the diverse stakeholder group found. Peer review guidance suggests reports of external reviews or summaries of reviews by state educators. The state provides letters of support for the academic content standards (English and math). No similar evidence was found for Science.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	chosen and well-qualified committees of educators and content area experts, find the committee member demographics (AL1.2F) and by extensive reviews and feedback from general public stakeholders (Summary Report AL1.2G, pg 5). An independent alignment study is being planned for Summer 2020.	

Section 1.2 Summary Statement

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

- Evidence of the strategies used to ensure the standards adequately specified what students should know and be able to do.
- The state needs to provide letters of support as they apply to the alternate assessment.
- Evidence that science is aligned to entrance requirements for credit-bearing institutions.

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

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
The State's assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments aligned with **grade-level academic achievement standards** or alternate academic achievement standards in: • Reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 9-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). AND The State's **academic content assessments** must be the same assessments administered to all students in the tested grades, with the following exceptions: • Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may take an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards. • A State may permit an LEA to administer a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in lieu of the State high school assessment if certain conditions are met. • A State that administers an end-of-course high school mathematics assessment may exempt an 8th grade student from the mathematics assessment typically administered in	AL1.3A Assessment Updates AL1.3B Assessment Schedule 2018-2019 AL1.3C A screen shot of Section 59-18-310(B)(1), the real time document can be found at: https://www.scstatehouse.gov/code/t59c018.php AL1.3D Section 59-18-325(3) AL1.3E Age vs. Grade Memorandum	Requirements for the South Carolina statewide assessments are delineated in the South Carolina Code of Laws. The current State code requires assessment in science in grades 4, 6, and high school. Alternate science assessments are provided for students who qualify to participate. No additional evidence is needed.

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

eighth grade and allow the student to take the State end-of-course mathematics test instead. • 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.		
Section 1.3 Summary Statement		
__x_ No additional evidence is required		

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

8

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
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. • For students with disabilities, policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including those children with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system; • For ELs: ○ Policies state that all ELs must be included in all aspects of the content assessment system, unless the State has chosen the statutory option for recently arrived ELs under which such ELs are exempt from one administration of its reading/language arts assessment. ○ If a State has developed native language assessments for ELs in R/LA, ELs must be assessed in R/LA in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except, if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native	AL1.4A Screen shot of Section 59-18-320(B), full document can be found at: https://www.scstatehouse.gov/ code/t59c018.php AL1.4B Guidance for IEP Teams on Determining Participation in the SC-Alt. AL1.4C Test Administrator Manual for Alternate Assessment AL1.4D Accessibility Support Document AL1.4E Section 1-1-696. Official State language. South Carolina includes all students in assessment. A district may not exclude any student group or subset of a group. Supporting documentation can be found: • Legislation: a screen shot of Section 59-18-320(B) is provided and the link for the full legislation (AL1.4A) • Procedures: South Carolina explicitly outlines Eligibility Criteria and the Eligibility Descriptors for participating in the alternate assessment through the Guidance for IEP Teams on Determining Participation in the SC-Alt (AL1.4B, pgs 3-6) • Test Administration Manual (AL1.4C pg 9) • Accessibility Support Document: (AL1.4D, pgs 14 and 17) South Carolina is an English only state. No assessments are developed in a language other than English. As found in AL1.4E.	South Carolina provided evidence that all students are required to be included in Statewide assessments, including those students who qualify for the alternate assessment. The State has an explicit policy that students with disabilities who are placed by districts or other public agencies in private or nonpublic schools or state-operated programs must participate in statewide and districtwide assessments and must be tested by the home school district. The State requires that all ELs must be included in all aspects of the Statewide assessment system. These policies are clearly communicated to schools.

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

language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years. ○ 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.		

Section 1.4 Summary Statement
x   No additional evidence is required

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

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
If the State has developed or amended challenging **academic** standards and assessments, the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with: • State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education). • Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas). • Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State. • Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents.	AL1.5A Prioritization meeting sign in sheet AL1.5B SC-Alt Technical Report 2018-2019 AL1.5C Performance level descriptors (PLD) Stakeholder feedback request AL1.5D Credential academic strategic planning document CE1.5E Credential proposed plan CE1.5F Credential notes CE1.5G Credential timeline of meetings	Department staff determined that South Carolina adopted science standards in 2014 and mathematics and R/LA standards in March 2015. This critical element is therefore not applicable.
Section 1.5 Summary Statement		
x No additional evidence is required		

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

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
The State's test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to **the depth and breadth of the State's academic content standards** for the grade that is being assessed and includes: • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of **the State's grade-level academic content standards** and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results. • Processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in **the State's academic content standards,** reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills). • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design	AL2.1A Education Accountability Act AL2.1B SC-Alt ELA blueprints AL2.1C SC-Alt math blueprints AL2.1D SC-Alt science blueprints AL2.1E AIR technical proposal AL2.1F South Carolina Cognitive Laboratory Report AL2.1G Math support guide AL2.1H ELA support guide AL2.1I Science prioritized standards and support guide AL2.1J Math prioritized standards AL2.1K ELA prioritized standards AL1.5B SC-Alt Technical Report 2018-2019 State's notes For the State's AA-AAAS: • Education Accountability Act (AL 2.1A) • The prioritized standards informed the development of the test blueprints. Each of the prioritized standards were included in the blueprints. Test blueprints can be found in (AL 2.1B-D) • Language from contract(s) for the State's assessments Test Design in AIR Technical Proposal (AL 2.1E, pg. 6-17) • South Carolina completed cognitive labs in 2018, results can be found in the South Carolina Cognitive Laboratory Report (AL2.1F pgs 5-14)	2.1F (Cognitive Labs) provided information about the cognitive processing that this student population uses. The narrative shows the limits of traditional cognitive labs when used for alternate assessments. These students clearly were not capable of discussing their own cognitive processing. Teacher surveys provided some additional insights, but it was clear from those surveys that the SC alternate assessment provides limited measurement of what the most significantly cognitively disabled students know and can do. This is not a criticism of the SC tests, in particular, it merely confirms the pattern seen in such tests of this population across states. The technical proposal does not provide adequate information on the implementation of item complexity. Peers could not find any information on administration procedures, including routing and stop rules.

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

and intended uses and interpretations of results. • If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the student is enrolled and uses that determination for all reporting. • If the State administers a content assessment that includes portfolios, such assessment may be partially administered through a portfolio but may not be *entirely* administered through a portfolio.	• South Carolina developed support guides for each subject and the prioritized standards. They can be found in (AL2.1G-I). Each support guide includes the prioritized standard and performance level descriptors, instructional activities, and links for resources. • The prioritized standards for each subject are in AL2.1I-K. The evidence crosswalks each prioritized standard with the South Carolina College and Career Ready Standards. The South Carolina technical manual includes all details on test design and development in AL1.5B pgs 69-75.	

Section 2.1 Summary Statement
__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • The state must provide evidence for administration procedures including routing and starting and stopping rules for computer adaptive tests.

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

Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to: • Assess student achievement based on the **State's academic content standards** in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.	AL2.2A Style Guide AL2.2B Content and Fairness Committee AL2.1E AIR technical proposal AL1.5B SC-Alt Technical Report 2018-2019 AL2.1F South Carolina Cognitive Laboratories Report State's notes The development process is explained in detail in (AL 2.1 E, pg. 13-15). An abbreviated explanation: It begins with establishing development targets and moves to item development and items are developed according to the Style Guide (AL2.2A), includes multiple rounds of reviews internally with the contractor and SCDE, and all the accepted items are then taken to a stakeholder Content and Fairness Committee review (AL2.2B). After the Content and Fairness Committee makes its recommendations, the SCDE and AIR go through a final edit resolution. • The content and cognitive process was assessed during Cognitive Labs. Information can be found AL2.1F pg. 5-14 • The South Carolina Technical Manual (AL1.5B pgs 74-88) includes all information on item development and the item data review process following development and field-testing.	2.2B is only a very brief description of panelists included in one convening of a Content and Fairness Committee. 1.5B, pp. 76- 82 included discussion of item review, and specific research on the suitability of new TEI types for potential use on state tests. The cognitive labs used for this purpose resulted in exclusion of certain item types. The item development flow chart on p. 78 and following narrative indicates that Content and Fairness Committees described in 2.2B convene annually to review newly-developed test items. 1.5B, pp. 87- 97 describe test data reviews for suitability for use in scoring. Overall, test difficulty is somewhat higher than student ability across all grades and subjects. AL2.1E describes processes that the contractor intended to use for the development of items. It is important to understand how those intentions are currently being implemented, including details of how the content is assessed in a cognitively appropriate manner. The state should also provide evidence of field tests. Peers could not find evidence of item writer qualifications, test specifications, or item development guidance. Only limited information was found regarding guidance for item writers and peers found no evidence of item writer training. Peers were unable to find evidence of Content and Fairness committee member membership and qualifications. Peers were unable to locate Content and Fairness committee recommendations.

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

		Peers found no evidence of concrete plans for a study of alignment.

Section 2.2 Summary Statement

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

- The state should provide information on the qualifications and membership of the Content and Fairness Committee as well as the committee recommendations.
- The state should provide evidence related to item development such as an item development manual or item specifications.
- The state should provide evidence of the field test and procedures used to evaluate field test data.
- Evidence of item writer qualifications and training should be provided.
- The state should provide evidence of a plan to study alignment.

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

Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State: • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.	AL2.3A DTC-Alt training Power Point AL2.3B DTC-Alt training Power Point from Breakout session AL2.3C DTC-Alt Agenda AL2.3D DTC-Alt Sign-in Sheet AL2.3E District Technology training Power Point AL2.3F SC-Alt TIDE user guide AL2.3G TA Training Module Storyboard 1 AL2.3H TA Training Module Storyboard 2 AL2.3I TA Training Module Storyboard 3 AL2.3J TA Training Module Storyboard 4 AL2.3K Accessibility and Test Security Training Powerpoint AL2.3L Accessibility and Test Security Training Sign in Sheet AL1.4C Test Administration Manual AL1.5B SC-Alt Technical Report 2018-2019 State's Notes The assessment is administered through the Test Information Distribution Engine (TIDE) For Alternate Assessment. South Carolina provides extensive training on policies, procedures, and test administration: **Communication of policies and procedures** • Policies and procedures for a standardized test administration of SC-Alt are provided in in the Test Administration Manual (AL1.4C, pg., 33)	Peers could not find evidence of contingency plans for managing technology challenges or disruptions. 2.3E contains information that computer-based testing system requirements were communicated to districts. Peers would also expect to find this in 2.3F – TIDE User Guide. 2.3E Slide 17 notes refer to *System Requirements for Online Testing,* but peers could not find that document in the evidence.

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

	• Districts and schools receive answers to policy and procedural questions via e-mail and phone calls to the Office of Assessment. A person is designated as the program coordinator for SC-Alt and the contractor provides at least three other staff for responding to questions and issues raised by educators across the state via the SC-Alt helpdesk. District test coordinators for Alternate Assessment receive a weekly email with updates beginning three months prior to the testing window, during the testing window, and concluding three months after the testing window. • In addition to memorandums and email blasts to District Test Coordinators for Alternate Assessment, the South Carolina communicates information about the required assessments to Alternate Assessment Test Administrators by weekly announcements on the SC-Alt Portal (https://sc-alt.portal.airast.org/). **Training** • In addition to the manuals, memos, and list-serv updates, District Test Coordinators for Alternate Assessment received face to face training by SCDE and AIR staff (December 12, 2018). The PowerPoints, agenda, and sign-in sheet from this training is located in evidence as AL2.3A-AL2.3D. • District Technology Coordinators received training via a statewide Web-Ex (November 17, 2018). The PowerPoint from this training is located in evidence as AL 2.3E. There is a TIDE user's guide for the online system located in evidence as AL 2.3F. • Test Administrators were required to participate in four training modules and take a certification quiz prior to administering the assessment (AL1.4C, pg 7). The storyboards	

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

| | for the modules are provided as evidence as AL2.3G-AL2.3J. TAs were also trained in district policies and procedures by their District Test Coordinator for Alternate Assessment.
• The SC-Alt technical report AL1.5B (pages 13-15) includes further details.
Districts were trained through 16 regional trainings of accessibility features and test security (AL2.3K; AL2.3L) | |

| **Section 2.3 Summary Statement** |
| __X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
 • The state must provide evidence regarding contingency plans in the event of technology challenges or large scale disruptions. |

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

18

Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. Monitoring of test administration should be demonstrated for all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS.	AL2.4A Procedures for Monitoring Students who take the Alternate Assessment AL2.4B Dorchester 4 Monitoring Letter AL2.4C Dorchester 2 Monitoring Letter AL2.4D Dorchester 2 Follow up letter AL2.4E Dates for Monitoring the 1% AL2.4F SC-Alt Monitor Training	South Carolina provided evidence that it conducted assessment monitoring of a sample of districts in spring 2019 and provided a training for monitors. SCDE also provided information about how it monitors districts that are testing over 1.0 percent of students with the alternate assessment. However, the training for monitors is not specific as to what is reviewed by the monitors. No checklists or protocols were provided or mentioned in the training.
Section 2.4 Summary Statement		
_x__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence that the State adequately monitors the administration of its alternate assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.		

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

Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
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: • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State's assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. • Application of test security procedures to all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS.	AL2.5A Comprehensive test security system AL2.5B Monitoring Form AL2.5C Test Security Violations and Students with Disabilities AL2.5D Test Security Action Plan AL1.4C Test Administration Manual AL1.5B SC-Alt Technical Report 2018-2019 State's notes The state has a law, regulation, policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities. • AL 2.5A, the Comprehensive Test Security System, provides protocol and procedures. • Included in AL2.5A, is the test security law (page 3) and test security regulation (page 4). The law and regulation define violations and consequences for violations, including possible fines and incarceration. • Documentation concerning selecting sites to be monitored is provided on page 10 in document AL2.5A. • Evidence that monitors are trained is provided in AL2.5A (pages 10-13). Monitors use document AL2.5B to document the visits. • Procedures are provided in documents AL2.5C (Reporting Test Security Violations) when violations do occur. District Test Coordinators submit Test Security Action information on the Test Security Action form (AL2.5D) Because the SC-Alt is an individual administration, the SCDE requires local monitors to observe each	Peers noted that the state provides monitors for all administrations. This should be commended. Page 29 of AL1.5B describes FERPA compliance but does not specify the minimum number of students per group for reporting.

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

administration to ensure that all procedures were followed and the test was administered with fidelity. Once the test has been administered the TA and monitor must sign the Test Administration Security Affidavit (AL1.4C, pg. 23-24)

The South Carolina Technical Manual includes specifics on test security on pages 35-40 AL1.5B. The SC-Alt technical report (AL1.5B pages 20-25) provides further details on internal test security.

State's notes

AIR's Technical Proposal lists the policies and procedures for protecting integrity and confidentiality of the test materials and data. See AL2.1E, pg. 39-42, 77-80, Appendix D.

The South Carolina Technical Manual (AL1.5B) includes specifics on protecting data integrity and privacy as outlined in pages 25-28. This includes test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results; student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality; and 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.

Guidelines for districts and schools can be found online at: https://ed.sc.gov/data/data-security-privacy/policies/. Policies and procedures developed by the SCDE concerning security include the following documents and are provided as evidence:
- Access Control Policy (AL2.6A);
- Acquisitions Development & Maintenance Policy (AL2.6B);
- Asset Management Policy (AL2.6C);

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

	- Business Continuity Management Policy (AL2.6D); - Data Protection and Privacy Policy (AL2.6E); - Information Security Program Master Policy (AL2.6F); - IT Compliance (AL2.6G); - IT Risk Strategy Policy (AL2.6H); - Mobile Security Policy (AL2.6I); - Physical and Environmental Security Policy (AL2.6J); - Risk Management Policy (AL2.6K); and Threat Vulnerability Management Policy (AL2.6L).	
Section 2.5 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

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
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: • To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.	AL2.1E AIR Technical Proposal AL1.5B SC-Alt Technical Report 2018-2019 AL2.6A Access Control Policy AL2.6B Acquisitions Development & Maintenance Policy AL2.6C Asset Management Policy AL2.6D Business Continuity Management Policy AL2.6E Data Protection and Privacy Policy AL2.6F Information Security Program Master Policy AL2.6G IT Compliance Policy AL2.6H IT Risk Strategy Policy AL2.6I Mobile Security Policy AL2.6J Physical and Environmental Security Policy AL2.6K Risk Management Policy AL2.6L Threat Vulnerability Management Policy State's notes AIR's Technical Proposal lists the policies and procedures for protecting integrity and confidentiality of the test materials and data. See AL2.1E, pg. 39-42, 77-80, Appendix D. The South Carolina Technical Manual (AL1.5B) includes specifics on protecting data integrity and privacy as outlined in pages 25-28. This includes test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results; student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality; and personally	The state specifics on polices related protecting data integrity and privacy, including test-related data, test administration, scoring, storage and use of results; student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality; and personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, <u>including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups</u>. Regarding the underlined claim, peers could find no definitive information on the minimum cell size policy, however, the Technical Report does give some indication of suppression rules in the sub-group tables beginning on p. 46, with a footnote that n<10 is the threshold. The state should clarify suppression rules. The state provided substantial numbers of policies, but peers found no procedures. There is no evidence provided that these policies are being systematically implemented.

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

	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. Guidelines for districts and schools can be found online at: https://ed.sc.gov/data/data-security-privacy/policies/. Policies and procedures developed by the SCDE concerning security include the following documents and are provided as evidence: • Access Control Policy (AL2.6A); • Acquisitions Development & Maintenance Policy (AL2.6B); • Asset Management Policy (AL2.6C); • Business Continuity Management Policy (AL2.6D); • Data Protection and Privacy Policy (AL2.6E); • Information Security Program Master Policy (AL2.6F); • IT Compliance (AL2.6G); • IT Risk Strategy Policy (AL2.6H); • Mobile Security Policy (AL2.6I); • Physical and Environmental Security Policy (AL2.6J); • Risk Management Policy (AL2.6K); and Threat Vulnerability Management Policy (AL2.6L).	
Section 2.6 Summary Statement		
__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • The state must provide information on the procedures that have been developed to implement security policies provided in the state's evidence to ensure data integrity and privacy.		

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

SECTION 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
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: **The State's academic assessments** measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State's academic content standards, including: • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State's assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards; • If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards and administers alternate assessments aligned with those standards, the assessments show adequate alignment to the State's academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content	AL1.5B SC-Alt Technical Report 2018-2019 AL2.1B SC-Alt ELA blueprints AL2.1C SC-Alt math blueprints AL2.1D SC-Alt science blueprints AL2.1F South Carolina Cognitive Laboratories Report State's notes Evidence to document adequate overall validity evidence for South Carolina's AA-AAAS includes: • a chapter on validity from the most current technical report (AL1.5B, pages 88-116) • Test blueprints (AL2.1B-D) to show the balance of content, and the depth and breadth of the content • South Carolina Cognitive Laboratories (AL2.1F) to show the cognitive complexity Each test item is written to its intended content standard. No items for SC–Alt measure more than one standard. In each of the item-review processes—such as group review, special education review, senior review, SCDE review, and Content and Fairness Committee review described in AL2.2. Each item is examined for its content accuracy and alignment. If an item is found not to align with the intended content standards, the item is either rejected or modified so that alignment can be established.	The percentage of students performing at the lowest achievement level (Foundational) is as high as 41% (Grade 4 Mathematics, p. 45, 1.5B) in the aggregate, and as high as 80%, for example, for Hearing Handicapped (Grade 4 ELA, p. 47, 1.5B). Given the outcomes from the cognitive labs, there may be a significant number of students for whom this assessment does not provide an adequate measure of learning. This is also borne out in the graphs of Student Ability–Item Difficulty Distributions starting on p. 94 of 1.5B, as well as SEM curves beginning on p. 133 that show error tends to be minimized nearer the upper cut points. As previously noted, this may be remediated somewhat by targeted item development, especially given that this is a relatively new assessment with an item pool that is not deep enough to measure accurately across all ability levels. The state needs to provide evidence that the test adequately matches the test blueprints. Peers could not find an alignment study between the alt assessment and the general academic content standards.

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

and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.		

Section 3.1 Summary Statement

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
- The state needs to provide evidence that the test adequately matches the test blueprints
- The state needs to provide evidence of alignment between the alternate assessment and general content standards.

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

Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap: **the intended cognitive processes** appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State's academic content standards.	AL2.1F South Carolina Cognitive Laboratories Report AL1.5B SC-Alt Technical Report 2018-2019 State's notes Validity evidence that shows levels of validity generally considered adequate by professional judgement regarding such assessments, such as: • Results of cognitive labs exploring student performance on items that show the items require demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (AL2.1F) A summary of the cognitive labs can also be found in the South Carolina Technical Manual (AL1.5B pages 106-107)	See comments for 3.1 and 2.1 regarding Cognitive Labs. Peers found it difficult to determine from AL2.1F if sufficient information was gathered about the degree to which the items reflected the cognitive processes intended in the standards. (p.6-14).

Section 3.2 Summary Statement
__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • The state must provide additional evidence that the assessment taps <u>intended</u> cognitive processes.

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

Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State's **academic content standards**.	AL1.5B SC-Alt Technical Report 2018-2019 State's notes Validity evidence based on the internal structure of the assessments that shows levels of validity generally consistent with expectations of current professional standards, such as: Reports of analyses of the internal structure of the assessments (e.g., tables of item correlations) that show the extent to which the interrelationships among sub-scores are consistent with the State's academic or extended academic content standards for relevant student groups (AL1.5B, pages 109-113).	The state should consider conducting additional dimensionality analyses to look for underlying constructs in the assessment.

Section 3.3 Summary Statement
_X__ No additional evidence is required

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

28

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.	AL1.5B SC-Alt Technical Report 2018-2019 (pg. 113-118) AL 3.4A SC-Alt External Validity State's notes Measuring the predictive validity of the test requires a second, independent measure of a similar construct. The SCDE used the Learner Characteristic Inventory (LCI) to document validity evidence based on other variables. The SCDE required TAs to complete the LCI before the administration of subject tests for each student. The results of the comparisons are provided in CE3.4 A SC-Alt External Validity. A summary of the evidence: • Using the LCI does correlate significantly with $p < 0.00001$ and can be used as a predictor of a student's overall score on an academic assessment. It also provides supporting validity evidence for the assessments, in that the assessment itself reflects the range of student skills in an academic content area with the higher scores correlating with an independent judgement of a higher student skill level. • A summary is also found in AL1.5B pages. 113-118. The SCDE has added additional questions to the LCI about the research based predictors of successful post-secondary outcomes from the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition. The SCDE plans to correlate the responses on the LCI to the performance levels of the student on the SC-Alt.	3.4A offers a study on LCIs correlated to assessment scores. While the summary says that the correlation is "significant", the summary in 1.5B describes it as "moderate". Peers would like to see how additional LCI questions will be developed and implemented to potentially strengthen correlations. Once those have been completed, the LCI should be resubmitted for peer review. See the above notes about DIF and test construction.
Section 3.4 Summary Statement		
_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide 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.

- The state needs to submit the revised LCI relationship for review once complete.

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

30

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

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**.
	AL1.5B SC-Alt Technical Report 2018-2019
	
	Evidence to support this critical element for the State's Assessment includes:
	• A chapter on reliability in the technical report for the State's assessments that shows reliability evidence (AL1.5B, pages 119-131)
	• For the State's AA-AAAS, evidence that shows levels of reliability generally considered adequate by professional judgement regarding such assessments including documentation such as:
	    ○ Internal consistency coefficients that show that item scores are related to the student's overall score (AL 1.5B, pg. 126-127)
	    ○ Correlations of item responses to student proficiency level classifications, CE1.5B, pg. 126-131).
		The reliability of classification is addressed on pp. 136-139, and reliability of strand scores on pp. 140-143. Peers note individual strand score reliabilities appeared low. Peers recommend the state examine how these might be improved.
		
		Peers were unable to find evidence reliability by student subgroup. The state must conduct an analysis by subgroup.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • The state must provide reliability by subgroup.		

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

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
For all State academic assessments, assessments should be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (see definition[1]). **For academic content assessments**, the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in their design, development and analysis.	AL1.5B SC-Alt Technical Report 2018-2019 State's notes Documentation describing approaches used in the design and development of the State's assessments (e.g., principles of UDL, language simplification, accessibility tools and features embedded in test items or available as an accompaniment to the item can be found in the technical manual: AL1.5B, pg. 69-89 Documentation of the approaches used for developing items (AL1.5B, Figure 7, pg. 70) Descriptions of the processes used to write, review, and evaluate items for bias and sensitivity (AL1.5B, pg. 72-73) Documentation of steps the State has taken in the analysis of its assessments, such as results of empirical analyses that identify possible bias or inconsistent interpretations of results across student groups (AL1.5B, pg. 31-61, pgs. 160-166).	1.5B, pp. 76- 82 included discussion of the process to write, review, and evaluate items for bias and sensitivity The cognitive labs used for this purpose resulted in the exclusion of certain item types. Peers were unable to find results of DIF analyses. The state must provide this information. Item development is documented in AL1.5B (p. 78-98) Universal design is discussed on pages 19-20 and 80. This description provides a list of tools that students can use (embedded and nonembedded) and states that UD is used during item review. Page 78 provides a figure for item development but there is no indication of how UD is used during development. There is also a list of review criteria on page 80-81. Peers were unable to find the item development manual. Pages 46- 70 show student performance by subgroup. The state might consider conducting reliability analysis by subgroup (either CTT, Rasch, classification consistency).
Section 4.2 Summary Statement		

__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
   • The state must provide results of DIF analyses.
   • The state must provide evidence of how UD is used in item development.		

---

[1] see page 28 of "*A State's Guide to the U.S. Department of Education's Assessment Peer Review Process*", September 24, 2018 available at: www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html

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

Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for **academic assessments**, including performance for high- and low-achieving students.	AL1.5B SC-Alt Technical Report 2018-2019 State's notes: Evidence of an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum Table of conditional standard errors of measurement at various points along the score range (AL 1.5B, pg. 119-131)	Peers noted that the percentage of students performing at the lowest achievement level (Foundational) is as high as 41% (Grade 4 Mathematics, p. 45, 1.5B) in the aggregate, and as high as 80%, for example, for Hearing Handicapped (Grade 4 ELA, p. 47, 1.5B). Given above and the outcomes from the cognitive labs, peers believe there may be a significant number of students for whom this assessment does not provide an adequate measure of learning. This is also borne out in the graphs of Student Ability–Item Difficulty Distributions starting on p. 94 of 1.5B, as well as SEM curves beginning on p. 133 that show error tends to be minimized nearer the upper cut points. As previously noted, this may be remediated somewhat by targeted item development, especially given that this is a relatively new assessment with an item pool that is <u>not deep enough</u> to measure accurately across all ability levels and might be producing a floor effect. Peers recommend the state examine information of student ability vs. item difficulty, eg., Rasch Person-item maps.
Section 4.3 Summary Statement		

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
- The state must provide additional evidence that the assessment provides appropriate performance information for students at the lowest end of the performance continuum.

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

34

Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State's **academic achievement standards**.	AL1.5B SC-Alt Technical Report 2018-2019 State's notes A chapter on scoring in the technical report (pages 132-136) describes scoring procedures, including: • Procedures for constructing scales used for reporting scores and the rationale for these procedures (AL1.5B, pg. 132-134) • Scale, measurement error, and descriptions of test scores (AL1.5B, pg. 135)	The state meets the requirement of this CE.
Section 4.4 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required		

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

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 **academic assessments** within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State's **academic content standards** and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.	State's notes Multiple test forms were not used in the 2018 administration of the SC-Alt.	The state indicates that multiple test forms were not used in the 2018 administration of the SC-Alt. However, peer review requires that CAT programs document year-to-year changes in the item pools or algorithms to support comparability across years. This is a relatively new assessment system, and the state discusses the item pool throughout Section 4 of the Technical Report (1,5B, beginning on p. 76), recognizing the need to develop items to certain benchmarks with few or no items. Peers were unable to find the state's plans to address item rejection rates for mathematics.

Section 4.5 Summary Statement

__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
- The state must provide evidence that the CAT program documents year-to-year changes in the item pools or algorithms to support comparability across years.

Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
If the State administers any of its assessments in multiple versions within a subject area (e.g., online versus paper-based delivery; **or a native language version of the academic content assessment**), grade level, or school year, the State: • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.	AL1.5B SC-Alt Technical Report 2018-2019 State's notes Evidence to support this critical element for South Carolina's assessment includes: • Documentation that the State followed design, development and test administration procedures to ensure comparable results across different versions of the assessment, such as a description of the processes in the technical report for the assessments or a separate version (AL1.5B, pg. 131) For SC–Alt, AIR and the SCDE provided a fixed-form test as an accommodation for students with access limitation. The fixed-form tests were also administered online. Physical manipulatives were provided for the fixed-form tests in place of the on-screen answer options. Students used the manipulatives to indicate an answer choice, which was then selected on the screen by the Test Administrator.	1.5B, p. 35 shows the number of students who took online vs paper tests. The n-sizes for those taking the paper-based version are very small, with the highest being n=11. It would be difficult to draw any conclusions about the efficacy of such an administration based on those numbers. Peers could not find information regarding how students were assigned fixed-form vs CAT tests. This is touched on somewhat in 4.7A, p. 2, but not found in the evidence. The peers could not find evidence regarding devices used in the state for administering alternate assessments, nor evidence regarding device comparability. The state did not address this component of CE 4.6 in its Submission Index. This is also touched on in 4.7A, p. 2, but not found in the evidence. The peers did not find evidence of comparability between CAT and paper-based forms.

Section 4.6 Summary Statement
__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • The state needs to provide evidence to demonstrate that the provision of substitute forms provides comparable meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. • The state needs to provide evidence of device comparability.

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

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
The State: • Has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments), and • Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State's website.	AL2.1E AIR Technical Proposal AL4.7A TAC Winter with ALT Review AL4.7B TAC FALL with ALT Review AL4.7C TAC Members AL1.5B SC-Alt Technical Report 2018-2019 State's notes Documentation that South Carolina has established and implemented clear and technically sound criteria for analyses of its assessment system, such as: • Sections from the State's assessment contract that specify the State's expectations for analyses to provide evidence of validity, reliability, and fairness; for independent studies of alignment and comparability, as appropriate; and for requirements for technical reports for the assessments and the content of such reports applicable to each administration of the assessment (AL2.1E, pg. 66) Documentation of the State's system for monitoring and improving, as needed, the on-going quality of its assessment system, such as: • Documentation of regular internal and external technical review of components of the State's assessment system, minutes from TAC meetings (AL4.7A TAC Winter with ALT Review and AL4.7B TAC FALL with ALT Review) , and documentation of roles and responsibilities of TAC members (AL4.7C TAC Members) • Quality assurance procedures are described in the Technical Report (AL1.5B, pg. 155-158)	Peers were able to locate the technical report on the state's website. Peers suggest the state document procedures that outline how feedback from technical results and TAC recommendations are incorporated in a cycle of improvement.

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

	The SC-Alt Technical Report is posted on the SC-AltPortal.	
Section 4.7 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

39

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
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. 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: • Establish guidelines for determining whether to assess a student with an AA-AAAS, including: o A State definition of "students with the most significant cognitive disabilities" that addresses factors related to cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior; • Provide information for IEP Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:	AL5.1A Testing All Students Memorandum AL5.1B Screenshot of Assessment section of IEP system AL5.1C Special Education Process Guide for South Carolina AL1.4B Guidance for IEP Teams on Determining Participation in the SC-Alt. AL1.4C Test Administration Manual for Alternate Assessment AL1.4D Accessibility Support Document AL2.4A Procedures for Monitoring Students taking the Alternate Assessment State's notes Documentation that the State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all students with disabilities, such as: • Guidance for IEP Teams and memo with testing requirement for all students (AL5.1A-Memo Testing All Students). • Parents are notified that their child will be assessed based on alternate achievement standards is documented in the IEP, as seen in the screenshot provided as evidence from the Enrich IEP system (AL5.1B) • Training materials for IEP Teams including Special Education Process Guide for South Carolina (AL5.1C-Sped Process Guide-page 66, E.2.e).	The state has met requirements for this critical element.

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

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

o Provides a clear explanation of the differences between assessments aligned with grade-level academic achievement standards and those aligned with alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student's education resulting from taking an AA-AAAS, such as how participation in such assessments may delay or otherwise affect the student from completing the requirements for a regular high school diploma;
 	
• Ensure that parents of students assessed with an AA-AAAS are informed that their child's achievement will be measured based on alternate academic achievement standards;
• Not preclude a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who takes an AA-AAAS from attempting to complete the requirements for a regular high school diploma; and
• Promote, consistent with requirements under the IDEA, the involvement and progress of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in the general education curriculum that is based on the State's academic content standards
	• Accommodations manuals or other key documents that provide information on accommodations for students with disabilities;
	  1. SC-Alt TAM (AL1.4C, pg. 38-40)
	  2. Accessibility Supports Document (AL1.4D)
	  3. Universal Supports Description (AL1.4D, pg. 10)
	
	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.
	• Guidance for IEP teams on determining participation in the SC-Alt and the definition of the ALT (AL2.4A)
	The state has internal procedures for monitoring districts to ensure appropriate students are taking the ALT (AL2.4A Procedures for Monitoring Students taking the Alternate Assessment)	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
for the grade in which the student is enrolled; and • Develop, disseminate information on, and promote the use of appropriate accommodations to ensure that a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who does not take an AA-AAAS participates in academic instruction and assessments for the grade in which the student is enrolled. • The State has in place and monitors implementation of guidelines for IEP teams to apply in determining, on a case-by-case basis, which students with the most significant cognitive disabilities will be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, if applicable. Such guidelines must be developed in accordance with 34 CFR § 200.6(d).[2]		
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required		

---

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

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

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
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: • Procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed with a linguistic accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for ELs; • Assistance regarding selection of appropriate linguistic accommodations for ELs, including to the extent practicable, assessments in the language most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what those students know and can do to determine the students' mastery of skills in academic content areas until the students have achieved English language proficiency.	AL5.2A SCDE English Learner Guiding Principles AL5.2B South Carolina MLL Identification AL5.2C SC State Assessment Accommodations MLLs AL5.2D SC State Assessment Accommodations MLLs 2 AL5.2E Cultivating Practices Intro & Session 1 Training Powerpoint AL5.1A Testing All Students Memorandum AL1.4D Accessibility Supports Manual AL1.4C Test Administrator Manual for Alternate Assessment State's notes Documentation of procedures for determining student eligibility for accommodations and guidance on selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners; • The ESOL Handbook has SC's procedures for everything ESOL including assessment, IMAPs/accommodations and identification (AL5.2A) • The SCDE has conducted training on identification and accommodations of Multilingual Learners (AL5.2B-AL5.2E) • Guidance for IEP Teams and memo with testing requirement for all students (AL5.1A-Memo Testing All Students). Accommodations manuals or other key documents that provide information on accommodations for English learners can be found in the Accessibility Supports Manual (AL1.4D) and the Test Administrator Manual	The state met the requirements for this critical element

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	for Alternate Assessment (AL1.4C Appendix D, page 63).	
Section 5.2 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

44

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
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: • Ensures that appropriate accommodations, such as, interoperability with, and ability to use, assistive technology, are available to measure the **academic achievement** of students with disabilities. • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs; • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student's need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. • Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny	AL1.4C Test Administrator Manual for Alternate Assessment AL1.4D Accessibility Supports Manual AL5.3B Special Circumstance Procedures State's notes Lists of accommodations available for students can be found: • Located in the TAM in pg. 31, 38-40 (AL1.4C). • The South Carolina Accessibility Supports Manual (AL1.4D) South Carolina uses the Enrich IEP system. Testing accommodations are documented by test in the IEP under the testing accommodations section (section IX of the IEP). Further, schools and districts input accommodations in PowerSchool, the state's education management system, during "precode" so that the proper materials may be ordered. There are two means to monitor accommodations use, through Enrich and through PowerSchool. South Carolina as a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed: The state has a procedure manual for reviewing special circumstances requests (AL5.3B Special Circumstance Procedures).	The state met the requirements for this CE

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

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

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

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

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:
• Consistent with the State's policies for accommodations;
• Appropriate for addressing a student's disability or language needs for each assessment administered;
• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;
• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student's IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL;
• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures;
• Monitored for administrations of all required academic content assessments and AA-AAAS.
	AL5.4A Monitoring Overview Rubric
	
	AL5.4B Monitoring IEP Development
	
	AL5.4C Results Input
	
	AL5.4D Monitoring Teams
	
	AL5.4E Assessment Monitoring Procedures
	
	AL5.4F Onsite IEP Development Results
	
	AL5.4G Onsite IEP Implementation Results
	
	AL1.4B Guidance for IEP Teams on Determining Participation in the SC-Alt.
	
	AL2.4A Procedures for Monitoring Students taking the Alternate Assessment
	
	State's notes
	
	Evidence to support this critical element for the State's assessment system includes documents such as:
	• Description of procedures the State uses to monitor that accommodations selected for students with disabilities, students covered by Section 504, and English learners are appropriate;
	  1. The Monitoring overview and rubric (MOR) for IEP Development that is used during onsite monitoring can be found on page 6 section 8 of the rubric at AL5.4A.
	  2. Results of the onsite monitoring of IEP development is input by monitors on a link online. A copy of the online form that monitors input data into can be found is evidence labeled as AL5.4B.
	  3. Results of onsite monitoring of IEP implementation is input by monitors on a
		1.4D - Accessibility Supports Manual mentions an ELL accommodation plan (p.11), which would seem to provide direct evidence for this CE, but peers were unable to locate the document itself. The state needs to provide evidence of monitoring EL accommodations.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	link online. A copy of the online form that monitors input data into can be found is evidence labeled as AL5.4C. Description of procedures the State uses to monitor that students with disabilities are placed by IEP Teams in the appropriate assessment; • Guidance for IEP teams on determining participation on South Carolina Alternate Assessments is listed as evidence at AL1.4B. • The state has internal procedures for monitoring districts to ensure appropriate students are taking the alternate assessment (AL2.4A). The State's written procedures for monitoring the use of accommodations during test administration, such as guidance provided to districts; instructions and protocols for State, district and school staff; and schedules for monitoring; • Schedules for onsite IEP monitoring is included on slides nine and ten of the Power Point slides for monitoring and overview that are publically posted online (AL5.4D). • Procedure for monitoring (CE5.4E). Summary of results of monitoring for the most recent year of test administration in the State. • Results of the onsite monitoring of IEP development as part of prong 1 of the monitoring procedure. Results of IEP development is evidence labeled as AL5.4F-Onsite IEP Development Results. Results of the onsite monitoring of IEP implementation as part of prong 1 of the monitoring procedure. Results	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	of IEP development is evidence labeled as AL5.4G-Onsite IEP Implementation Results.	
Section 5.4 Summary Statement		
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • The state needs to provide evidence of monitoring EL accommodations.		

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

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
For academic content standards: The State formally adopted **challenging academic achievement standards** in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for all students, specifically: • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; The State's academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (1) at least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third for lower achievement; (2) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (3) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.	AL6.1A South Carolina Standard Setting Technical Report for Science and High School AL6.1B South Carolina Standard Setting Technical Report for ELA and Math Grades 3-8 AL6.1C SC-Alt Science and High School Standards Approval Letter AL6.1D SC Board of Education Agenda - SC-Alt Science and High School Standards Approval AL6.1E SC Board of Education Minutes- SC-Alt Science and High School Cut Scores AL6.1F SC-Alt ELA and Math Grades 3-8 Standards Approval Letter AL1.4C Test Administration Manual AL2.1A Education Accountability Act AL5.1A Testing All Students Memorandum AL1.5B SC-Alt Technical Report 2018-2019 State's notes Evidence to support this critical element for the State's assessment system includes: • Evidence of adoption of the State's academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, in the required tested grades and subjects (i.e., in reading/language arts and mathematics for each of grades 3-8 and high school and in science for each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9, and 10-12)), such as State Board of Education minutes, memo announcing formal approval from the	The state meets the requirement of this CE.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Chief State School Officer to districts, legislation, regulations, or other binding approval of academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards (AL6.1A –AL6.1F); • State statutes, regulations, policy memos, State Board of Education minutes, memo from the Chief State School Officer to districts or other key documents that clearly state that the State's academic achievement standards apply to all public elementary and secondary school students in the State (AL1.4C; AL2.1A; AL5.1A). Evidence (AL6.1A, pg. 10; AL6.1B, pgs. 7-9) regarding the academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards for the following: (a) at least three levels of achievement, including two levels of high achievement (e.g., proficient and advanced) and a third of lower achievement (e.g., basic); (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores (i.e., "cut scores") that differentiate among the achievement levels. Additional evidence can be found on pages 137-140 of the South Carolina Technical Manual (AL1.5B pages 137-140).	
Section 6.1 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

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: • **Academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards**.	AL6.2A Science and HS Standard Setting Sign in Sheet AL6.2B ELA and Math Standard Setting Sign in Sheet AL6.1A South Carolina Standard Setting Technical Report Science and HS AL6.1B South Carolina Standard Setting Technical Report ELA and Math Grade 3-8 State notes: Evidence to support this critical element for the State's general assessments and AA-AAAS includes the State's standards-setting report, including: • A description of the standards-setting method and process used by the State (AL6.1 A, pg. 10; AL6.1B, pg 13); • The rationale for the method selected (AL6.1A, pg. 10; AL6.1B, pg 13); • Documentation that the method used for setting cut scores allowed panelists to apply their knowledge and experience in a reasonable manner and supported the establishment of reasonable and defensible cut scores (AL6.1A, pg. 17-34; AL6.1B, pg. 20-38); • Documentation of the process used for setting cut scores and developing performance-level descriptors aligned to the State's academic content standards (AL6.1A, pg 19-22, AL6.1B, pg. 19-20, 22-23) • A description of the process for selecting panelists (AL6.1A, pg. 14-17; AL6.1B, pg. 15-16) Documentation that the standards-setting panels consisted of panelists with appropriate experience and expertise, including:	The state meets the requirements of this CE.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	• Content experts with experience teaching the State's academic content standards in the tested grades (AL6.1A, pg. 15; AL6.1B, pg., 17); • Individuals with experience and expertise teaching students with disabilities, English learners and other student populations in the State (AL6.1 A, pg. 15; AL6.1B, pg. 16-17); • A description, by relevant characteristics, of the panelists (overall and by individual panels) who participated in achievement standards setting (AL6.1A, pg. 14-17; AL6.1B, pg. 15-18); Participant rosters or sign-in sheets (AL 6.2A, 6.2B)	
Section 6.2 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

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

For academic achievement standards:
 	
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.
 	
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
	AL 6.3 A SCHSC- Coursework Combined
	
	AL 6.3 B SCHSC Symposium-Instructional Session Career Ready-Final
	
	AL1.5B SC-Alt Technical Report 2018-2019
	
	AL 6.1A South Carolina Standard Setting Technical Report for Science and High School
	
	AL 6.1B South Carolina Standard Setting Technical Report for ELA and Math Grades 3-8
	
	State's notes
	
	Evidence to support this critical element for the State's general assessments and AA-AAAS includes documentation that the State's alternate academic achievement standards are aligned with the State's academic content standards, such as:
	• A description of the process used to develop the State's alternate academic achievement standards that shows that:
	  ○ The State's grade-level academic content standards or extended content standards were used as a main reference in writing performance level descriptors (AL6.1A, pg. 19-20; AL6.1B, pg. 19-20);
	  ○ The process of setting cut scores used, as a main reference, performance level descriptors that reflect the State's grade-level academic content standards (AL6.1A, pg. 22-24; AL6.1B, pg 22-24)
	
	The SC-Alt performance level descriptors were used as the base starting point for the course work and standards
		The state cites 6.1A, pg. 19-20; 6.1B, pg. 19-20) as evidence that the State's grade-level academic content standards or extended content standards were used as the main reference in writing performance level descriptors. However, this narrative is only a general description of PLDs. There is a bit more narrative on pp. 22-24 that may contribute some evidence.
		
		It is not clear how 6.3A (SCHSC Coursework Combined) connects to the PLDs for the alternate assessment. Similarly, 6.3 B SCHSC Symposium-Instructional Session Career Ready Final has no discernible link to the alternate test nor to the alternate tests' PLDs. Overall, while the standard setting process itself seems sound, peers could not find evidence of a strong link to the general academic standards other than the narrative on pp. 22-24.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
postsecondary education or competitive integrated employment.	for the SC High School Credential. Evidence AL6.3A (SCHSC Coursework Combined) shows the alignment for High School standards used for the SC-Alt high school standards aligned to the college and career ready standards. English can be found on pages 7-47, math can be found on pages 48-59, Science specifically biology, can be found on pages 60-62. Alignment of the standards to the college and career ready standards was completed by outside stakeholder. Evidence can be found in evidence (AL6.3 B SCHSC Symposium-Instructional Session Career Ready Final). For each test, the procedure was based on an ordered-item booklet (OIB) composed of statistically sound items that were aligned to the prioritized standards. Each item is written to measure a single prioritized standard. During the standard-setting meeting, panelists set the cut scores by bookmarking the OIBs according to the PLD for the test. Additional evidence can be found in the South Carolina Technical Manual (AL1.5B page 137-140). Alignment is established during content and bias meetings as described in critical element 3.1 and 3.2.	

Section 6.3 Summary Statement
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • The state needs to provide evidence of a link between the state's grade-level academic content standards, the PLDs and how they were used to set cut scores beyond a general description.

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

Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
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. The State reports to the public its assessment results on **student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level**[3] For **academic content assessments**, 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 **specific academic needs of students**, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results. • 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:	AL 6.4A SC-Alt Individual Student Reports AL 6.4B SC-Alt Family Interpretive Guide AL 6.4C SC-Alt Online Reporting System User's Guide AL1.5B SC-Alt Technical Report 2018-2019 State's notes The results of the South Carolina Alternate Assessments are available in the Online Reporting System (ORS). The ORS also generated paper family reports to be sent home with the students. Both online and paper reports provide valid and reliable test results and help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students. Only scale scores, standard errors of the scale scores, performance levels, and descriptions of performance levels that are associated with PLDs are included in the reports. No subscores are reported. As described in the South Carolina Technical Manual (AL1.5B pages 140-154). The SCDE provides an Individual Student Report (ISR) to each student and parent. The ISRs are shipped to the schools; schools keep a copy of the ISR for the permanent record and distribute a copy to the parents. A copy of the spring 2019 ISR is found in evidence (AL6.4A).	The peers could not find evidence of a timeline for the delivery of reports. The peers could not find evidence of a method for informing parents of how to request reports in alternate formats or languages.

---

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
o Provide valid and reliable information regarding a **student's academic achievement**; o Report the **student's academic achievement** in terms of the State's grade-level academic achievement standards; o Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific **academic needs of students**; o Are provided in an understandable and uniform format; o 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; o Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent. • The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • The state needs to provide a timeline for the delivery of reports. • The state needs to provide evidence of a method for informing parents of how to request reports in alternate formats or languages.		

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

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

March 2020 State Assessment Peer Review Notes

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

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

Contents

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

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

SECTION 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
For academic content standards: 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.		The state meets the requirement of this critical element.
Section 1.1 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required		

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
For academic content standards: 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.	SP 1.1-1 2014 Academic Standards & Indicators for Science SP 1.2-1 Timeline for Reviewing, Revising and Drafting Standards SP 1.2-2 Memo Requesting Public Comment	The peers were unable to find evidence that standards are aligned with the entrance requirements for colleges or career and technical education standards. Peers felt 1.2-1 did not provide sufficient evidence of review.
Section 1.2 Summary Statement		

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
- The state must provide additional evidence related to external review and revision of standards to align to college entrance requirements and career technical education standards.

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

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
The State's assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments aligned with **grade-level academic achievement standards** or alternate academic achievement standards in: • Reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 9-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). AND The State's **academic content assessments** must be the same assessments administered to all students in the tested grades, with the following exceptions: • Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may take an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards. • A State may permit an LEA to administer a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in lieu of the State high school assessment if certain conditions are met. • A State that administers an end-of-course high school mathematics assessment may exempt an 8th grade student from the mathematics assessment typically administered in	SP 1.1-1 2014 Academic Standards & Indicators for Science SP 1.3-1 South Carolina Code of Laws; Sections 59-18-310; 59-18-320; 59-18-325 and Proviso 1.94 SP 1.3-2 Overview of the Alternate Assessment SP 1.3-3 Guidance for IEP Teams on Determining Participation in the SC-Alt SP 1.3-4 SC Alternate Key Testing Dates SP 1.3-5 2019 SCREADY/SCPASS Test Administration Manual for Online Testing SP 1.3-6 2019 SCREADY/SCPASS Test Administration Manual for Paper Testing SP 1.3-7 SCPASS Brochure for Parents and Students SP 1.3-8 Memo Assessment Update and Test Dates for 2017-18 dated 9-13-2017 SP 1.3-9 2018-19 Assessment Schedule SP 1.3-10 ListServ Message SCPASS Program Updates SP 1.3-11 New DTC Orientation Handbook	Requirements for the South Carolina statewide assessments are delineated Sections 59-18-310, 59-18-320, and 59-18-325 of the South Carolina Code of Laws (SP 1.3-1). The current State code requires assessment in science in grades 4, 6, and high school. Alternate science assessments are provided for students who qualify to participate. No additional evidence is needed.

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

eighth grade and allow the student to take the State end-of-course mathematics test instead. • 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.		
Section 1.3 Summary Statement		
__x_ No additional evidence is required		

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

7

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

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.
• For students with disabilities, policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including those children with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system;
• For ELs:
  ○ Policies state that all ELs must be included in all aspects of the content assessment system, unless the State has chosen the statutory option for recently arrived ELs under which such ELs are exempt from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment.
  ○ If a State has developed native language assessments for ELs in R/LA, ELs must be assessed in R/LA in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except, if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native
	SP 1.3-1 South Carolina Code of Laws; Sections 59-18-310; 59-18-320; 59-18-325 and Proviso 1.94
	
	SP 1.3-5 2019 SC READY/SCPASS Online Test Administration Manual (p.1, pp. 30-33)
	
	SP 1.3-6 2019 SC READY/SCPASS Paper Test Administration Manual (p.1, pp. 30-33)
	
	SP 1.3.7 SCPASS Brocure for Parents and Students
	
	SP 1.3-8 Memo Assessment Updates and Test Dates for 2017-18 dated 9-13-2017
	
	SP 1.3-9 2018-19 Assessment Schedule
	
	SP 1.3-10 ListServ Message SCPASS Program Updates
	
	SP 1.4-1 Memo Accessibility Support Document
	
	SP 1.4-2 Accessibility Support Document
	
	SP 1.4-3 Guidance for IEP Teams on Determining Participation in the SC-ALT
	
	SP 1.4-4 2019 SCREADY SCPASS Pretest Workshop PowerPoint
	
	SP 1.4-5 2019 SCPASS Score Report User's Guide
	
	SP 1.4-6 Memo – Testing Requirements for All Students 2014
	
	SP 1.4-7 Memo – Testing Requirements for All Students 2015
	
	SP 1.4-8 Memo – Change in Testing Requirements for ELL Students
		South Carolina provided evidence that all students are required to be included in Statewide assessments, including those students who qualify for the alternate assessment. The State has an explicit policy that students with disabilities who are placed by districts or other public agencies in private or nonpublic schools or state-operated programs must participate in statewide and districtwide assessments and must be tested by the home school district. The State requires that all ELs must be included in all aspects of the Statewide assessment system. These policies are clearly communicated to schools.

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

language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years. ○ 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.		

Section 1.4 Summary Statement
x   No additional evidence is required

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

9

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
If the State has developed or amended challenging **academic** standards and assessments, the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with: • State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education). • Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas). • Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State. • Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents.		The science standards were adopted in 2014, therefore this critical element does not apply.
Section 1.5 Summary Statement		
x No additional evidence is required		

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

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
The State's test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to **the depth and breadth of the State's academic content standards** for the grade that is being assessed and includes: • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of **the State's grade-level academic content standards** and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results. • Processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in **the State's academic content standards,** reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills). • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design	SP 2.1-1 The SCPASS Technical report SP 2.1-2 GUIDELINES FOR ITEM ANALYSIS AND FORM CONSTRUCTION SP 2.1-3 TEST MAPS FOR SCPASS SCIENCE FOR 4TH AND 6TH GRADE SP 2.1-4 South Carolina Assessment Evaluation Report #2 The SCPASS technical report states the purpose and intended interpretations and uses of the assessments pages 2-3 (SP 2.1-1). Test blueprints are in the Guidelines for Item Analysis and Form Construction document (SP 2.1-2 pages 13-14). The process to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills is included in the standards is outlined in the Guideline for Item Analysis and Forms Construction. (SP 2.1-2 pages 5-7). Test maps for SCPASS Science 4th and 6th grade are provided (SP 2.1-3). HumRRO conducted an independent study of the development and construction processes for the End-of-Course Examination Program (EOCEP). The study did not include a review of SCPASS, but the processes for EOCEP and SCPASS are the same. The HumRRO report states that the South Carolina test design process works as intended. (SP 2.1-4, p. xix).HumRRO also provided favorable feedback on a number of specific elements of the test development test construction process. (SP 2.1-4 page xv).RE 2.1-1 SC READY Test Design document	2.1-4 HumRRO Report #2 Technical and Legal Evaluation <u>did not include an evaluation of the science tests submitted</u>, however, the state claims that the processes for the reviewed tests are the same as for science. The state must provide evidence that these reviews have occurred. No evidence was found to address technology usability in this CE as suggested by peer review guidance. Peers are unclear how changes to the system have been made since the release of the evaluation report. The state needs to provide a timeline with anticipated deliverables for the improvements. Peers were unable to find an alignment study for science, which is critical given the complexity of the standards. Peers could not find evidence of a formal process to ensure cognitive complexity is addressed appropriately through the assessment.

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

and intended uses and interpretations of results. • If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the student is enrolled and uses that determination for all reporting. • If the State administers a content assessment that includes portfolios, such assessment may be partially administered through a portfolio but may not be *entirely* administered through a portfolio.		

Section 2.1 Summary Statement

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
    • The state must provide evidence to address technology usability.
    • The state needs to provide evidence that it has addressed issues in the HumRRO report.
    • The state must provide evidence of an alignment study for science.
    • The state must provide evidence of a formal process to ensure cognitive complexity is captured through the assessment blueprints and test maps.

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

12

Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to: • Assess student achievement based on the **State's academic content standards** in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.	SP 2.1-1 The SCPASS Technical Report SP 2.1-2 Item Analysis and Forms Construction Guidelines SP 2.1-4 South Carolina Assessment Evaluation Report #2 SP 2.2-1 Data Recognition Corporation (DRC) Item Development Manual SP 2.2-2 Agenda for SCPASS 4th grade science Content Review SP 2.2-3 Agenda for SCPASS 6th grade science Content Review SP 2.2-4 Committee Lists for SCPASS Science Content Review SP 2.2-5 Training PowerPoint for SCPASS Science Content Review SP 2.2-6 Committee list for Bias and Sensitivity Committee SP 2.2-7 Training PowerPoint for the Bias and Sensitivity review **State's notes** Detailed development procedures are outlined in the Data Recognition Corporation (DRC) Item Development Manual (SP 2.2-1). Procedures for development and item selection are outlined in the SCPASS Technical Report	The state once again cites the HumRRO report, although the SCPASS assessment was not included in the alignment study. Peers could not find evidence that the state addressed accessibility tools and their effect on the test construct. Peers could not find evidence to address cognitive processes. Peers were unable to find information regarding field-testing. Peers noted that there is no evidence provided with regard to the degree to which the state will develop items that address the dimensionality of the science standards.

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

| | (2.1-1 pages 9-12) and in the Guideline for Item Analysis and Forms Construction (2.1-2 pages 5-7).

A thorough internal review processes occurs within DRC followed by review by the state client. Separate content alignment review committees for SCPASS Science were convened in Columbia, South Carolina, and DRC facilitated the meeting. Agendas (2.2-2 and 2.2-3) and committee lists (SP 2.2- 4) for the meetings are included. In addition to how to review items for content alignment, committee members were trained on cognitive complexity (e.g., DOK) and how to consider such when reviewing items with additional consideration of the alignment of the item with the proper South Carolina standard. A training PowerPoint is included. (SP 2.2-5).

Bias and Sensitivity reviews occur concurrently with content reviews. A committee list (SP 2.2-6) and a training PowerPoint for the bias and sensitivity review is included. (SP 2.2-7)

Although the SCPASS assessment was not included in the alignments study, the development and construction processes are the same as the End of Course and SCPASS assessments. An independent review of the test development process by HumRRO (SP 2.1-4, pages 3-11 and appendices A-F) provides evidence that the test development adhere to industry best practices (SP 2.1-4 p. xii). | |

Section 2.2 Summary Statement

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
- The state must provide evidence that it has examined accessibility tools and the effect on the test construct.
- The state must provide evidence that the assessment addresses cognitive processes.
- The state must provide evidence of field-testing.

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

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

Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State: • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.	SP 1.3-1 South Carolina Code of Laws; Sections 59-18-310; 59-18-320; 59-18-325 SP 1.3-5 2019 SC READY/SCPASS Online Test Administration Manual SP 1.3-6 2019 SC READY/SCPASS Paper Test Administration Manual SP 1.3-7 SCPASS Brochure for Parents and Students SP 1.4-4 2019 SCREADY SCPASS Pretest Workshop PowerPoint SP 2.3-1 Online Enrollment and Overview on Ordering Materials Document SP 2.3-2 School Test Coordinator and Test Administrator Tool SP 2.3-3 E-mail : Opening of Online Enrollment SP 2.3-4 Email: Closing of Online Enrollment SP 2.3-5 COS Document SP 2.3-6 E-mail: COS Document – Overview and Training SP 2.3-7 SFTP Instructions for DTCs SP 2.3-8 DRC Customer Service Chat Pilot SP 2.3-9 DTC Weekly Update November 12-16, 2018 SP 2.3-10 DTC Weekly Update January 7-11, 2019 SP 2.3-11 DTC Weekly Update February 11-15, 2019 SP 2.3-12 DTC Weekly Update March 18-22, 2019 SP 2.3-13 DTC Weekly Update April 15-19, 2019	The peers were unable to find sufficient information related to procedures related to technological disruptions and contingency plans for challenges during test administration.

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

	SP 2.3-14 DTC Weekly Update May 27-31, 2019	
	SP 2.3-15 DTC Weekly Update June 10-14, 2019	
	SP 2.3-16 List of attendees for Pretest Training	
	SP 2.3-17 Technology Coordinator's Training PowerPoint	
	SP 2.3-18 List of attendees for the Technology Coordinator Training	
	SP 2.3-19 Precode Manual	
	SP 2.3-20 Precode Coordinator Training PowerPoint	
	SP 2.3-21 List of attendees for Precode Training	
	SP 2.3-22 South Carolina Proviso 1.71	
	SP 2.3-23 Waiver Memo	
	SP 2.3-24 Waiver Request Form	
	SP 2.3-25 2018-19 Online Assessment Technical Requirements	
	SP 2.3-26 Memo - Online Assessment Technical Requirements	
	SP 2.3-27 eDIRECT User Guide	
	SP 2.3-28 The DRC INSIGHT™ Technology User Guide Volume I	
	SP 2.3-29 The DRC INSIGHT™ Technology User Guide Volume II TSM	
	SP 2.3-30 The DRC INSIGHT™ Technology User Guide Volume III COS	
	SP 2.3-31 The DRC INSIGHT™ Technology User Guide Volume IV	
	SP 2.3-32 The DRC INSIGHT™ Technology User Guide Volume V OTT EMS	

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

	SP 2.3-33 DRC Insight Certificate Update Instructions	
	SP 2.3-34 Tech Bulletin Enhanced Retries	
	SP 2.3-35 Tech Bulletin TSM to COS	
	SP 2.3-36 Tips for Keyboard Setting	

| **Section 2.3 Summary Statement** |
| _X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
 • The state must provide evidence regarding its contingency plans in the event of technology challenges or large-scale disruptions. |

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

Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. Monitoring of test administration should be demonstrated for all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS.	SP 1.3-5 2019 SCREADY/SCPASS Test Administration Manual for Online Testing SP 1.3-6 2019 SCREADY/SCPASS Test Administration Manual for Paper Testing SP 2.4-1 South Carolina Code of Laws Section; 59-1-445 and Section 59-1-447 SP 2.4-2 State Board of Education Regulations 43-100 (2015) SP 2.4-3 Test Security Program Manager Job Functions SP 2.4-4 Comprehensive Test Security System Handbook SP 2.4-5 Frequency of Response Changes for Paper Tests SP 2.4-6 Frequency of Response Changes for Online Tests SP 2.4-7 Unusual Gain Scores for Each School SP 2.4-8 Frequency of Test Security Violations by School and District SP 2.4-9 Test Monitoring Plan & Sites Visited – Spring 2019 SP 2.4-10 Administration Monitoring Guide 2019-20 SP 2.4-11 PowerPoint for Training Monitors SP 2.4-12 Monitoring Visit Procedures 3-2019 SP 2.4-13 Monitoring Procedures for Accommodations SP 2.4-14 Test Security Violation Guide for Monitors SP 2.4-15 On-site testing Monitor Letter	SCDE provided comprehensive evidence of its monitoring process, including a form to be completed by monitors, training and guidance for monitors, a schedule of monitoring visits, and an example of communication with districts. All tests are included in the monitoring. No additional evidence is needed.

Section 2.4 Summary Statement

x   No additional evidence is required

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

Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
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: • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State's assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. • Application of test security procedures to all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS.	SP 1.3-5 2019 SCREADY/SCPASS Test Administration Manual for Online Testing SP 1.3-6 2019 SCREADY/SCPASS Test Administration Manual for Paper Testing SP 1.4-4 2019 SCREADY SCPASS Pretest Workshop PowerPoint SP 2.3-2 School Test Coordinator and Test Administrator Tool SP 2.3-2 School Test Coordinator and Test Administrator Tool SP 2.3-16 List of attendees for Pretest Training SP 2.4-1 South Carolina Code of Laws; Section 59-1-445 and Section 59-1-447 SP 2.4-2 State Board of Education Regulations 43-100 (2015) SP 2.4-3 Test Security Program Manager Job Functions SP 2.4-4 Test Security Comprehensive System SP 2.4-5 Frequency of Response Changes for Paper Tests SP 2.4-6 Frequency of Response Changes for Online Tests SP 2.4-7 Unusual Gain Scores for Each School SP 2.4-8 Frequency of Test Security Violations by School and District SP 2.5-1 List of Regional Accessibility and Test Security Training Sessions SP 2.5-2 Test Security Training PowerPoint for DTCs SP 2.5-3 Accessibility and Test Security Training List of Attendees Spartanburg School District 10-4-19 SP 2.5-4 Accessibility and Test Security Training List of Attendees Horry School District 10-8-19 SP 2.5-5 Accessibility and Test Security Training List of Attendees Darlington school District 10-24-19 SP 2.5-6 SCDE Test Security Handbook	Peers noted the inclusion of a full-time test security position, and feels the state should be commended. The state meets the requirement for this CE.

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

	SP 2.5-7 Test Security Violations Sample Letter – Failure to Follow Directions SP 2.5-8 Test Security Violations Sample Letter – IEP SP 2.5-9 Test Security Violation Totals from 2006-2019 By Type of Violation SP 2.5-10 Number of Types of Test Security Violations	
Section 2.5 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

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
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: • To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.	RE 2.6-1 SC Code of Laws Section 59-1-490 RE 2.6-2 Information Security Policy–Data Protection and Privacy RE 2.6-3 Information Security Policy–Human Resource (HR) and Security Awareness RE 2.6-4 Information Security Program Master Policy RE 2.6-5 Information Security Policy–IT Compliance RE 2.6-6 Information Security Policy–Threat and Vulnerability Management RE 2.6-7 Information Security Policy–Access Control RE 2.6-8 Information Security Policy–Information Systems Acquisitions, Development and Maintenance RE 2.6-9 Information Security Policy–Asset Management RE 2.6-10 Information Security Policy–Business Continuity Management RE 2.6-11 Information Security Policy–IT Risk Strategy RE 2.6-12 Information Security Policy–Mobile Security RE 2.6-13 Information Security Policy–Physical & Environmental Security RE 2.6-14 Information Security Policy–Risk Management RE2.6-15 System and Information Integrity Policy and Procedures RE2.6-16 Use of External Information Systems	In the Submission Index, the state reports cells are suppressed when the N count is less than 10 students. It would be helpful to see the evidence where this is codified in policy. The state should provide a formal process/policy regarding minimum n-size and suppression rules. The state has submitted a large number of policies. However, many of these are dated from several years ago, and do not appear to have been updated. Additionally, it's important to note that polices do not equal procedures. The state should provide more detailed information regarding procedures related to this critical element. Peers could not find evidence of how the vendor secures items.

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

	RE 2.6-17 2019 SCREADY/SCPASS Test Administration Manual for Paper Testing State's notes State law is the foundation of the data security policies and procedures. SC Code Ann. § 59-1-490 addresses data use and governance policy. The policy indicates that data must be maintained in a secure environment with access limited to pre-identified staff. The law mandates training in data security and student privacy laws. SCDE staff complete training modules with quizzes on a routine basis (RE 2.6-1). Evidence of state policies to protect the integrity and confidentiality of student-level assessment data and protest student privacy and confidentiality are provided in 2.6-2 through RE2.6-16. Guidelines for district and school staff are provided in the SCREADY/SCPASS Test Administration Manual (RE 2.6-17). Specific procedures are provided on the following pages. • Security legislation: pages 7–9 • State Board regulations: pages 10–12 • Guidelines for reporting, investigating, and documenting test security violations: pages 13–15 • Guidelines for reporting violations involving students with disabilities: pages 16–17 • Student and school responsibilities for maintaining test security, including secure materials, storage policies and access to secure materials: pages 19–20 • Use of security checklists, protecting secure test items: pages 21–22 • Policy concerning electronic devices: pages 22–23 • Calculator policy: pages 23–25	

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

	• Seating charts: page 25: • Appropriate proctoring of tests: pages 26–27 • Securing the testing environment, breaks and student activities: pages 34–37 procedures for handling disruptions: pages 37–40	

Section 2.6 Summary Statement
_x__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • The state must provide information on the procedures that have been developed to implement security policies provided in the state's evidence to ensure data integrity and privacy.

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

SECTION 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
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: **The State's academic assessments** measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State's academic content standards, including: • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State's assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards; • If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards and administers alternate assessments aligned with those standards, the assessments show adequate alignment to the State's academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content	RE 3.1-1 SC READY Technical Report RE 2.1-19 South Carolina Assessment Evaluation Report #2 State's notes The SC READY Technical Report describes three types of validity: evidence based on test content, internal structure, and relations to other variables (RE 3.1-1, p. 49-57). HumRRO conducted an independent alignment study of the SC READY mathematics and ELA items in 2017-18. The HumRRO Evaluation Report established that the SC READY assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State's academic content standards (RE 2.1-19; p. 111).	The state again cites the HumRRO reports as evidence for this CE, although science was not part of that review. The state notes that an alignment study is planned for 2020. Peers note that the results of this study and a plan to address any findings should be submitted upon completion. Peers noted that the state provided limited information relative to validity argument and evidence. In addition, peers found no information presented with regard to how validity results will be used to improve the tests on an ongoing basis.

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

and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.		

Section 3.1 Summary Statement
__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • The state must provide evidence of the completion of an alignment study and provide a plan for addressing any findings from the study. • The state must provide evidence of a validity argument that meets current professional standards including methods, results, and how the findings will be used to improve the assessment system.

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

Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap: **the intended cognitive processes** appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State's academic content standards.	RE 3.2-1 Content Review Committee List RE 3.2-2 Depth of Knowledge and Cognitive Complexity Training Manual RE 2.1-19 South Carolina Assessment Evaluation Report #2 RE 3.2-3 Education Oversight Committee Approval Letter State's notes DRC content staff conducted an internal content review of the SC READY math and ELA items, with a subsequent review by a committee of external content experts from across the state to evaluate the items. A list of the Content Review Committee members is provided (RE 3.2-1). In addition to how to review items for content, committee members were trained on cognitive complexity (e.g., DOK) and how to evaluate alignment of an item with the proper South Carolina standard. The Depth of Knowledge and Cognitive Complexity Training Manual is provided (RE 3.2-2). An independent alignment study established that the SC READY assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State's academic content standards (RE 2.1-19, p. 111). The South Carolina Education Oversight Committee approved the SC READY assessment for South Carolina. The approval letter is provided (RE 3.2-3).	2.2-5 Training PowerPoint for Science Content Review Slide 7 has this: "Cognitive complexity is an aspect of a person's cognitive functioning which at one end is defined by the use of many constructs with many relationships to one another (complexity) and at the other end by the use of few constructs with limited relationships to one another (simplicity)." Peers are unclear how this was translated into a review of the items for tapping the intended cognitive processes.

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

Section 3.2 Summary Statement
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
• The state must provide evidence that assessment measure intended cognitive processes, such as evidence obtained through cognitive labs, or specific evidence of expert judgment.

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

28

Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State's **academic content standards**.	SP 3.3-1 Science Item Analysis SP 3.3-2 Internal-External Correlations SP 3.3-3 Correlations Between Reporting Categories and the Total Test Score by Grade Item analyses show generally well-performing items (SP 3.3-1). SP 3.3-2 shows the correlation between the SCPASS Science total test and the same students' ELA and Mathematics Scores. These correlations are relatively high because of the combination of verbal and mathematic loads of our practice-based science items. SP 3.3-3 shows high correlations between reporting categories and the total test scores. This demonstrates that the fit of the underlying Rasch model is appropriate and there is sufficient separation between reporting categories.	Peers noted that the evidence provided should be formally captured and discussed in a technical report, along with recommendations for improvement, rather than as stand-alone documents. Peers noted that documents (including item statistics) were provided without narrative, with the exception of notes for peer review. It is unclear how these documents are utilized as a part of an improvement process.

Section 3.3 Summary Statement
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • The state must submit validity evidence as it relates to a larger system of assessment improvement.

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

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.	SP 3.3-2 Internal – External Correlations	Peers suggest that the state could draw some kind of link between Grades 4 and 8 NAEP and at least the state's Grade 4 Science assessment. The test in its current iteration was administered in 2015, and the state also received state-level NAEP results for Science that year. The NAEP frameworks were listed as one reference for creating the state's standards. Peers suggest that the validity evidence would be strengthened if the state considered other validity evidence that the science assessments were measuring the intended construct. Peers noted that the evidence provided should be formally captured and discussed in a technical report, along with recommendations for improvement, rather than as stand-alone documents. Peers noted that documents were provided without context, with the exception of notes for peer review. It is unclear how these documents are utilized as a part of an improvement process.
Section 3.4 Summary Statement		

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
- The state must submit validity evidence as to how the assessment is related to other variables, and how the findings are included in a larger system of assessment improvement.

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

SECTION 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
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**.	SP 4.1-1 Science Internal Consistency – All SP 4.1-2 Science Internal Consistency by Subgroup SP 4.1-3 Science Decision Consistency – All SP 4.1-4 Science Decision Consistency by Subgroup SP 4.1-5 SCPASS Grade 4 Truncated Conversion Table SP 4.1-6 SCPASS Grade 6 Truncated Conversion Tables SP 4.1-1 and 4.1-2 demonstrate high internal consistency estimates for the total test population and subgroups. SP 4.1-3 and 4.1-4 demonstrate high decision consistency of performance levels for the total test population and subgroups. SP 4.1-5 and SP 4.1-6 show the standard error in the theta and scale score metrics at every raw score point in grades 4 and 6, respectively.	The state reports student results by domain. It would be important to include the reliability of those domains (6.4-10). In addition, the state should report how cut scores are generated for the subscores and how error can potentially impact those subscores. Peers found scale score tables challenging to interpret (4.1.5). The state might consider including a written summary showing how they have considered the impact of the SEMs on the reliability of the assessment as well as if the SEMs are adequate at the cut scores. Peers noted that reliability evidence is reported, but without discussion for incorporating these data into a system of assessment improvement.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • The state needs to provide reliability by domain • The state needs to provide evidence that reliability estimates are being used as part of a systematic process for improvement.		

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

32

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
For all State academic assessments, assessments should be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (see definition[4]). **For academic content assessments**, the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in their design, development and analysis.	SP 2.2-1 Data Recognition Corporation (DRC) Item Development Manual SP 2.2-2 Agenda for SCPASS 4th grade science Content Review SP 2.2-3 Agenda for SCPASS 6th grade science Content Review SP 2.2-4 Committee Lists for SCPASS Science Content Review SP 2.2-5 Training PowerPoint for SCPASS Science Content Review SP 2.2-6 Committee list for Bias and Sensitivity Committee SP 2.2-7 Training PowerPoint for the Bias and Sensitivity review SP 4.2-1 Making Assessments Accessible and Inclusive: A Handbook for DRC Employees, Independent Consultants, and Passage/Item Writers The Item Development Manual references test specifications guidance documents including adherence to the Principles of Universal Design, which were jointly developed and implemented by content experts and test development experts at SCDE and DRC (SP 2.2-1 page 41-42). A through internal review process occurs within DRC followed by review by the state client. Separate content alignment review committees for SCPASS Science were	The state provides documentation of bias and sensitivity review and comments (4.2-1). Item writing guidance is provided in 4.2.2. Peers could not find evidence of training occurring.

[4] see page 28 of "*A State's Guide to the U.S. Department of Education's Assessment Peer Review Process"*, September 24, 2018 available at: www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html

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

	convened in Columbia, South Carolina, and DRC facilitated the meeting. Agendas (SP 2.2-2 and SP 2.2-3) and committee lists (SP 2.2-4) for the meetings are included. In addition to how to review items for content alignment, committee members were trained on cognitive complexity (e.g., DOK). The Principles of Universal Design, and how to consider such when reviewing items with additional consideration of the alignment of the item with the proper South Carolina standard. A training PowerPoint is included. (SP 2.2-5) Bias and Sensitivity reviews occur concurrently with content reviews. A committee list (SP 2.2-6) and a training PowerPoint for the bias and sensitivity review is included. (SP 2.2-7) Item writers are trained in the Principles of Universal Design in the item writer handbook, Making Assessments Accessible and Inclusive: A Handbook for DRC Employees, Independent Consultants, and Passage/Item Writers (SP 4.2-1)	

Section 4.2 Summary Statement
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • The state needs to provide evidence that training for content review and bias and sensitivity has occurred (such as sign-in sheets).

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

Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for **academic assessments**, including performance for high- and low-achieving students.	SP 4.1-5 SCPASS Grade 4 Truncated Conversion Table SP 4.1-6 SCPASS Grade 6 Truncated Conversion Table The theta distribution extends quite low and high, although there is both a HOSS and LOSS applied to the assessments, for both grade 4 (SP 4.1-5) and grade 6 (SP 4.1-6).	Evidence does not adequately demonstrate that the test measures the full performance continuum. Such evidence could include summary tables that show additional information such as frequency distributions, Rasch item maps, or separability indices. The state provides test maps (2.1-3) that show p-values. These values seem clustered between .4 and .6. The state might provide information about how p-values are monitored to ensure that the test accurately measures students across the full performance continuum.

Section 4.3 Summary Statement
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • The state must provide evidence that the test measures the full performance continuum.

Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State's **academic achievement standards**.	SP 2.1-1 SCPASS Technical Report SP 4.4-1 2017 SCPASS Science Standard Setting Report with PLDs (pp. 2-3) SP 4.4-2 2017 SCPASS Standard Setting Report – SCDE Addendum The SCPASS Technical Report SP 2.1-1 (p. 22) discusses the actual scoring process of paper and online assessments; whereas, the alignment in regards to the state's academic achievement standards is covered in the standard setting process (SP 4.4-1 & SP 4.4-2).	The state has met the requirements of this critical element.

Section 4.4 Summary Statement
_X__ No additional evidence is required

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

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 **academic assessments** within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State's **academic content standards** and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.	SP 2.1-1 SCPASS Technical Report (section 7.7, pp. 25-26; section 9.2, pp. 34-36) SP 2.1-2 Guidelines for Item Analysis and Form Construction SP 2.1-3 Test maps for SCPASS Science 4th and 6th grade SP 2.1-1 section 9.2 (pp. 34-36) demonstrates that items are predominantly the same on both forms and all are checked for mode differential item functioning (DIF). Because the assessments are post-equated and linking items are present (SP 2.1-1, section 7.7, pp. 25-26), all forms are on the same common scale and the Rasch model evens out the comparability in the event that one form is slightly easier than the other. Test blueprints are found in the Guidelines for Item Analysis and Form Construction document on pages 13-14. (SP 2.1-2). Test maps for SCPASS Science 4th and 6th grade are included. (SP 2.1-3).	The state meets the requirements for this CE.
Section 4.5 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

37

Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
If the State administers any of its assessments in multiple versions within a subject area (e.g., online versus paper-based delivery; **or a native language version of the academic content assessment**), grade level, or school year, the State: • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.	SP 2.1-1 SCPASS Technical Report SP 2.1-1 section 9.2 (pp. 34-36) demonstrates that items are predominantly the same on both forms and all are checked for mode differential item functioning (DIF). Because the assessments are post-equated and linking items are present (SP 2.1-1, pp. 25-26), all forms are on the same common scale and the Rasch model evens out the comparability in the event that one form is slightly easier than the other.	2.1-1 p. 3 and p. 16 discuss that TEI items were replaced by MC items on paper-based forms. Peers could find no evidence regarding how many items were replaced on each test. Peers could not find evidence of how many paper-based tests were given at each grade. Peers found evidence regarding the low number of alternate forms (braille, large print). It was difficult to interpret the test maps in terms of item construction on the paper versus online. Peers feel it would be helpful to understand how the DIF results are used to improve the comparability of assessments in future cycles. The peers could not find evidence of paper-pencil/online DIF. The peers could not find evidence regarding devices used in the sate for administering assessments, not evidence regarding device comparability.

Section 4.6 Summary Statement

__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
  • The state must submit additional evidence on item replacement and numbers of paper forms given at each grade level as well as evidence to ensure that the forms are comparable.
  • The state needs to provide evidence of device comparability.

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

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
The State: • Has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments), and • Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State's website.	SP 4.7-1 TAC Minutes [September 2019] (Algebra 1 Item Displacement, pp. 4-5) SP 4.7-2 SCDE Website SP 4.7-1 discusses item displacement for Algebra 1; however, the same general procedure of detecting item drift is applied to SCPASS. At each post-equating drift is calculated for all items. If drift is detected, the item is then referred to our development team who presents it to committees of teachers to determine the item's suitability for inclusion on future forms of SCPASS. SP 4.7-2 shows a list of all posted technical reports. More recent technical reports are available upon request; however the agency, in moving to section 508 compliance, is not prepared to post fully compliant technical reports.	The state offers some narrative in the submission index regarding the post-equating and drift analysis, but peers feel this would be better suited for inclusion in the technical reports. The state might provide information on item drift for the science assessment similar to 4.7-1 (Algebra) The state should provide a timeline for when the most current technical reports would be posted or available. 4.7-2 only provides information on EOCEP. The state should submit documentation about the availability of the science assessment. Peers could not find evidence of science technical reports being made public. The peers could not find evidence of a systematic process of improving the science assessment.

Section 4.7 Summary Statement
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • The state must provide evidence of a system for monitoring, maintaining and improving the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of the Science assessment. • The state must provide evidence of the publication of science technical reports online.

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

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
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. 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: • Establish guidelines for determining whether to assess a student with an AA-AAAS, including: o A State definition of "students with the most significant cognitive disabilities" that addresses factors related to cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior; • Provide information for IEP Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:	SP 1.3-5 READY/SCPASS Test Administration Manual for Online Testing SP 1.3-6 SCREADY and SCPASS Test Administration Manual for Paper Testing SP 5.1-1 Memo Testing all Students SP 5.1-2 Special Education Process Guide SP 5.1-3 South Carolina Accessibility Support Document SP 5.1-4 Memo-Accessibility Support SP 5.1-5 FAQ Testing Students with Disabilities SP 5.1-6 Guidance for IEP teams on Determining Participation in the SC-Alt SP 5.1-7 Procedures for Monitoring Students taking the Alternate Assessment The State has procedures in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public school students with disabilities participate in the State's assessment system. • The READY/SCPASS Test Administration Manual for Online Testing (SP 1.3-5 pages 1, 7-8, 32–35, C-2, C3) • The READY/SCPASS Test Administration Manual for Paper Testing (SP 1.3-6 pages 1, 7-8, 30–33, C-2, C-3) • Memo with testing requirement for all students (SP 5.1-1). Training materials and documents are provided for IEP and 504 Teams. • Special Education Process Guide for South Carolina (SP 5.1-2; page 66, e).	The state provides required evidence for the CE.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
o Provides a clear explanation of the differences between assessments aligned with grade-level academic achievement standards and those aligned with alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student's education resulting from taking an AA-AAAS, such as how participation in such assessments may delay or otherwise affect the student from completing the requirements for a regular high school diploma; • Ensure that parents of students assessed with an AA-AAAS are informed that their child's achievement will be measured based on alternate academic achievement standards; • Not preclude a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who takes an AA-AAAS from attempting to complete the requirements for a regular high school diploma; and • Promote, consistent with requirements under the IDEA, the involvement and progress of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in the general education curriculum that is based on the State's academic content standards	• The South Carolina Accessibility Support Document is a full accommodations and accessibility guide for IEP and 504 teams (SP 5.1-3) • Memo to distribute the new/updated Accessibility Support Document (SP 5.1-4) Additional information is provided on accommodations available for students with disabilities. • Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities can be found in of the Test Administration Manual (SP 1.3-5 and SP 1.3-6 Appendix pages C-3 through C-6). • FAQ Testing Students with Disabilities (SP 5.1-5). 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. • Guidance for IEP teams on Determining Participation in the SC-Alt and the definition of the SC-Alt (SP 5.1-6) The state has internal procedures for monitoring districts to ensure appropriate students are taking the SC-Alt (SP 5.1-7)	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
for the grade in which the student is enrolled; and • Develop, disseminate information on, and promote the use of appropriate accommodations to ensure that a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who does not take an AA-AAAS participates in academic instruction and assessments for the grade in which the student is enrolled. • The State has in place and monitors implementation of guidelines for IEP teams to apply in determining, on a case-by-case basis, which students with the most significant cognitive disabilities will be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, if applicable. Such guidelines must be developed in accordance with 34 CFR § 200.6(d).[5]		
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required		

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

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
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: • Procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed with a linguistic accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for ELs; • Assistance regarding selection of appropriate linguistic accommodations for ELs, including to the extent practicable, assessments in the language most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what those students know and can do to determine the students' mastery of skills in academic content areas until the students have achieved English language proficiency.	SP 1.3-5 SCREADY/SCPASS Test Administration Manual for Online Testing SP 1.3-6 SCREADY and SCPASS Test Administration Manual for Paper Testing SP 1.4-1 Memo - Accessibility Support Document SP 1.4-2 Accessibility Support Document Procedures are in place for ensuring inclusion of all EL students in testing and determining whether an EL should be assessed with an accommodation. • 2019 SCREADY SCPASS Test Administration Manual (Test Administration Manual) for Online Testing (SP 1.3-5 page 33, D-1, D-4 through D-6) • 2019 SC READY SCPASS Test Administration Manual for Paper Testing (SP 1.3-6 page 31, D-1, D-4 through D-6). • Accessibility Support Document Memo (SP1.4-1) • South Carolina Accessibility Support Document (SP 1.4-2) Guidance in the above documents indicates all accommodation decisions must be based on individual student needs and provides suggestions regarding what types of accommodations may be most appropriate for students.	The state meets the criteria for this critical element
Section 5.2 Summary Statement		
__X_ No additional evidence is required		

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

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
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: • Ensures that appropriate accommodations, such as, interoperability with, and ability to use, assistive technology, are available to measure the **academic achievement** of students with disabilities. • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs; • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student's need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. • Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny	SP 1.3-5 2019 SCPASS/SCREADY Test Administration Manual for Online Testing SP 1.3-6 2019 SCPASS/SCREADY Test Administration Manual for Paper Testing SP 5.1-5 Accommodation FAQ Document SP 5.3-1 Special Circumstance Procedures Accommodations are available for students with disabilities and English learners as indicated. • Accommodations for Students with Disabilities are located in Appendix C of the SCREADY/SCPASS Test Administration Manuals (SP 1.3-5 and SP1.3-6 pages C-3 through C-10 in both) • Accommodations for ELs are located in Appendix D of both SCPASS/SCREADY Test Administration Manuals (SP 1.3-5 and SP1.3-6 pages D-4 through D-6) • Accommodations FAQ document (SP 5.1-5) South Carolina as a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed: (SP 5.3-1) A special request form as found in Appendix C of the SCPASS Online and Paper Test Administration Manuals (SP 1.3-5 and SP 1.3-6; page. C-19).	The state meets the requirements. The state should consider providing theoretical or research studies on the use of accommodations and how they impact reliability and validity.

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

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

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

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
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: • Consistent with the State's policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student's disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student's IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures; • Monitored for administrations of all required academic content assessments and AA-AAAS.	SP 5.1-6 Guidance for IEP teams on Determining Participation in the SC-Alt SP 5.1-7 Procedures for Monitoring Students taking the Alternate Assessment SP 5.4-1 Monitoring Overview and Rubric SP 5.4-2 Monitoring IEP Development SP 5.4-3 Results Input SP 5.4-4 Onsite IEP Development Results SP 5.4-5 Onsite IEP Implementation Results SP 5.4-6 Monitoring Use of Accommodations Monitoring Procedures Description of procedures the State uses to monitor accommodations: • The Monitoring overview and rubric (MOR) for IEP Development that is used during onsite monitoring can be found on page 6 section 8 of the rubric (SP 5.4-1). • Results of the onsite monitoring of IEP development is input by monitors on a link online (SP 5.4-2). • Results of onsite monitoring of IEP implementation is input by monitors on a link online. A copy of the online form that monitors input data is provided (SP 5.4-3). Description of procedures the State uses to monitor that students with disabilities are placed by IEP Teams in the appropriate assessment:	The state provided information on the monitoring conducted to ensure accommodations are used and are appropriate for students with IEPs. 5.4.4 states that ELL and 504 plans may have accommodations but the monitoring and results (in 5.4-1, -2, 3) seem to reflect only students with IEPs (not EL students). 1.4-2 - Accessibility Supports Manual mentions an ELL accommodation plan (p.11), which would seem to provide direct evidence for this CE, but peers were unable to locate the document itself. The state needs to provide evidence of monitoring EL accommodations.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	• Guidance for IEP teams on determining participation in the SC-Alt (SP 5.1-6) • The state has internal procedures for monitoring districts to ensure appropriate students are taking the SC-Alt (SP 5.1-7) • Results of the onsite monitoring of IEP development as part of prong 1 of the monitoring procedure. Results of IEP development is evidence (SP 5.4-4). • Results of the onsite monitoring of IEP implementation as part of prong 1 of the monitoring procedure. Results of IEP development is evidence (SP 5.4-5). • Additionally 12 individualized statewide accommodations training provided at districts as seen in (SP 5.4-6). • The State's written procedures for monitoring the use of accommodations during test administration are included (SP 5.4-6).	
Section 5.4 Summary Statement		
__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: The state needs to provide evidence of monitoring EL accommodations.		

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

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
For academic content standards: The State formally adopted **challenging academic achievement standards** in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for all students, specifically: • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; The State's academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (1) at least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third for lower achievement; (2) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (3) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.	SP 6.1-1 SCPASS State Superintendent Standards approval letter In South Carolina, the State Superintendent of Education alone accepts the standards and cut scores (SP 6.1-1). The standards are then presented to the State Board of Education for information only.	The state meets the requirements for this CE.

Section 6.1 Summary Statement
X   No additional evidence is required

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

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: • **Academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards**.	SP 4.4-1 2017 SCPASS Science Standard Setting Report with PLDs SP 4.4-2 2017 SCPASS Standard Setting Report – SCDE Addendum SP 4.4-1 and SP 4.4-2 detail the procedure by which SCDE and its contractor DRC set the science standards for SCPASS. The bookmark procedure was used to guide a group of South Carolina teachers through the standard setting procedure.	4.4-1 is the Standard Setting Report. The bookmark method was used, with three rounds. OIBs were augmented to fill gaps. Three cuts were set for the four achievement levels. The Grade 6 committee may have not all initially completely understood the task, given the maximum cut of 60 at each cut (p.5). This may be borne out in the evaluation results, where more than a few panelists disagreed that adequate training was provided in the opening session (p.100). The differences in impact across grades were large, perhaps a further indication that panelists may not have understood the purpose of vertical articulation. 4.4-2 is an addendum to the Standard Setting report that addresses the vertical articulation issue. There was no display of the adjusted impact data, but it is assumed that the vertical articulation issue was addressed but no evidence for addressing that issue was found by peers. The outcome of such significant policy adjustments (more than 2 SEs) is that it may undermine the validity of the Standard Setting process itself, as the policy adjustments depart significantly from the panelists' recommendations.
Section 6.2 Summary Statement		

__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
  • The state must provide evidence demonstrating that post-hoc adjustments to cut scores did not impact the validity of the Standard Setting process.

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

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
For academic achievement standards: 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.	SP 2.1-4 South Carolina Assessment Evaluation Report #2 SP 2.2-2 Agenda for SCPASS 4th grade science Content Review SP 2.2-3 Agenda for SCPASS 6th grade science Content Review SP 2.2-4 Committee Lists for SCPASS Science Content Review SP 2.2-5 Training PowerPoint for SCPASS Science Content Review SP 4.4-1 2017 SCPASS Science Standard Setting Report with PLDs SP 4.4-2 2017 SCPASS Standard Setting Report – SCDE Addendum	The peers did not find sufficient evidence that the state's academic achievement standards are aligned to the state's content standards. The peers could not find evidence of benchmarking results against other assessments. Given the post-hoc adjustments to cut scores were so significant, the peers suggest the state engage in an external validation of the cut scores to ensure they measure the breadth and depth of the standards and are articulated appropriately.
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	A through internal review processes occurs within DRC followed by review by the state client. Separate content alignment review committees for SCPASS Science were convened in Columbia, South Carolina, and DRC facilitated the meeting. Agendas (SP 2.2-2 and S{ 2.2-3) and committee lists (SP 2.2-4) for the meetings are included. In addition to how to review items for content alignment, committee members were trained on cognitive complexity (e.g., DOK) and how to consider such when reviewing items with additional consideration of the alignment of the item with the proper South Carolina standard. A training PowerPoint is included. (SP 2.2-5) Although the SCPASS assessment was not included in the alignments study, the development and construction processes are the same for the End of Course and SCPASS assessments. An independent review of the test development process by HumRRO (SP 2.1-4, p. 3-11, appendices A-F) provides evidence that South Carolina	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
postsecondary education or competitive integrated employment.	test development adheres to industry best practices (SP 2.1-4 p. xii). An independent alignment study for SCPASS is scheduled for 2020. The Standard Setting Reports (SP 4.4-1 & SP 4.4-2) demonstrate the extent to which South Carolina's teachers aligned the performance levels with the standards. An independent alignment study of SCPASS assessment was not conducted by HumRRO. Therefore, an independent alignments study for the SCPASS assessments is planned for 2020.	

Section 6.3 Summary Statement

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
- The state must provide evidence that the state's academic achievement standards are aligned to the state's content standards.

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

Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
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. The State reports to the public its assessment results on **student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level**[6] For **academic content assessments**, 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 **specific academic needs of students**, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results. • 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:	SP 1.4-5 2019 SCPASS Score Report User's Guide SP 1.4-5 2019 SCPASS Score Report User's Guide SP 6.4-1 South Carolina Code of Laws; Sections 59-18-360 and 59-18-900 SP 6.4-1 South Carolina Code of Laws; Sections 59-18-360 and 59-18-900 SP 6.4-2 2018-19 Accountability Manual SP 6.4-3 Addendum to the Accountability Manual SP 6.4-4 EOC School Report Card Guide SP 6.4-5 2019 South Carolina Report Card - Science SP 6.4-6 2019 District Report Card - Science SP 6.4-7 2019 School Report Card - Science SP 6.4-8 2019 SCPASS Statewide Science Scores by Grade Level SP 6.4-9 2019 SCPASS Statewide Science Scores by Grade and Demographics SP 6.4-10 2019 SCPASS Statewide Scores by Grade and Content Standard SP 6.4-11 2019 SCPASS Scores for Charleston School District by Grade and Demographics SP 6.4-12 2019 SCPASS Scores for Carolina Park Elementary by Grade and Demographics SP 6.4-13 Data Review Committee Participants	The peers could not find evidence of a method for parents to request reports in alternate formats.

---

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
o Provide valid and reliable information regarding a **student's academic achievement**; o Report the **student's academic achievement** in terms of the State's grade-level academic achievement standards; o Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific **academic needs of students**; o Are provided in an understandable and uniform format; o 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; o Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent. • The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.	SP 6.4-14 Item Analysis Explanation SP 6.4-15 Data Review PowerPoint SP 6.4-16 2019 Science Data Review Recommendations SP 6.4-17 Memo – Data Review Reports & Quick Links for Teachers SP 6.4-18 SCPASS Individual Student Report SP 6.4-19 Frequency of Foreign Languages SP 6.4-20 Spanish translation of the SCPASS ISR SP 6.4-21 Spanish translation of the Student/Parent Brochure SP 6.4-22 Mandarin translation of the SCPASS ISR SP 6.4-23 Mandarin translation of the Student/Parent Brochure SP 6.4-24 Russian translation of the SCPASS ISR SP 6.4-25 Russian translation of the Student/Parent Brochure SP 6.4-26 Cost of Translations SP 6.4-27 Approval of Translation Production SP 6.4-28 DTC Weekly Update SP 6.4-29 Email - Notification of Test Results Posted SP 6.4-30 Memo – Delivery of Paper Reports Sections 59-18-360 and 59-18-900 of the South Carolina Code of Laws (SP 6.4-1) mandates that the state and district report cards must be furnished to parents and the public by October 1. The Education Oversight Committee and the SCDE produces the Accountability Manual (SP 6.4-2) which indicates the proficiency	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	targets that must be included on the report cards. See also the Addendum to the manual (SP 6.4-3) and the EOC School Report Card Guide (6.4-4).	
	SCPASS science accountability data are included on the South Carolina Report Card (SP 6.4-5); District Report Cards (SP 6.4-6); and School Report Cards (SP6.4-7). All are posted on the SCDE Website for public viewing. Performance levels for subgroups of students are also posted:	
	2019 SCPASS Statewide Science Scores by Grade Level (SP 6.4-8);	
	2019 SCPASS Statewide Science Scores by Grade and Demographics (SP 6.4-9);	
	2019 SCPASS Statewide Scores by Grade and Content Standard (SP6.4-10);	
	2019 SCPASS Scores for Charleston School District by Grade and Demographics (SP6.4-11); and,	
	2019 SCPASS Scores for Carolina Park Elementary (Charleston School District) by Grade and Demographics (SP6.4-12).	
	Itemized Score Analysis	
	An item analysis is conducted each year by a committee of teachers from across the state (SP 6.4-13). The	
	teachers are trained on statistical terms (SP 6.4-14) and other information in a PowerPoint presentation (SP 6.4-15). Results are reviewed and recommendations made for publication (SP 6.4-16). These results are posted on the state Website (Memo with links - SP 6.4-17) and in presentation to various organizations.	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Interpretive Guides	
	The SCPASS Score Report User's Guide (SP 1.4-5) discusses the types of score reports, explains key measurement concepts and includes science standards, test blueprints, and cut scores. There is an emphasis on test score interpretation.	
	Individual Student Reports (ISRs)	
	The SCPASS Individual Student Reports (IRSs) (paper and electronic) (SP6.4-18) provide an overall scale score for science and a performance level: Does Not meet Expectations, Approaches Expectations, Meets Expectations and Exceeds Expectations. To meet the academic needs of students the ISR provides examples of parent friendly performance level descriptors.	
	Districts and schools also receive data files, student rosters, and student labels. Examples are given in the User's Guide (SP 1.4-5; pages.7-10).	
	Alternative Formats	
	Beginning in 2018-19, Braille, large print, and foreign language translations of the ISR and the Student and Parent Brochure were available to schools for distribution to students and parents who are non-native English speakers or parents, and students who are blind or have limited eyesight.	
	Translations of the three most frequently spoken languages of EL elementary and middle school students were produced (SP 6.4-19) and posted on the	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	contractor's secure website for schools to download or to request copies	
	Spanish translation of the SCPASS ISR (SP 6.4-20); Student/Parent Brochure (SP 6.4-21)	
	Mandarin - SCPASS ISR (SP 6.4-22);	
	Student/Parent Brochure (SP 6.4-23)	
	Russian - SCPASS ISR (SP 6.4-24);	
	Student/Parent Brochure (SP 6.4-25)	
	Cost and approval documentation for these translations provide evidence that the materials were done (SP 6.4-26 and SP 6.4-27).	
	Process and Timeline	
	Sections 59-18-360 and 59-18-900 of the South Carolina Code of Laws (SP 6.4-1) outline the minimum criteria for reporting student, school, district and state assessment results. The law specifically states that assessment results must be disseminated to individual students and schools by August first each year. It also states that schools and districts are responsible for disseminating this information to parents.	
	The Office of Assessment collaborates with the contractor, DRC, to ensure that electronic data files, electronic and paper ISRs, and Scoring Guides for the districts are delivered as soon as possible after scoring, but no later than August 1. Timelines for the delivery of reports are published in the DTC Weekly Update, which	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	is a newsletter sent to districts (SP 6.4-28). Included is an e-mail notifying scores were posted online in July 2019 (6.4-29) and a memo indicating delivery of paper reports to the districts (SP 6.4-30).	

Section 6.4 Summary Statement

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

- The state needs a method for parents to request reports in alternate formats or languages.

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

57

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

Contents

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

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

SECTION 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
The State's test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to **the depth and breadth of the State's academic content standards** for the grade that is being assessed and includes: • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of **the State's grade-level academic content standards** and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results. • Processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in **the State's academic content standards,** reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills). • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design	RE 2.1-1 SC READY Test Design document RE 2.1-2 SC READY ELA Blueprints RE 2.1-3 SC READY Math Blueprints RE 2.1-4 SC READY ELA Test Map grade 3 RE 2.1-5 SC READY ELA Test Map grade 4 RE 2.1-6 SC READY ELA Test Map grade 5 RE 2.1-7 SC READY ELA Test Map grade 6 RE 2.1-8 SC READY ELA Test Map grade 7 RE 2.1-9 SC READY ELA Test Map grade 8 RE 2.1-10 SC READY Math Test Map grade 3 RE 2.1-11 SC READY Math Test Map grade 4 RE 2.1-12 SC READY Math Test Map grade 5 RE 2.1-13 SC READY Math Test Map grade 6 RE 2.1-14 SC READY Math Test Map grade 7 RE 2.1-15 SC READY Math Test Map grade 8 RE 2.1-16 Sample Passage Placemat RE 2.1-17 SC READY Math Framework RE 2.1-18 READY Guidelines for Item Analysis and Forms Construction RE 2.1-19 South Carolina Assessment Evaluation Report #2 RE 2.1-20 Usability Study RE 2.1-21 Mode Effect Study Results	Usability: Peers did not find any evidence of any study examining the potential effects of different types of technology (tablets vs. computer, for example). The state must show that there are no differences in those modes of administration. DOK: The state needs to provide evidence that it has addressed concerns raised in the HumRRO report.

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

and intended uses and interpretations of results. • If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the student is enrolled and uses that determination for all reporting. • If the State administers a content assessment that includes portfolios, such assessment may be partially administered through a portfolio but may not be *entirely* administered through a portfolio.	RE 2.1-22 Test Administration Manual RE 2.1-23 Education Accountability Act RE 2.1-24 Online Testing Waiver Request Form RE 2.1-25 Online Testing and Waiver Requests memo <u>State notes</u> The SC READY Test Design document (RE 2.1-1) describes the attention given to the alignment of the item difficulty and the cognitive complexity in the design process. The blueprints and test maps for SC READY ELA and Math provide evidence of the full range of content coverage and challenging content (RE 2.1-2 through 2.1-15). The Sample Passage Placemat document and the SC READY Math Framework document further exemplify the alignment and cognitive complexity of the items (RE 2.1-16 and RE 2.1-17). The Guidelines for Item Analysis and Forms Construction document provide evidence of specifications and procedures to develop test forms (RE 2.1-18). An independent review of the test development process provides evidence that the test development and process worked as intended. South Carolina (RE 2.1-19: Assessment Evaluation Report #2; Pages 12-30 and Appendices A-F). • A study was conducted to evaluate the usability of the technology for delivering assessments. Students in grades 3 – 8 completed a survey on their experiences The Mode Effect study did	

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

	not indicate score differences attributed to testing mode. (RE2.1-21, p 7) • SCDE avoids and reduces the possibility of usability problems or mode effects by providing a number of testing accommodations for students testing online. The accommodations enable the program to maximize usability across the entire student population. (RE 2.1-22, p. C-1). SCDE reduces the possibility of usability issues or mode effects by allowing districts to test students on paper. Section 59-18-325, (g) of the State's Education Accountability Act (EAA) (RE 2.1-23) mandates computer-based testing; however, a proviso allows districts and individual public charter schools to submit a request for a waiver to the State Board of Education requesting an exemption from the online testing requirement. If a district, in its judgement, believes, for example, that their students do not have the keyboarding skills to effectively test online, or handle an essay online, they can apply for a waiver from the requirement to test online. If granted, they may test on paper. Evidence provided includes the form for requesting a waiver (RE 2.1-24), and a memo from the Board of Education approving the waiver (RE 2.1-25). All waiver requests submitted for 2017-18 were approved with the testing technology. No evidence was found that using technology or the standard paper test provided any untoward impact on the students' testing experience. (RE 2.1-20).	

Section 2.1 Summary Statement
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • The state needs to provide evidence that it has addressed issues in the HumRRO report. • The state needs to provide evidence that it has examined potential effects of different types of technology (tablets vs computer, for example). The state must show that there are no differences in those modes of administration.

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

Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to: • Assess student achievement based on the **State's academic content standards** in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.	RE 2.2-1 DRC Item Development Manual RE 2.1-19 South Carolina Assessment Evaluation Report #2 State's notes In response to the recommendation from an independent evaluator (HumRRO), DRC created an Item Development Manual that outlines the development process in detail (RE 2.2-1). The manual references test specifications guidance documents, which were jointly developed and implemented by content experts and test development experts at SCDE and DRC. An independent review of the test development process by HumRRO (RE 2.1-19, pages 12-30 and Appendices A-F) provides evidence that the test development process worked as intended. HumRRO also provided favorable feedback specific elements of the test development process (RE 2.1-19, p. ii).	The HumRRO report documented some areas where Biology and Algebra could be improved in terms of the distribution of cognitive complexity (xiv-xv). A response was provided by the state in 1.3-4, but the focus was on improving DOK for ELA, but not Biology and aAlgebra, where there was some identified need for improvements. The state needs to provide documentation that issues listed have been effectively addressed.
Section 2.2 Summary Statement		
_x__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • The state needs to provide evidence of improvements recommended in the HumRRO report.		

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

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
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: • To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.	RE 2.6-1 SC Code of Laws Section 59-1-490 RE 2.6-2 Information Security Policy–Data Protection and Privacy RE 2.6-3 Information Security Policy–Human Resource (HR) and Security Awareness RE 2.6-4 Information Security Program Master Policy RE 2.6-5 Information Security Policy–IT Compliance RE 2.6-6 Information Security Policy–Threat and Vulnerability Management RE 2.6-7 Information Security Policy–Access Control RE 2.6-8 Information Security Policy–Information Systems Acquisitions, Development and Maintenance RE 2.6-9 Information Security Policy–Asset Management RE 2.6-10 Information Security Policy–Business Continuity Management RE 2.6-11 Information Security Policy–IT Risk Strategy RE 2.6-12 Information Security Policy–Mobile Security RE 2.6-13 Information Security Policy–Physical & Environmental Security RE 2.6-14 Information Security Policy–Risk Management RE2.6-15 System and Information Integrity Policy and Procedures RE2.6-16 Use of External Information Systems	The state has submitted a large number of policies. However, many of these are dated from several years ago, and do not appear to have been updated. Additionally, it is important to note that polices do not equal procedures for implementing those policies. The state should provide more detailed information regarding procedures related to this critical element. Peers could not find any evidence of requirements that vendors use industry-standard practices for maintaining secure items, data, and for remedying breaches.

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

	RE 2.6-17 2019 SCREADY/SCPASS Test Administration Manual for Paper Testing	
	State's notes	
	State law is the foundation of the data security policies and procedures. SC Code Ann. § 59-1-490 addresses data use and governance policy. The policy indicates that data must be maintained in a secure environment with access limited to pre-identified staff. The law mandates training in data security and student privacy laws. SCDE staff complete training modules with quizzes on a routine basis (RE 2.6-1).	
	Evidence of state policies to protect the integrity and confidentiality of student-level assessment data and protest student privacy and confidentiality are provided in 2.6-2 through RE2.6-16.	
	Guidelines for district and school staff are provided in the SCREADY/SCPASS Test Administration Manual (RE 2.6-17). Specific procedures are provided on the following pages. • Security legislation: pages 7–9 • State Board regulations: pages 10–12 • Guidelines for reporting, investigating, and documenting test security violations: pages 13–15 • Guidelines for reporting violations involving students with disabilities: pages 16–17	

Section 2.6 Summary Statement

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

The state should provide information on the procedures that have been developed to implement security policies provided in the state's evidence to ensure data integrity and privacy

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

9

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
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: **The State's academic assessments** measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State's academic content standards, including: • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State's assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards; • If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards and administers alternate assessments aligned with those standards, the assessments show adequate alignment to the State's academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content	RE 3.1-1 SC READY Technical Report RE 2.1-19 South Carolina Assessment Evaluation Report #2 State's notes The SC READY Technical Report describes three types of validity: evidence based on test content, internal structure, and relations to other variables (RE 3.1-1, p. 49-57). HumRRO conducted an independent alignment study of the SC READY mathematics and ELA items in 2017-18. The HumRRO Evaluation Report established that the SC READY assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State's academic content standards (RE 2.1-19; p. 111).	Peers noted that the alignment study was aligned to KY standards. The state must provide a crosswalk to SC standards. The HumRRO report details some findings in the content and complexity related to alignment to the standards. The state must provide evidence that they have addressed concerns outlined in the report. The peers note that the HumRRO report references a larger alignment study, but peers could not find the study itself to review. Peers request that report for review.

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

and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.		

Section 3.1 Summary Statement
_x__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • The state must provide evidence of a crosswalk between KY standards and SC standards.   • The state must provide evidence that they have addressed issues raised in the HumRRO study   • The state must provide for review the original alignment study referenced by HumRRO.

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

11

Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap: **the intended cognitive processes** appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State's academic content standards.	RE 3.2-1 Content Review Committee List RE 3.2-2 Depth of Knowledge and Cognitive Complexity Training Manual RE 2.1-19 South Carolina Assessment Evaluation Report #2 RE 3.2-3 Education Oversight Committee Approval Letter State's notes DRC content staff conducted an internal content review of the SC READY math and ELA items, with a subsequent review by a committee of external content experts from across the state to evaluate the items. A list of the Content Review Committee members is provided (RE 3.2-1). In addition to how to review items for content, committee members were trained on cognitive complexity (e.g., DOK) and how to evaluate alignment of an item with the proper South Carolina standard. The Depth of Knowledge and Cognitive Complexity Training Manual is provided (RE 3.2-2). An independent alignment study established that the SC READY assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State's academic content standards (RE 2.1-19, p. 111). The South Carolina Education Oversight Committee approved the SC READY assessment for South Carolina. The approval letter is provided (RE 3.2-3).	2.1.19 The report shows mixed results with respect to cognitive complexity. ELA items were often below the intended complexity of the standard, while a majority of mathematics items were above the standards' intended complexity. The state needs to provide evidence that these issued have been addressed.

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

Section 3.2 Summary Statement
_x__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • The state needs to provide evidence that issues regarding cognitive complexity in ELA and math have been addressed.

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

13

Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State's **academic content standards**.	RE 3.3-1 Summary of Validity Based on Internal Structure RE 3.3-2 Correlations between reporting categories and the total test score by grade and subject State's notes The summary provided (RE 3.3-1) lays out the interpretation of evidence to support the claim that scoring and reporting structures of the SC READY are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State's academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based. This document includes the criteria used in interpreting these results and a plan for increasing reliabilities for ELs on the mathematics assessment. A spreadsheet providing correlation between reporting categories and total test scores is provided (RE 3.3-2). The KR20s represent conservative estimators of reliability.	The state provides evidence of correlations between the total test score and subdomains. The state should consider reporting the reliability of each subdomain and how low reliability would be addressed (or report dissattenuated correlations). SC states that they: "have sufficient evidence to support a unidimensional model." The peers feel this statement supports the need to reduce overlap in subscores.
Section 3.3 Summary Statement		
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • The state needs to provide narrative of how it plans to reduce overlap in subscores.		

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

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.	RE 3.4-1 Validity Narrative – Relationships with Other Variables RE 3.4-2 Impact of SC READY Performance Level Cuts compared with previous SC Assessments and NAEP RE 3.4-3 Relationships between reporting categories and total tests between ELA and Mathematics RE 3.4-4 SC READY cut scores compared with other assessments State's notes The Validity Narrative document (RE 3.4-1) and the Impact document (RE 3.4-2) lay out the argument of the strong relationships between SC READY and nationally recognized assessments of the same constructs, ELA or mathematics. The narrative also defines the State's evaluation criteria for correlations between ELA and Mathematics (RE 3.4-1and 3.4-3). These guidelines are rather conservative, as the correlation cut-off provides an r^2 of less than .50, meaning that still less than half of the variability between the two scores is explained by the nature of the two scores.	Peers could not determine whether the information provided by the state met the criteria for this critical outcome. Peers were unable to find explanations associated with 3.4-3 and 3.4-4. Additionally, it is unclear whether the comparisons selected adequately address relationships with other variables. For example, Lexiles are a proxy for reading level based on the transformation of a reading score, they are not a separable variable. Correlations between ELA and math content of the same assessment system do not meet the criteria of this element.

Section 3.4 Summary Statement
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • The State must provide evidence that it has documented adequate validity evidence that the State's assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.

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

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
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**.	RE 4.1-1 Clarification of Reliability Document RE 4.1-2 TAC minutes August 2018 (p. 5 3.3b) State's notes The Clarification of Reliability document (RE 4.1-1) clearly outlines the State's standard minimum reliability expectations of scores for large subgroups. The SCDE posed the question to the Technical Advisory Committee. The TAC suggested that, if absolutely necessary, the SCDE could use a standard deviation correction for small subgroups. However, the TAC supported the State's position that the decreased variation in the small subgroups caused the diminished KR20 reliabilities, which the TAC emphasized, is a lower boundary on reliability (RE 4.1-2, p.5 3.3b).	The evidence provided appears to sufficiently address this critical element, although technical documentation should be included in the state's Technical Report. For example, the TAC minutes, 4.1-2 were very insightful and useful, but currently exist only as a stand-alone document. The state's decisions and actions taken as a result of the TAC feedback are not captured formally. The state provides a sufficient rationale for lower reliability of the results for English learnerss.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

17

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
For all State academic assessments, assessments should be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (see definition[7]). **For academic content assessments**, the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in their design, development and analysis.	RE 4.2-1 Bias and Sensitivity Review Description RE 4.2-2 Training for Bias & Sensitivity Committee <u>State's notes</u> The Bias, Fairness, and Sensitivity Specialist panel of external, expert reviewers possessed a broad range of experiences in the educational field; all reviewers had bachelor-level, master-level, or doctoral-level degrees and teaching experience in their specific areas of expertise. A description of the Bias and Sensitivity Review of SC READY items is provided (RE 4.2-1). Training provided to the committee participants is provided (RE 4.2-2).	The state met the criteria for this item.
Section 4.2 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required		

---

[7] see page 28 of "*A State's Guide to the U.S. Department of Education's Assessment Peer Review Process"*, September 24, 2018 available at: www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html

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

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
For academic content standards: The State formally adopted **challenging academic achievement standards** in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for all students, specifically: • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; The State's academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (1) at least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third for lower achievement; (2) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (3) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.	RE 6.1-1 Letter of Approval from the Superintendent State's notes Evidence of official adoption of the academic achievement standards for SC READY ELA and math is provided (RE 6.1-1).	The state meets the requirements for this element.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 6.1 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
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. The State reports to the public its assessment results on **student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level**[8] For **academic content assessments**, 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 **specific academic needs of students**, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results. • The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each	RE 6.4-1 2019 Individual Student Report RE 6.4-2 Score Report Interpretative Guide for Parents RE 6.4-3 Score Report User's Guide RE 6.4-4 Explanation of Vertical Scaling RE 6.4-5 Three Most Frequently Spoken Foreign Languages RE 6.4-6 SC READY ISR - Spanish RE 6.4-7 SC READY ISR - Mandarin RE 6.4-8 SC READY ISR - Russian RE 6.4-9 SC Ready Parent and Student Brochure - Spanish RE 6.4-10 SC READY Parent and Student Brochure - Mandarin RE 6.4-11 SC READY Parent and Student Brochure - Russian RE 6.4-12 SC Code of Laws Section 59-18-360 RE 6.4-13 South Carolina Weekly Testing Update (May 27-31, 2019) <u>State's notes</u> The 2019 Individual Student Report (ISR) was redesigned to include performance-level descriptors (PLDs) (RE 6.4-1).	The state indicates that they provide reports in alternate formats to parents. However, the peers could not find evidence of a method for parents to know about and specifically request alternate formats of reports.

---

[8] 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.

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
administration of its academic content assessments that: o Provide valid and reliable information regarding a **student's academic achievement**; o Report the **student's academic achievement** in terms of the State's grade-level academic achievement standards; o Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific **academic needs of students**; o Are provided in an understandable and uniform format; o 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; o Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent. • The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers,	• The ISR also includes scale scores and performance levels for previous administrations. • Since the SC READY is on a vertical scale, parents are able to observe and compare their child's increase in the mastery of the S.C. College and Career Ready Academic Standards from grade to grade. Lexile and Quantile scores, as well as percentile ranks are also provided, which also help parents and educators address the specific needs of students. A Score Report Interpretative Guide for Parents (RE 6.4-2) was developed for schools to send to parents with the ISR. Key measurement concepts are explained in the guide. The guide is posted online for schools and parents to download. Online translations are available. The Score Report User's Guide (RE 6.4-3) is updated and distributed annually to district and schools for use in interpreting scores. An explanation of the SCREADY vertical scaling was sent to districts (RE 6.4-4). **Translations and Alternate Formats** Beginning in 2018-19, Braille, large print, and foreign language translations of the ISR and the Parent Brochure were available to schools for distribution to students and parents who are non-native English speakers or parents and to parents of students who are blind or have limited eyesight. A list of the most frequently spoken languages of ELL elementary and middle school students are provided in	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.	RE 6.4-5. Translations of the ISR and Parent Brochures were provided in these languages and are posted on the contractor's secure website for schools to download. • SC READY ISR-Spanish (RE 6.4-6) • SC READY ISR-Mandarin (RE 6.4-7) • SC READY ISR-Russian (RE 6.4-8) • SC Ready Parent and Student Brochure-Spanish(RE 6.4-9) • SC Ready Parent and Student Brochure - Mandarin (RE 6.4-10) • SC Ready Parent and Student Brochure - Russian (RE 6.4-11) **Reporting Timelines** South Carolina Code of Laws Section 59-18-360 outlines the minimum criteria for reporting assessment results. The law specifically states that assessment results must be disseminated by August 1st each year. It also states that schools and districts are responsible for disseminating this information to parents (RE 6.4-12). Timelines for the delivery of reports are published in the DTC Weekly Update, which is a newsletter sent to districts (RE 6.4-13 page 3).	

Section 6.4 Summary Statement

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
- The state needs to provide evidence of a method for parents to know about and specifically request alternate formats of reports.

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

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

March 2020 State Assessment Peer Review Notes

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR SOUTH CAROLINA EOC TESTS

Contents

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

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

SECTION 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
For academic content standards: 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.	EC 1.1-1 Minutes from the January 8 South Carolina State Board of Education meeting EC 1.1-2 Minutes from the February 10 South Carolina Education Oversight Committee meeting EC 1.1-3 Minutes from the March 9 South Carolina Education Oversight Committee meeting EC 1.1-4 Minutes form the March 11 South Carolina State Board of Education meeting State's notes The 2014 South Carolina Academic Standards and Performance Indicators for Science were, with one exception, adopted by the South Carolina State Board of Education on January 8, 2014 The final approval was in March. (EC 1.1-1, page 5) and by the Education Oversight committee (EOC) on February 10, 2014. (EC 1.1-2, page 1) The exception consisted of a single high school Biology standard (H.B.5). Therefore, the 2005 version of H.B.5 standard remains in effect with the 2014 standards. The 2015 South Carolina College- and Career-Ready Standards for South Carolina College- and Career-Ready Standards for English language arts and mathematics were approved by the South Carolina Education Oversight Committee on March 9, 2015 (EC 1.1-3) and received final approval by the South Carolina State Board of Education on March 11, 2015.(EC 1.1-4, pages 7 and 8).	The state has met the requirements for this CE.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Evidence for English 1 is not included in this submission because the state discontinued administering English 1 as a statewide assessment in spring 2019 and is administering English 2 as the high school test beginning with in the 2019-20 school year.	
Section 1.1 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

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
For academic content standards: 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.	EC 1.2-5 Certification from Coastal Carolina University EC 1.2-6 South Carolina Academic Standards and Performance Indicators for Science EC 1.2-7 Biology Standard (H.B.5) EC 1.2-8 Timeline for Reviewing, Revising and Drafting Standards EC 1.2-9 Memo Requesting Public Comment EC 1.2-10 Linking the South Carolina Standards to the ACT® State's notes The South Carolina College-and-Career-Ready Standards for Mathematics (EC 1.2-1) are aligned with the entrance requirements for credit-bearing course work in the system of public higher education in South Carolina and relevant career and technical education standards as evidenced by the certification letters from several South Carolina Universities. (EC 1.2-2 through EC 1.2-5). Rigor and coherence within and across grades of the South Carolina Academic Standards and Performance Indicators for Science (EC 1.2-6) and Biology standard H.B.5 (EC 1.2.7) were also ensured by multiple reviews by carefully chosen and well-qualified committees of educators and content area experts and by extensive reviews and feedback from general public stakeholders. Meetings of these groups is shown in the timeline (EC 1.2-8). A memo requesting public comment is also included (EC 1.2-9). The South Carolina Academic Standards and Performance Indicators for Science and Biology	Peers found no evidence of detailed documentation of the strategies used to ensure the standards are adequately aligned to what students should know and are able to do, nor was there evidence found of feedback the stakeholder groups provided, nor how the feedback was addressed.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	standard H.B.5 and the South Carolina College-and-Career-Ready Standards for mathematics were linked to the statewide ACT® assessment (1.2-10). The ACT® correlates with both college readiness and the WorkKeys® career readiness benchmarks.	

Section 1.2 Summary Statement
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • The state must provide evidence of detailed documentation of the strategies used to ensure the standards adequately align specifically to what students should know and are able to do.

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

7

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
The State's assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments aligned with **grade-level academic achievement standards** or alternate academic achievement standards in: • Reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 9-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). AND The State's **academic content assessments** must be the same assessments administered to all students in the tested grades, with the following exceptions: • Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may take an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards. • A State may permit an LEA to administer a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in lieu of the State high school assessment if certain conditions are met. • A State that administers an end-of-course high school mathematics assessment may exempt an 8th grade student from the mathematics assessment typically administered in	EC 1.2-1 South Carolina College- and Career-Ready Standards for Mathematics EC 1.2-6 South Carolina Academic Standards and Performance Indicators for Science EC 1.2-7 Biology Standard (H.B.5) EC 1.3-1 South Carolina Code of Laws; Sections 59-18-310 and 59-18-320 EC 1.3-2 South Carolina Regulation 43-262 EC 1.3-3 HumRRO Evaluation Report #2 EC 1.3-4 EOCEP Test Administration Manual for Online Testing Fall-Winter 2019-2020 EC 1.3-5 EOCEP Test Administration Manual for Paper Testing Fall-Winter 2019-2020 EC 1.3-6 EOCEP Assessment Brochure EC 1.3-7 EOCEP 2019 Score Report User's Guide EC 1.3-8 Memo: EOCEP Federal Accountability Guidance-7-1-2016 EC 1.3-9 Memo: EOCEP & Course Grades for SPED students	Requirements for the South Carolina statewide assessments are delineated Sections 59-18-310, 59-18-320, and 59-18-325 of the South Carolina Code of Laws (SP 1.3-1). The current State code requires assessment in science in grades 4, 6, and high school. Alternate science assessments are provided for students who qualify to participate. No additional evidence is needed.

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

eighth grade and allow the student to take the State end-of-course mathematics test instead. • 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.		

Section 1.3 Summary Statement
__x_ No additional evidence is required

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

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

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.
• For students with disabilities, policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including those children with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system;
• For ELs:
  o 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.
  o 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
	EC 1.3-1 South Carolina Code of Laws; Sections 59-18-310 and 59-18-320
	EC 1.3-4 EOCEP Test Administration Manual for Online Testing Fall-Winter 2019-2020
	EC 1.3-5 EOCEP Test Administration Manual for Paper Testing Fall-Winter 2019-2020
	EC 1.3-6 EOCEP Assessment Brochure
	EC 1.3-7 EOCEP 2019 Score Report User's Guide
	EC 1.3-8 Memo: EOCEP Federal Accountability Guidance-7-1-2016
	EC 1.3-9 Memo: EOCEP & Course Grades for SPED students
	EC 1.4-1 EOCEP 2019-2020 Pretest Workshop PowerPoint Presentation
	EC 1.4-2 August 24 EOCEP Clarification Options for coding
	EC 1.4-3 Memo – Intro for Coding SPED students for EOCEP
	EC 1.4-4 Instruction for Coding SPED Students for EOCEP
	EC 1.4-5 Memo – Testing Requirements for All Students 2014
	EC 1.4-6 Memo – Testing Requirements for All Students 2015
	EC 1.4-7 Memo – Accessibility Support Document
	EC 1.4-8 Memo – 2019 Accessibility Support Document
	EC 1.4-9 Guidance for IEP Teams on Determining Participation in South Carolina Alternate Assessment
	EC 1.4-10 Memo – Change in Testing Requirements for ELL Students 12-20-17
		South Carolina provided evidence that all students are required to be included in Statewide assessments, including those students who qualify for the alternate assessment. The State has an explicit policy that students with disabilities who are placed by districts or other public agencies in private or nonpublic schools or state-operated programs must participate in statewide and districtwide assessments and must be tested by the home school district. The State requires that all ELs must be included in all aspects of the Statewide assessment system. These policies are clearly communicated to schools.

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

language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years. ○ 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.		

Section 1.4 Summary Statement

x   No additional evidence is required

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

11

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
If the State has developed or amended challenging **academic** standards and assessments, the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with: • State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education). • Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas). • Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State. • Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents.		The science standards were adopted in 2005 and 2014 and the mathematics standards were adopted in March 2015, therefore this critical element does not apply.
Section 1.5 Summary Statement		
x No additional evidence is required		

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

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
The State's test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to **the depth and breadth of the State's academic content standards** for the grade that is being assessed and includes: • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of **the State's grade-level academic content standards** and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results. • Processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in **the State's academic content standards,** reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills). • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design	EC 1.3-3 HumRRO Evaluation Report #2 EC 2.1-1 EOCEP Technical Report EC 2.1-2 GUIDELINES FOR ITEM ANALYSIS AND FORMS CONSTRUCTION EC 2.1-3 ALGEBRA 1 TEST MAP EC 2.1-4 BIOLOGY TEST MAP EC 2.1-5 HumRRO report #1 State's notes The EOCEP Technical Report states the purpose and intended interpretations and uses of the assessments. (EC 2.1-1, page 1). TEST BLUEPRINTS THAT DESCRIBE THE STRUCTURE OF THE TESTS ARE FOUND IN THE GUIDELINES FOR ITEM ANALYSIS AND FORMS CONSTRUCTION (EC 2.1-2 PAGES 12-14 AND 18). TEST MAPS FOR ALGEBRA 1 (EC 2.1-3) AND BIOLOGY 1 (EC 2.1-4) ARE INCLUDED. A process to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the standards is outlined in the EOCEP Technical Report (EC 2.1-1 pages 8-10) and in the Guidelines for Item Analysis and Forms Construction (EC 2.1-2 pages 6-9).	The state did not address technology usability in this critical element as suggested by peer review guidance. The alignment study is summarized in 1.3-3. It would strengthen the evidence if the full alignment report was submitted, including the background of the participants and how findings were being addressed. A crosswalk to the Kentucky standards was referenced but not provided. Peers were unable to find adequate delineation of similarities and differences between the two states' standards. Alignment of Algebra 1 was provided in 2.1-5 which showed low categorical concurrence. The state should provide information with regard to the degree that this finding will be incorporated and addressed as part of the cycle of assessment improvement.

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

and intended uses and interpretations of results. • If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the student is enrolled and uses that determination for all reporting. • If the State administers a content assessment that includes portfolios, such assessment may be partially administered through a portfolio but may not be *entirely* administered through a portfolio.	An independent review of the test design process by HumRRO #1 provides evidence that the test design process worked as intended (EC 2.1-5, page xix). HumRRO also provided favorable feedback on a number of specific elements of the test development test construction process in Report #2 (EC 1.3-3 page xii). • The Alignment study process is described on pages 12-19. • The results for the Biology results are found on pages 33-36. • The overall results are found on pages 37-38. • The test construction review is described on pages 39-41 and the results are found on pages 42-56 and 63-64. For Algebra 1 alignments results are found in HumRRO report #1 pages 23-31. Results for the test construction review are found on pages 33-42 (EC 1.3-3).	

Section 2.1 Summary Statement

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
- The state must provide evidence of addressing technology usability in this critical element, as suggested by peer review guidance.
- The state must provide the full alignment study for peer review.
- The state must delineate the differences between KY and SC standards and how that might impact alignment analysis.
- The state must provide evidence that it has addressed alignment issues noted in the HumRRO report.

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

Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to: • Assess student achievement based on the **State's academic content standards** in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.	EC 1.3-3 HumRRO Report #2 EC 2.1-1 EOCEP Technical report EC 2.1-2 Guidelines for Item Analysis and Form Construction EC 2.2-1 DRC Item Development Technical Manual EC 2.2-2 Algebra 1 Content Review Meeting Agenda EC 2.2-3 Biology Content Review Meeting Agenda EC 2.2-4 Bias-Sensitivity Committee Meeting Agenda EC 2.2-5 Participant lists for Content Review and Bias and Sensitivity Review Committees EC 2.2-6 Training PowerPoint for Content Review EC 2.2-7 Training PowerPoint for the bias and sensitivity review <u>State's notes</u> The processes used for test and item development are described in the DRC Item Development Technical Manual (EC 2.2-1 pages 6-29). Procedures for Test Design and Development and item selection are in the EOCEP Technical Report (EC 2.1-1 pages 8-10) and in the Guidelines for Item Analysis and Form Construction (EC 2.1-2 pages 6-10). Content alignment review committees for Algebra 1 and Biology were convened in Columbia, South Carolina, and DRC facilitated the meeting. Bias and Sensitivity reviews occurred concurrently with content reviews.	Peers could not find evidence of the accessibility tools and their effect on the test construct. Peers could not find evidence that the state addresses cognitive processes. 2.1-1 p.19 mentions this, but it is only in terms of cognitive complexity. The HumRRO report documented some areas where biology and algebra could be improved in terms of cognitive complexity (xiv-xv). A response was provided by the state in 1.3-4 but the focus was on improving DOK for ELA, but not Biology and Algebra where there was some identified need for improvements. The state needs to provide documentation that issues listed may be effectively addressed. The state may wish to examine evidence related to item quality via processes such as field testing and/or reviews of item statistics.

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

	Agendas and participant lists for the Content Review meetings and the participant lists for Content Review and Bias and Sensitivity are included (EC 2.2-2–EC2.2-5). In addition to training to review items for content alignment, Content Alignment committee members were trained on cognitive complexity (e.g., DOK) and how to consider such when reviewing items, with additional consideration of the alignment of the item with the proper South Carolina standard (2.2-6). Bias and Sensitivity Committees were trained on Universal Design and on how to ensure that items are not biased against any populations. (EC 2.2-7). The independent review by HumRRO provides evidence that the test development process adheres to industry best practices (EC 1.3-3, page xii, page 3-11, appendices A-F).	

Section 2.2 Summary Statement

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
- The state must provide evidence of accessibility tools and their effect on the test construct.
- The state needs to provide evidence that it has addressed cognitive processes.
- The state needs to provide evidence of improvements recommended in the HumRRO report.

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

Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State: • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.	EC 1.3-4 EOCEP Test Administration Manual for Online Testing Fall-Winter 2019-2020 EC 1.3-5 EOCEP Test Administration Manual for Paper Testing Fall-Winter 2019-2020 EC 1.3-6 EOCEP Assessment Brochure EC 1.4-1 EOCEP 2019-2020 Pretest Pretest Workshop PowerPoint Presentation EC 2.3-1 Online Enrollment and Materials Overview EC 2.3-2 EOCEP Fall-Winter 2019-2020_School Test Coordinator/Test Administrator Training Tool EC 2.3-3 2019 New DTC Orientation Handbook EC 2.3-4 EOCEP Fall_Winter 2019-2020 Online Enrollment notification email EC 2.3-5 EOCEP Fall_Winter 2019-2020 Online Enrollment Opens Today - September 26-email EC 2.3-6 EOCEP Fall_Winter Online Enrollment Reminder - Closes EOD Friday, October 4 EC 2.3-7 Test Dates for 2019-2020 EC 2.3-8 SFTP Instructions for DTCs EC 2.3-9 DRC Customer Service - Chat Pilot-email EC 2.3-10 EOCEP Fall_Winter 2019-2020 School Testing Survey EC 2.3-11 DTC Weekly Update August 5-9 EC 2.3-12 DTC Weekly Update August 26-30 EC 2.3-13 DTC Weekly Update September 9-13	Peers could not find information in the training PPTs, manuals, or troubleshooting guides regarding contingency plans in the event of technology challenges or large-scale disruptions.

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

	EC 2.3-14 DTC Weekly Update September 16-20
	EC 2.3-15 DTC Weekly Update September 30-Oct 4
	EC 2.3-16 DTC Weekly Update October 14-18
	EC 2.3-17 DTC Weekly Update November 4-8
	EC 2.3-18 DTC Weekly Update November 25-29
	EC 2.3-19 EOCEP FW 2019_2020 Pretest Workshop Attendees
	EC 2.3-20 2019-2020 South Carolina Technology Coordinator Training Power Point
	EC 2.3-21 2019-2020 South Carolina Technology Coordinator Training Attendees
	EC 2.3-22 2019-2020 Precode Manual
	EC 2.3-23 Precode Coordinator Training PowerPoint
	EC 2.3-24 List of attendees for Precode Training
	EC 2.3-25 2018-19 Online Assessment Technical Requirements
	EC 2.3-26 Memo - Technical Specifications for Statewide Assessments
	EC 2.3-27 Technology User Guide Vol I Introduction to Online Testing 09_04_19
	EC 2.3-28 Technology User Guide Vol II Central Office Services_09_04_19
	EC 2.3-29 Technology User Guide Vol III_DRC INSIGHT_SC_09_04_19
	EC 2.3-30 Technology User Guide Vol IV_Troubleshooting_09_04_19
	EC 2.3-31 South Carolina eDIRECT User Guide_Final_Aug_2019

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

	EC 2.3-32 Tips for Keyboard Settings on iPads & Chromebooks- 2018-04-09	
	EC 2.3-33 DRC COS-SD Decision Guide Rev 2.0	
	EC 2.3-34 DRC Network Evaluation and Troubleshooting, Rev 1.6	
	EC 2.3-35 DRC Site Readiness - Overview, rev 1.3	
	EC 2.3-36 DRC Site Technology Readiness Checklist, Rev 1.6.2	
	EC 2.3-37 Enhanced DRC INSIGHT Portal Navigation	
	EC 2.3-38 INSIGHT-Portal-Admin-Training-Videos-SC-20190828	
	EC 2.3-39 Testing Site Capacity Estimator v4.0.2	
	EC 2.3-40 Memo-Central Office Overview_07_30_2018	
	EC 2.3-41 Memo-DRC INSIGHT TSM SSL Certificate Update Instructions, 2019-05-10	
	EC 2.3-42 Tech Bulletin_Extended Retries_06_27_19	
	EC 2.3-43 Tech Bulletin_TSM - COS Migration_State_09_12_19	
	EC 2.3-44 Email--DTC Weekly Update June 10-14 & Technical Bulletin	
	EC 2.3-45 Email-Reminder of DRC INSIGHT Software Update for 2019-20 Testing	
	EC 2.3-46 Email--Reminder of DRC INSIGHT Software Update for 2019-20 Testing	
	EC 2.3-47 Email-TSM SSL Certificate Expiration	
	EC 2.3-48 Email-Updates to the DRC INSIGHT Secure Browser	
	State's notes	

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

| | Policies and procedures to establish a standardized administration of EOCEP are provided in the following documents. EOCEP Test Administration Manual for Online Testing Fall-Winter 2019-2020 Directions for administration of Algebra 1 and Biology (EC 1.3-4 pages 47-59) EOCEP Test Administration Manual for Paper Testing Fall-Winter 2019-2020 (EC 1.3-5 pages 62-67) Procedures for students with disabilities are found in Appendix C of each Test Administration Manual; procedures for EL students are located in Appendix D of each Test Administration Manual (EC 1.3-5 and EC 1.3-5 EOCEP Assessment Brochure is distributed by schools to parents at the start of the school-year or semester (EC 1.3-6) EOCEP 2019-2020 Pretest Pretest Workshop PowerPoint Presentation (EC 1.4-1) Online Enrollment and Materials Overview (EC 2.3-1) EOCEP Fall-Winter 2019-2020_School Test Coordinator/Test Administrator Training Tool (EC 2.3-2)0 2019 New District Test Coordinator (DTC) Orientation Handbook (EC 2.3-3) Districts and schools receive answers to policy and procedural questions via e-mail and phone calls to the SCDE's program manager and the contractor. Examples of communications sent to the districts concerning procedural information include the following. Notices to the District Test Coordinators about Online Enrollment (EC 2.3-4 through (EC 2.3-6) Test Dates for 2019-2020 (EC 2.3-7) | |

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

	• SFTP Instructions for DTCs (EC 2.3-8) • DRC Customer Service - Chat Pilot (EC 2.3-9) • EOCEP Fall/Winter 2019-2020 School Testing Survey (EC 2.3-10) District Test Coordinators receive weekly updates from the contractor (DRC). Each week new information appears in purple text to notify districts of ordering deadlines, training dates, webinar logins, changes in procedures, and posting/shipping of deliverables. Examples of District Test Coordinator's Weekly Updates containing procedural information for the EOCEP 2019-2020 Fall/Winter administration are provided (EC 2.3-11 through EC 2.3-18). The SCDE uses a train-the-trainer model for training distrct and school staff. • The Pretest Workshop PowerPoint provides evidence of training for District Test Coordinator (EC 1.4-1). • The School Test Coordinator and Test Administrator Training Tool is provided to District Test Coordinators and can be used to train test administrators (EC 2.3-2). • A list of attendees to EOCEP Fall/Winter 2019-2020 Pretest Workshop Webinar is provided (EC 2.3-19) • A Technology Coordinator's Training is also held annually. The South Carolina Technology Coordinator Training PowerPoint was presented in fall 2019 (EC 2.3-20). The list of attendees is provided (EC 2.3-21). Training for Precode Coordinators is provided several times each year. • Procedures are provided in the Precode Manual (SP 2.3-22).	

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

	- Training is conducted through a PowerPoint presentation (EC 2.3-23) - The list of attendees at the fall 2018 precode training is provided (EC 2.3-24). EOCEP assessments are administered almost entirely online. Paper tests may be requested for students who have IEPs that require paper testing due to a disability or are in situations for which online testing is impractical (such as incarceration, homebound, or group homes etc.) Districts may request a paper waiver during the testing window if extreme weather, other disruptions not the fault of the districts, or significant technology disruptions occur. The 2019 Test Administration Manual for online testing (EC 1.3-4) includes testing policies and procedures such as the following. - test security (pages 1-12) - SCDE policies and procedures (pages 13-32) - School Test Coordinator's Section (pages 34-40) - Test Administrator's Section (pages 41-46) - Standardized administration directions and scripts for test administrators (pages. 47-59) - Online Calculator shortcuts for Algebra 1 (page 59) - Appendix B of the Test Administration Manual provides procedures for schools and districts to follow in the case of online pauses, computer inactivity, and loss of power or internet connectivity (pages B4-B6) Technology requirements for online testing are outlined in a number of documents. - The 2018-19 Online Assessment Technical Requirements (EC 2.3-25) sent to districts with	

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

	- a memo (EC 2.3-26) and is posted on the SCDE website. - Technology User Guide Volume I-IV (EC 2.3-27 through EC 2.3-30) - The eDIRECT User Guide (EC 2.3-31). - Tips for Keyboard Settings on iPads & Chromebooks- 2018-04-09 (EC 2.3-32) - DRC COS-SD Decision Guide Rev 2.0 (EC 2.3-33) - DRC Network Evaluation and Troubleshooting, Rev 1.6 (EC 2.3-34) - DRC Site Readiness - Overview, rev 1.3 (EC 2.3-35) - DRC Site Technology Readiness Checklist, Rev 1.6.2 (EC 2.3-36) - Enhanced DRC INSIGHT Portal Navigation (EC 2.3-37) - INSIGHT-Portal-Admin-Training-Videos-SC-20190828 (EC 2.3-38) - Testing Site Capacity Estimator v4.0.2 (EC 2.3-39) - Memo-Central Office Overview_07_30_2018 (EC 2.3-40) - Memo-DRC INSIGHT TSM SSL Certificate Update Instructions, 2019-05-10 (EC 2.3-41) - Tech Bulletin_Extended Retries_06_27_19 (EC 2.3-42) - Tech Bulletin_TSM - COS Migration_State_09_12_19 (EC 2.3-43) - Email-DTC Weekly Update June 10-14 & Technical Bulletin EC 2.3-44 - Email-Reminder of DRC INSIGHT Software Update for 2019-20 Testing EC 2.3-45 - Email--Reminder of DRC INSIGHT Software Update for 2019-20 Testing EC 2.3-46 - Email-TSM SSL Certificate Expiration EC 2.3-47	

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

	Email-Updates to the DRC INSIGHT Secure Browser EC 2.3-48	
Section 2.3 Summary Statement		
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • The state needs to provide evidence regarding contingency plans in the event of technology challenges or large-scale disruptions		

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

24

Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. Monitoring of test administration should be demonstrated for all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS.	EC 1.3-4 EOCEP Test Administration Manual for Online Testing Fall-Winter 2019-2020 EC 1.3-5 EOCEP Test Administration Manual for Paper Testing Fall-Winter 2019-2020 EC 2.4-1 South Carolina Code of Laws Section 59-1-445 and Section 59-1-447 EC 2.4-2 South Carolina State Board of Education Regulations 43-100 (2015), Section X EC 2.4-3 Test Security Program Manager Job Functions EC 2.4-4 Comprehensive Test Security System Handbook EC 2.4-5 Test Security Violation Data by District - 072419 EC 2.4-6 SCDE Monitoring Data Analysis for 2018-19 EC 2.4-7 South Carolina Test Monitoring Plan and Sites Visited – Spring 2019 EC 2.4-8 Administration Monitoring Guide 2019-20 EC 2.4-9 PowerPoint for Training Monitors EC 2.4-10 Monitoring Visit Procedures 3-2019 EC 2.4-11 Monitoring Procedures for Accommodations EC 2.4-12 Test Security Violation Guide for Monitors EC 2.4-13 On-site testing Monitor Letter	SCDE provided comprehensive evidence of its monitoring process, including a form to be completed by monitors, training and guidance for monitors, a schedule of monitoring visits, and an example of communication with districts. All tests are included in the monitoring. No additional evidence is needed.
Section 2.4 Summary Statement		
x No additional evidence is required		

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

Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
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: • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State's assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. • Application of test security procedures to all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS.	EC 1.3-4 EOCEP Test Administration Manual for Online Testing Fall-Winter 2019-2020 EC 1.3-5 EOCEP Test Administration Manual for Paper Testing Fall-Winter 2019-2020 EC 2.4-1 South Carolina Code of Laws Section 59-1-445 and Section 59-1-447 EC 2.4-2 South Carolina State Board of Education Regulations 43-100 (2015), Section X EC 2.4-3 Test Security Program Manager Job Functions EC 2.4-4 Comprehensive Test Security System Handbook EC 2.4-5 Test Security Violation Data by District - 072419 EC 2.4-6 SCDE Monitoring Data Analysis for 2018-19 EC 2.4-7 South Carolina Test Monitoring Plan and Sites Visited – Spring 2019 EC 2.4-8 Administration Monitoring Guide 2019-20 EC 2.4-9 PowerPoint for Training Monitors EC 2.4-10 Monitoring Visit Procedures 3-2019 EC 2.4-11 Monitoring Procedures for Accommodations EC 2.4-12 Test Security Violation Guide for Monitors EC 2.4-13 On-site testing Monitor Letter <u>State's notes</u> Test security is defined and mandated in Sections 59-1-445 and 59-1-447 of the South Carolina Code of Laws (SP 2.4-1) and in South Carolina State Board of Education Regulation 43-100 (SP 2.4-2, p. 4).	Peers noted the inclusion of a full-time test security position, and feels the state should be commended. The state meets the requirement for this critical element.

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

	Test Administration Manuals are distributed to all district and school personnel to ensure fidelity with test security procedures across the state. They include the test security laws (EC 1.3-4 and EC 1.3-5; pages 1-4). The SCDE has a full-time Test Security Program Manager to coordinate test security training and monitoring and to address test security violations. The job description for this position is submitted as evidence (EC 2.4-3). The Comprehensive Test Security System Handbook (EC 2.4-4) details the protocols and procedures regarding test security. Section IV – Detection of Test Irregularities- of the handbook discusses: - Selection of sites to be monitored - Selection and training of monitors - Procedures for before, during and after monitor visits A Security Committee evaluates forensic and qualitative data to select the districts and schools for monitoring. Forensic data includes frequency of response changes for paper tests (if appropriate) and online tests, unusual gains for each school, and frequency of test security violations per school and district (EC 2.4-5 and EC 2.4-6).	
Section 2.5 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

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
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: • To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.	EC 2.6-7 Information Security Policy–Access Control EC 2.6-8 Information Security Policy–Information Systems Acquisitions, Development and Maintenance EC 2.6-9 Information Security Policy–Asset Management EC 2.6-10 Information Security Policy–Business Continuity Management EC 2.6-11 Information Security Policy–IT Risk Strategy EC 2.6-12 Information Security Policy–Mobile Security EC 2.6-13 Information Security Policy–Physical & Environmental Security EC 2.6-14 Information Security Policy–Risk Management EC 2.6-15 System and Information Integrity Policy and Procedures EC 2.6-16 Use of External Information Systems State law is the foundation of the data security policies and procedures. Section 59-1-490 (EC 2.6-1) of the South Carolina Code of Laws addresses data use and governance policy. SCDE Policies and procedures concerning security are included in the following documents. • Data Protection and Privacy Policy (EC 2.6-2) • HR and Security Awareness Policy (EC 2.6-3) • Information Security (EC 2.6-4) • IT Compliance (EC 2.6-5) • Threat Vulnerability Management Policy (EC 2.6-6)	In the Submission Index, the state reports cells are suppressed when the N count is less than 10 students. Peers suggest including in documentation a formal policy regarding minimum n and suppression processes. The state has submitted a large number of policies. However, many of these are dated from several years ago, and do not appear to have been updated. Additionally, it is important to note that polices do not equal procedures. The state should provide more detailed information regarding procedures related to this critical element. Peers could not find any evidence of requirements that vendors use industry-standard practices for maintaining secure items, data, and remedying breaches.

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

	• Access Control Policy (EC 2.6-7) • Acquisitions Development & Maintenance Policy (EC 2.6-8) • Asset Management Policy (EC 2.6-9) • Business Continuity Management Policy (EC 2.6-10) • IT Risk Strategy Policy (EC 2.6-11) • Mobile Security Policy (EC 2.6-12) • Physical and Environmental Security Policy (EC 2.6-13) • Risk Management Policy (EC 2.6-14) • System and Information Integrity – District (EC 2.6-15) • Use of External Information Systems – District (EC 2.6-16) EOCEP Test Administration Manuals (EC 1.3-4 and EC 1.3-5) include specific procedures such as the following topics. The page references are in the manual for online testing (EC 1.3-5): • Education legislation (page 1) • South Carolina State Board of Education Regulations (pages 2-4) • Guidelines for reporting, investigating, and documenting test security violations, (pages 5-7 • Test security procedures concerning violations of the student's IEP or 504 Plan (pages 8-9) • Test security agreement forms, online technology security, security checklist (pages 10-12) • Student and school responsibilities for maintaining test security (pages 18-19) • Calculator policy (pages 20-22) • Policy on use of electronic devices (page 22) • Procedures for disruptions, threats, or power failures; student injury, illness, cheating and transfers (pages 25-27)	

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

	• Secure materials and storage policies (pages 28-29) • Seating charts (page 30) • Proctoring tests (pages 30-33) All personally identifiable information (PII) is stored on secure servers at SCDE. When reporting data, cells are suppressed when the N count is less than 10 students. Moreover, the State ensures that only pertinent personally identifiable information (PII) is located on files sent to districts. These data fields include name, data of birth, State ID, and relevant demographic information. SCDE does not collect information such as Social Security numbers, addresses, or student contact information.	

Section 2.6 Summary Statement

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

• The state must provide information on the procedures that have been developed to implement security policies provided in the state's evidence to ensure data integrity and privacy.

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

30

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
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: **The State's academic assessments** measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State's academic content standards, including: • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State's assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards; • If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards and administers alternate assessments aligned with those standards, the assessments show adequate alignment to the State's academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content	EC 2.1-1 EOCEP Technical Report EC 2.1-2 Guideline for Item Analysis and Forms Construction. 14-17 (pages 6-9 and 12-14, 18) EC 2.1-3 TEST MAP FOR ALGEBRA 1 EC 2.1-4 TEST MAP FOR BIOLOGY EC 1.3-3 HumRRO Report #2 State's notes A process to ensure that each assessment is aligned to the knowledge and skills included in the standards is outlined in in the EOCEP Technical Report (EC 2.1-1 pages 8-10, and 19) and in the Guidelines for Item Analysis and Forms Construction (EC 2.1-2 pages 6-9). DOCUMENTATION THAT THE ASSESSMENTS ADDRESS THE BREADTH AND DEPTH OF THE CONTENT STANDARDS IS FOUND IN THE TEST BLUEPRINTS INCLUDED IN THE GUIDELINES FOR ITEM ANALYSIS AND FORM CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENT ON PAGES 14-17 (EC 2.1-2 PAGES 12-14, 18) AND IN THE TEST MAPS FOR ALGEBRA 1 (EC 2.1-3) AND BIOLOGY 1 (EC 2.1-4). An independent review of the test design process by HumRRO provides evidence that the test design process	Peers noted that the alignment study was aligned to KY standards. The state must provide a crosswalk to SC standards. The HumRRO report details some findings in the content and complexity related to alignment to the standards. The state must provide evidence that they have addressed concerns outlined in the report.

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

and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.	worked as intended. For example, the HumRRO report #2 included favorable feedback, noting that, "Overall, the findings from Tasks1-6 indicate that the South Carolina assessments mostly adhere to sound testing practices as described in The Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing, and thereby support the validity of the test scores for their intended uses and purposes. No critical concerns were identified from the technical evaluation of the South Carolina assessments. (EC 1.3-3 page xix.).	

Section 3.1 Summary Statement
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
• The state must provide evidence of a crosswalk between KY standards and SC standards.
• The state must provide evidence that they have addressed issues raised in the HumRRO study.
• The state must provide the original alignment study referenced in the HumRRO study.

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

Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap: **the intended cognitive processes** appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State's academic content standards.	EC 1.3-3 HumRRO Report #2 EC 2.1-1 EOCEP Technical Report EC 2.1-2 GUIDELINES FOR ITEM ANALYSIS AND FORMS CONSTRUCTION EC 2.1-6 Bias-Sensitivity Committee Meeting Agenda EC 2.2-4 Algebra 1 Content Review Meeting Agenda EC 2.2-5 Biology Content Review Meeting Agenda EC 2.2-7 Participant lists EC 2.2-8 Training PowerPoint for Content Review EC 2.2-9 Training PowerPoint for the bias and sensitivity review State's notes A process to ensure that each assessment taps the intended cognitive processes as represented in the standards is outlined in the EOCEP Technical Report (EC 1.2-1 pages 8-10, and 19) and in the Guidelines for Item Analysis and Forms Construction (EC 2.1-2 pages 6-9). Separate content alignment review committees for Algebra 1 and Biology were convened in Columbia, South Carolina, and DRC facilitated the meeting. Agendas (EC 2.2-4, EC2.2-5, and EC 2.2-6) and participant lists (EC 2.2-7) for the meetings are included. In addition to training on how to review items for content alignment, committee members were trained on cognitive complexity (e.g., DOK), the Principles of Universal Design and how to consider such when	2.2-6 Alg 1 Bio 1 Content Review Training PPT, Slide 15 has this: "Cognitive complexity is an aspect of a person's cognitive functioning which at one end is defined by the use of many constructs with many relationships to one another (complexity) and at the other end by the use of few constructs with limited relationships to one another (simplicity)." It is not clear how this was translated into a review of the items for tapping the intended cognitive processes. 1.3-3 HuMRRO Report #2, p. 35 addresses findings related to cognitive complexity for Biology. The review found that ~71% to 72% of the Biology 1 items were below the intended complexity level of the standard being measured. This may yield some evidence that the Biology test may not require complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills. 2.1-5 HumRRO Report #1, p. 27 addresses findings related to cognitive complexity for Algebra 1. The review found that a significant majority of Algebra 1 items were at or above the intended complexity level of the standard being measured.

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

	reviewing items, with additional consideration of the alignment of the item with the proper South Carolina standard. A training PowerPoint is included. (EC 2.2-8). Bias and Sensitivity reviews occurred concurrently with content reviews. A training PowerPoint for the bias and sensitivity review is included.(EC 2.2-9)	

Section 3.2 Summary Statement

__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
- The state must provide evidence that they have addressed depth of knowledge concerns raised in the HumRRO report.
- The state must provide evidence that the tests measure the intended cognitive processes via cognitive labs or judgement of subject-matter experts.

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

Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State's **academic content standards**.	EC 2.1-1 EOCEP Technical Report EC 3.3-1 Appendix 5 EC 3.3-2 Appendix 6 <u>State's notes</u> Validity based on internal structure is provided in section 3.3 of the Technical Report (EC 2.1-1). This narrative covers validity related to the assessed constructs (pp. 19-20), empirical correlations between the items and the total test (p. 20), Rasch fit statistics (p. 20), validity evidence for different student populations (EC 2.1-1, p. 26), intercorrelations between reporting categories (EC 3.3-1), and item distributions across content domains, dimensionality of the total test (EC 3.3-2).	The intercorrelations for Algebra and Biology were quite high (.6-.8 for alg and .6-.7 for bio). The state should also consider accounting for the impact of measurement error on these correlations. The dimensionality analyses indicate that the tests are generally unidimensional (with eigenvalues less than 2). The state should interpret how these results relate to the structure of their standards and reporting. The state should provide narrative regarding how it plans to reduce overlap in subscores. The state must provide evidence that the assessments are operating as intended across all administrations. If the state has evidence that tests administered in non-standard windows (fall/winter or summer, for example) are functioning as they should, the state must provide that to peers.

Section 3.3 Summary Statement

_X__   The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
    • The state needs to provide narrative of how it plans to reduce overlap in subscores.
    • The state needs to provide evidence that assessments are operating as intended for all administrations, and provide a rationale for differences seen in non-standard administration windows.

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

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.	**EC 2.1-1 EOCEP Technical Report** State's notes Validity based on relations to other variables is covered in section 3.4 of the Technical Report (EC 2.1-1, pp. 26-27). The 'B' cut score was set by setting the percentage of students at this level on each subject to the corresponding ACT® college-readiness benchmark on the ACT® assessment. A correlation matrix between the subjects assessed by the EOCEP with relatively low correlations between subjects. Similarly, in subjects that report Lexile® and Quantile® scores (English 1 and Algebra 1, respectively), the correlations between total scores and the Lexile or Quantile scores exist above .99.	2.1-1 Technical Report, pp. 26-27 addresses validity based on relations to other variables. There is a discussion of two correlation matrices, but neither is included in the Technical Report, and no related appendix is mentioned or provided. The state should submit data that provides the statistics for low correlations between subjects and the results from the EOCEP to the ACT.

Section 3.4 Summary Statement
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • The state must provide evidence that the State's assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.

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

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
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**.	EC 2.1-1 EOCEP Technical Report EC 4.1-1 Appendix 2 EC 4.1-2 Appendix 4 State's notes The State operationalizes reliability as internal consistency (i.e., Chronbach's Alpha), which shows values in the high .80s to the low .90s depending on the subject assessed (EC 2.1-1, p. 28; EC 4.1-1). SEM calculation is provided in the Technical Report (EC 2.1-1, p. 29). A table of CSEMs at each raw score point is provided in Appendix 4 (EC 4.1-2) and Rasch person separation reliability and item separation reliability values are provided in Appendix 2 (EC 4.1-1). The State utilizes two computations of decision consistency, Huynh's method and Livingston & Lewis's method (EC 2.1-1, pp. 29-31). Both methods tend to arrive at similar locations that the State considers sufficient for the decisions made based on the performance levels reported in each subject on the EOCEP (EC 2.1-1, Tables 4.2 and 4.3, p. 31). The EOCEP is not an adaptive test.	4.1-1 Appendix 2 of the Technical Report shows reliabilities above .80 for Algebra 1 and Biology, with the exception of forms administered to very small populations. Beginning on p. 23, we see TIFs, but not SEM curves. For purposes of this review, peers focused on spring forms due to the more substantial population sizes. Information for Algebra 1 seems to be maximized around the F/D cut (pp. 26-27), and peers inferred from narrative that this is the cut point of most interest. It is not made explicitly clear what stakes are associated with each cut. Biology TIF curves on pp. 31-32 showed the same pattern. The state reports test reliability (both alpha and model error) for paper and online versions of the assessment. The value for algebra paper assessment appeared low. The state might address this or establish a minimum sample size for calculating alpha. The state provides person and item separation indices for the assessments but does not provide criteria for how these are evaluated. Decision consistency was quite low across five categories (p. 31). Peers were unable to locate reliability by demographics or domain. The state needs to provide this evidence.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		The SEM at the cut scores ranges from 3.6 to 6.6 (p. 39 – 40). Peers felt that this was high given that there is only a 10 point scale score difference between the categories. Given a 95%CI = Score $\pm$(1.96*SEM), students' true scores would be between 70.4 and 89.6. The state should provide evidence on how it plans to address these issues. The state reports student results by domain. The state should report how cut scores were generated for those subscores, and how error could potentially impact those subscores.

Section 4.1 Summary Statement
__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
• The state needs to provide evidence that it has addressed the issues with SEM.
• The state needs to provide evidence of reliability by subgroup and domain.

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

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
For all State academic assessments, assessments should be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (see definition[9]). **For academic content assessments**, the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in their design, development and analysis.	EC 4.2-1 Making Assessments Accessible and Inclusive EC 2.2-7 Participant lists EC 2.2-9 Training PowerPoint for the bias and sensitivity review EC 4.2-1 Making Assessments Accessible and Inclusive State's notes In response to the recommendation from an independent evaluator (HumRRO), Data Recognition Corporation (DRC) created an Item Development Technical Manual (EC 2.2-1 pages 41-42). The manual references test specifications guidance documents including adherence to the Principles of Universal Design, which were jointly developed and implemented by content experts and test development experts at SCDE and DRC. Separate content alignment review committees for Algebra 1 and Biology were convened in Columbia, South Carolina, and DRC facilitated the meeting. In addition to how to review items for content alignment, committee members were trained on cognitive complexity (e.g., DOK), the Principles of Universal Design and how to consider such when reviewing items, with additional consideration of the alignment of the item with the proper South Carolina standard. Bias and Sensitivity reviews met concurrently with content reviews. Agendas (EC 2.2-6) and participant lists (EC 2.2-7) for the meetings are included. A training	2.1-1 Technical Report addresses DIF beginning on p. 32. Very few items exhibit B or C DIF, however, the document does not appear to show how these items were treated, nor if they were removed from scoring. The state must provide evidence of how this is resolved.

[9] see page 28 of "*A State's Guide to the U.S. Department of Education's Assessment Peer Review Process*", September 24, 2018 available at: www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html

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

| | PowerPoint for the bias and sensitivity review is included.(EC 2.2-9)

Item writers are trained in the principles of universal design during the development training (EC 4.2-1).

Assessments of DIF using the SMD and ETS Delta classification show very few items exhibiting extreme DIF for gender, ethnicity, or mode on any subject and shown in the EOCEP Technical Report (EC 2.1-1 Section 4.2). | |

Section 4.2 Summary Statement

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
  • The state must provide evidence of how B and C DIF items were treated on operational tests, and rationale for doing so.

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

Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for **academic assessments**, including performance for high- and low-achieving students.	EC 2.1-1 EOCEP Technical Report State's notes This section, 4.3 (EC 2.1-1, p. 38-60), contains a description of the scoring scale and its computation from a raw score to a scale score with cut points on the scoring scale and the theta scale. The distributions of scores across all administrations for the year are provided and show that there is sufficient information, displayed as the SS SEM, about each cut score.	Peers could not find tables that show classification accuracy for each cut. One issue that is beyond the state's control is the number of performance levels. The state must provide evidence of classification accuracy at each level, and evidence that the state plans to address any issues discovered through that process. The SEMs at the cut scores are high which leads to some uncertainty about student classification into the PLs. The state may wish to consider Rasch-item maps that show how item difficulty is related to student ability.

Section 4.3 Summary Statement
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • The state must provide evidence of classification accuracy for each performance level, and evidence that the state addressed any issues discovered through that process.

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

Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State's **academic achievement standards**.	EC 2.1-1 EOCEP Technical Report State's notes The EOCEP Technical Report provides documentation of standardized scoring procedures (EC 2.1-1, section 4.4, p. 61).	The state has met the requirements of this CE.
Section 4.4 Summary Statement		
_X_ No additional evidence is required		

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

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 **academic assessments** within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State's **academic content standards** and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.	EC 2.1-1 EOCEP Technical Report State's notes The EOCEP Technical Report (EC 2.1-1 page 62) describes the various forms that may be administered during an administration window. The text also describes that all forms are built to the same test blueprint. Because the assessment is pre-equated, there is an intrinsic ability to ensure equality of score interpretations and score comparability within and across years.	The state must provide evidence of why students are performing differently across multiple administrations of identical forms.

Section 4.5 Summary Statement
__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • The state must provide evidence of why students are performing differently across multiple administrations of identical forms.

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

Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
If the State administers any of its assessments in multiple versions within a subject area (e.g., online versus paper-based delivery; **or a native language version of the academic content assessment**), grade level, or school year, the State: • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.	EC 2.1-1 EOCEP Technical Report <u>State's notes</u> The EOCEP Technical Report (EC 2.1-1 page 62) describes different versions of the EOCEP assessment, such computer-based, paper-based, and American Sign Language (ASL). This section also describes the comparability of different versions, but the number of paper and ASL tests is very low.	Fewer than 4,000 students had testing accommodations for each of the EOCs that are under review. There is no disaggregation of the data by accommodation type. For the paper-based forms, there were only 224 administered for Algebra 1 and 231 for Biology. Braille is discussed on p. 74, but peers could find no information on the number of forms, nor on the process used to create the braille forms. The state should provide comprehensive evidence about how accommodated/alternate forms are built, and how they effectively maintain the intended construct. Peers could not find evidence of device comparability for computer-based tests.

Section 4.6 Summary Statement
__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • The state needs to provide comprehensive evidence about how accommodated forms are constructed and how they effectively maintain the intended construct. • Evidence of device comparability

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

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
The State: • Has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments), and • Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State's website.	EC 2.1-1 EOCEP Technical Report EC 4.7-1 TAC Minutes [September 2019] (Algebra 1 Item Displacement) State's notes Technical analyses and ongoing maintenance and the item storage, banking, and retrieval mechanism is discussed in the EOCEP Technical Report (EC 2.1-1 Section 4.7, p. 62). The SC Technical Advisory Committee approved a mechanism for updating Rasch locations by using post-equated checks on the items. This corrects for item drift (EC 4.7-1 pages 4-5).	4.7-1 TAC Notes include a very important discussion of Algebra 1 cut scores on p. 2. In other TAC notes (AL 4.7B), there is also a discussion of the issue. The discussion on p. 4 addresses an item also discussed in AL 4.7 A or B regarding item displacement for Algebra 1. The narrative suggests that the state must improve its item bank maintenance and recommended that the state develop a bank maintenance plan to present to the TAC. The TAC emphasized that there is an urgency to address the issue. The state should apply the resulting methodology to the other EOC item banks as well. The TAC reported some considerations for equating and item bank maintenance in Algebra 1. These seem to be important issues that impact the reliability of the scores. The state noted that they were making corrections for item drift. The state must provide evidence that they have addressed the issues raised by the TAC. The state should provide evidence that the most current technical reports are on the website.

Section 4.7 Summary Statement

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
  • The state must provide evidence that they have addressed issues raised by the TAC.
  • The state needs to provide evidence that the most current technical reports are publicly available on the website.

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

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
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. 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: • Establish guidelines for determining whether to assess a student with an AA-AAAS, including: o A State definition of "students with the most significant cognitive disabilities" that addresses factors related to cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior; • Provide information for IEP Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:	EC 1.3-4 EOCEP Test Administration Manual for Online Testing Fall-Winter 2019-2020 EC 1.3-5 EOCEP Test Administration Manual for Paper Testing Fall-Winter 2019-2020 EC 2.1-1 EOCEP Technical Report EC 5.1-1 Memo Testing all Students EC 5.1-2 Memo for EOCEP Accommodations EC 5.1-3 Oral Administration Guidance EC 5.1-4 Sped Process Guide EC 5.1-5 Accessibility Support EC 5.1-6 Memo-Accessibility Support EC 5.1-7 FAQ Accommodations EC 5.1-8 ALT Participation EC 5.1-9 Procedures for Monitoring Students taking the Alternate Assessment <u>State's notes</u> 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. • Memo with testing requirement for all students (EC 5.1-1). • Memo for EOCEP Accommodations (EC 5.1-2) • Oral administration guidance for EOCEP ELA, (EC 5.1-3).	The state has met the requirements of this CE.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
- o Provides a clear explanation of the differences between assessments aligned with grade-level academic achievement standards and those aligned with alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student's education resulting from taking an AA-AAAS, such as how participation in such assessments may delay or otherwise affect the student from completing the requirements for a regular high school diploma; - Ensure that parents of students assessed with an AA-AAAS are informed that their child's achievement will be measured based on alternate academic achievement standards; - Not preclude a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who takes an AA-AAAS from attempting to complete the requirements for a regular high school diploma; and - Promote, consistent with requirements under the IDEA, the involvement and progress of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in the general education curriculum that is based on the State's academic content standards	- Special Education Process Guide for South Carolina (EC 5.1-4, section E.2.e, page 66). - The South Carolina Accessibility Support Document is a full accommodations and accessibility guide for IEP and 504 teams (EC 5.1-5) - Memo to distribute the new/updated Accessibility Support Document (EC 5.1-6) Key documents provide additional information on accommodations for students with disabilities. - Appendix C of the Test Administration Manuals (EC 1.3-4 and EC 1.3-5) - Accommodations FAQ document (EC 5.1-7) The State monitors implementation of guidelines for IEP teams to apply in determining, on a case-by-case basis, which students will be assessed on alternate academic achievement standards. - Guidance for IEP teams on determining participation in the SC-Alt and the definition of the ALT (EC 5.1-8) Procedures are in place for monitoring districts to ensure appropriate students are taking the alternate assessments. (EC 5.1-9). The EOCEP Technical Report defines the procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students and where to find information on those procedures (EC 2.1-1, p. 73).	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
for the grade in which the student is enrolled; and • Develop, disseminate information on, and promote the use of appropriate accommodations to ensure that a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who does not take an AA-AAAS participates in academic instruction and assessments for the grade in which the student is enrolled. • The State has in place and monitors implementation of guidelines for IEP teams to apply in determining, on a case-by-case basis, which students with the most significant cognitive disabilities will be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, if applicable. Such guidelines must be developed in accordance with 34 CFR § 200.6(d).[10]		
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required		

---

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

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

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
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: • Procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed with a linguistic accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for ELs; • Assistance regarding selection of appropriate linguistic accommodations for ELs, including to the extent practicable, assessments in the language most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what those students know and can do to determine the students' mastery of skills in academic content areas until the students have achieved English language proficiency.	EC 1.3-4 EOCEP Test Administration Manual for Online Testing Fall-Winter 2019-2020 EC 1.3-5 EOCEP Test Administration Manual for Paper Testing Fall-Winter 2019-2020 EC 2.1-1 EOCEP Technical Report EC 5.1-1 Memo Testing all Students EC 5.1-2 Memo for EOCEP Accommodations EC 5.1-3 Oral Admin Guidance EC 5.1-5 Accessibility Support EC 5.2-1 ELL Enrollment and Services EC 5.2-2 ELL Timeline for Implementation EC 5.2-3 Office of Assessment SWD Unit PD & Presentations State's notes Procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed: • Documentation for testing all students EC 5.1-1 Memo Testing all Students • Enrollment and Services for Limited English Proficient Students (EC 5.2-1) A description of the procedures for determining student eligibility for ESOL programs is provided (EC 5.2-1). The following documents provide guidance that all accommodation decisions must be based on individual student needs. These documents also provide suggestions regarding what types of accommodations	The state has met the requirements for this CE.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	may be most appropriate for students with various levels of proficiency in their first language and English. • Memo for EOCEP Accommodations (EC 5.1-2) • Oral Admin Guidance (EC 5.1-3) • Appendix D of the Test Administration Manuals (EC 1.3-4 and EC 1.3-5)	
Section 5.2 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required		

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
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: • Ensures that appropriate accommodations, such as, interoperability with, and ability to use, assistive technology, are available to measure the **academic achievement** of students with disabilities. • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs; • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student's need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. • Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny	EC 1.3-4 EOCEP Test Administration Manual for Online Testing Fall-Winter 2019-2020 EC 1.3-5 EOCEP Test Administration Manual for Paper Testing Fall-Winter 2019-2020 EC 2.1-1 EOCEP Technical Report EC 5.1-5 Accessibility Support EC 5.1-7 FAQ Accommodations EC 5.3-1 Validity Study EC 5.3-2 Special Circumstance Procedures State's notes Appropriate accommodations available for students with disabilities and English learners are provided in the following. • Appendix C and Appendix D of the Test Administration Manuals (EC 1.3-4 and EC 1.3-5). • South Carolina Accessibility Support Document,. This is a full accommodations and accessibility guide for IEP and 504 teams (EC 5.1-5) • Accommodations FAQ document (EC 5.1-7). Documentation that scores for students based on assessments administered with allowable accommodations can be found in the EOCEP Technical Report (EC 2.1-1 pages 74 & 75). The percentages of students using accommodations is on page 76. A validity study to examine the use of oral administration was conducted in the summer of 2016. Results of the study is provided (EC 5.3-1).	The state meets the requirements. The state should consider providing theoretical or research studies on the use of accommodations and how they impact reliability/validity.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.	South Carolina uses the Enrich IEP system. Testing accommodations are documented by test in the IEP under the testing accommodations section (section IX of the IEP). Further, schools and districts input accommodations in PowerSchool, the state's education management system, during "precode" so that the proper materials may be ordered. South Carolina has a process to individually review requests for students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. • The state has a procedure manual for reviewing special circumstances requests (EC5.3-2). The form for submitting for a special request is in Appendix C of the Test Administration Manuals (EC 1.3-4 and EC 1.3-5 page C-19)	
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
X　　No additional evidence is required		

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

52

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
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: • Consistent with the State's policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student's disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student's IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures; • Monitored for administrations of all required academic content assessments and AA-AAAS.	EC 2.1-1 EOCEP Technical Report EC 5.1-8 ALT Participation EC 5.1-9 Procedures for Monitoring Students taking the Alternate Assessment EC 5.2-3 Office of Assessment SWD Unit PD & Presentations EC 5.4-1 Monitoring Overview and Rubric EC 5.4-2 Monitoring IEP Development EC 5.4-3 Results Input EC 5.4-4 Assessment Accommodations Monitoring Procedures EC 5.4-5-Onsite IEP Development Results EC 5.4-6-Onsite IEP Implementation Results Description of procedures the State uses to monitor that accommodations: • The Monitoring overview and rubric (MOR) for IEP Development used during onsite monitoring can be found on page 6 section 8 of the rubric (EC 5.4-1). • Results of the onsite monitoring of IEP development is input by monitors on a link online (EC 5.4-2). • Results of onsite monitoring of IEP implementation is input by monitors on a link online. A copy of the online form that monitors input data is provided (EC 5.4-3 Results Input).	The state provided information on the monitoring conducted to ensure accommodations are used and are appropriate for students with IEPs. 5.4-4 states that ELL and 504 plans may have accommodations but the monitoring and results (in 5.4-1, -2, 3) seem to reflect only students with IEPs (not EL students). 1.4-7 - Accessibility Supports Manual mentions an ELL accommodation plan (p.11), which would seem to provide direct evidence for this CE, but peers were unable to locate the document itself. The state needs to provide evidence of monitoring EL accommodations.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Description of procedures the State uses to monitor that students with disabilities are placed by IEP Teams in the appropriate assessment: • Guidance for IEP teams on determining participation in the alternate assessment (EC 5.1-8) • The state has internal procedures for monitoring districts to ensure appropriate students are taking the alternate assessment (EC 5.1-9). Procedures for monitoring the use of accommodations during test administration are included (EC 5.4-4). Results of the onsite monitoring of IEP development as part of prong 1 of the monitoring procedure. Results of IEP development is evidence (EC 5.4-5). Results of the IEP implementation is evidence (EC 5.4-6) Additional training on accommodations is provided directly to districts by request (EC 5.2-3). The EOCEP Technical Report (EC 2.1-1, section 5.4, pages 76 & 77) defines for the field the procedures for tmonitoring test administration for special policies and where to find further information.	
Section 5.4 Summary Statement		

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
  • The state needs to provide evidence of monitoring EL accommodations.

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

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
For academic content standards: The State formally adopted **challenging academic achievement standards** in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for all students, specifically: • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; The State's academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (1) at least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third for lower achievement; (2) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (3) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.	EC 6.1-1 State Superintendent Standards Approval Letter State's notes In South Carolina, cut scores are adopted by the State Superintendent of Education. A letter of statement is provided (EC 6.1-1).	The state meets the requirement of the CE.
Section 6.1 Summary Statement		
_X__ No additional evidence is required		

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

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: • **Academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards**.	EC 6.2-1 EOCEP Biology Standard Setting Report EC 6.2-2 EOCEP Algebra 1 and English 1 Standard Setting Report State's notes South Carolina used the Bookmark method to set standards for the EOCEP Biology 1 and Algebra 1 Assessments. A representative sample of South Carolina educators were on the committees. (EC 6.2-1 and EC 6.2-2).	6.2-1 is the Biology Standard Setting Report stating that PLDs specific to the standards were used in the bookmark method of standard setting. Panelist demographics seem reasonably diverse and included only educators. Qualifications were not provided. Three rounds were used. The process describes four categories with 3 cut points, however, the rest of the evidence indicates 5 levels, A-F. There is no explanation of how the C/B cut was determined. Policy adjustments reduced the percentage of students not meeting expectations as well as the percentage of students exceeding expectations. 6.2-2 is the Algebra Standard Setting Report stating that PLDs were used in the bookmark method of standard setting, and Appendix And states that they were specifically tied back to the standards. Qualifications were not provided. Three rounds were used. The process describes four categories with 3 cut points, however, the rest of the evidence indicates 5 levels, A-F. There is no explanation of how the C/B cut was determined. There was no mention of any policy adjustments to panelist recommendations as was indicated for Biology. Evidence submitted by the state shows five achievement levels. However, these documents show four achievement levels. The state must provide clarifiying evidence about the rationale, and processes used to determine the number of levels used in these assessments. The peers noted the lack of diversity of the panels of educators to participate in the SS for algebra (p. 1-2) and biology (p. 4). The state may wish to ensure in future that diversity of the panels reflect the diversity of the student body.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 6.2 Summary Statement		
__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: The state must provide clarifying evidence about the rationale, process used to determine the number of levels used in these assessments.		

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

57

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
For academic achievement standards: 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. 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	EC 6.2-1 EOCEP Biology Standard Setting Report EC 6.2-2 EOCEP Standard Setting Report <u>State's notes</u> The Standard Setting Reports (EC 6.2-1 and EC 6.2-2) demonstrate the extent to which South Carolina's teachers aligned the performance levels with the state's content standards.	6.2-1 Biology Standard Setting Report states that PLDs specific to the standards were used in the bookmark method of standard setting. The document includes the PLDs. Policy adjustments reduced the percentage of students not meeting expectations as well as the percentage of students exceeding expectations. Given the panelist recommendations that resulted in over 40% of students not meeting expectations, the policy adjustment seems reasonable. 6.2-2 is the Algebra Standard Setting Report states that PLDs were used in the bookmark method of standard setting, and Appendix A states that they were specifically tied back to the standards. There was no mention of any policy adjustments to panelist recommendations as was indicated for Biology, but the cuts seem rigorous as recommended, and in line somewhat with Biology. The final participant surveys in Biology indicated that approximately one-third of participants were not confident in their placement of level one bookmark, felt that too little time was given to PLDs, and disagreed that the process would produce appropriate results (p. 36 and 37). The state might provide some information regarding how these were considered. The state must provide evidence of how participant survey responses were considered in the standard setting process, and how decisions were made in light of the low participant confidence in the levels in the lower cut score levels for both Biology and Algebra I.

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
postsecondary education or competitive integrated employment.		
Section 6.3 Summary Statement		
_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: The state must provide evidence of how participant survey responses were considered in the standard setting process, and how decisions were made in light of the low participant confidence in the levels in the lower cut score levels for both Biology and Algebra I.		

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

Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
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. The State reports to the public its assessment results on **student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level**[11] For **academic content assessments**, 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 **specific academic needs of students**, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results. • 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:	EC 1.3-6 EOCEP 2019 Score Report User's Guide EC 6.4-1 South Carolina Code of Laws, Sections 59-18-360 and 59-18-900 EC 6.4-2 2018-19 Accountability Manual EC 6.4-3 South Carolina Education Oversight Committee School Report Card Guide EC 6.4-4 2019 South Carolina State Report Card EC 6.4-5 2019 District Report Card EC 6.4-6 2019 School Report Card EC 6.4-7 2018-19 EOCEP Statewide Scores-Algebra 1 and Biology 1 EC 6.4-8 2018-19 EOCEP Statewide Scores Algebra 1 & Biology by Demographics EC 6.4-9 2018-19 EOCEP Algebra 1 & Biology Reporting Categories-Statewide EC 6.4-10 2018-19 EOCEP Algebra 1 & Biology Scores Lexington-Richland District Five EC 6.4-11 2018-19 EOCEP Algebra 1 & Biology Scores Lexington-Richland District Five by demographics EC 6.4-12 2018-19 EOCEP Algebra 1 & Biology Reporting Categories-District	The state indicates that they provide reports in alternate formats to parents. However, the peers could not find evidence of a method for parents to know about and specifically request reports in alternate formats or languages.

---

[11] 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 SOUTH CAROLINA EOC TESTS

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

o Provide valid and reliable information regarding a **student's academic achievement**;
    o Report the **student's academic achievement** in terms of the State's grade-level academic achievement standards;
    o Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific **academic needs of students**;
    o Are provided in an understandable and uniform format;
    o 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;
    o Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.
• The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.
	EC 6.4-13 2018-19 EOCEP Algebra 1 & Biology Scores Dutch Fork High School
	
	EC 6.4-14 2018-19 EOCEP Algebra 1 & Biology Scores Dutch Fork High School by demographics
	
	EC 6.4-15 2018-19 EOCEP Algebra 1 & Biology Reporting Categories-School
	
	EC 6.4-16 Biology Data Review Committee Members
	
	EC 6.4-17 Algebra 1 Data Review Committee Members
	
	EC 6.4-18 Explanations of Statistical Terms for Data Review
	
	EC 6.4-19 Data Review Presentation 2019-EOCEP Alg1
	
	EC 6.4-20 2018 Data Review PowerPoint for Teachers-Science
	
	EC 6.4-21 Algebra 1 - 2018 Test Results Data Review
	
	EC 6.4-22 Biology 1 - 2018 Test Results Data Review
	
	EC 6.4-23 Memo-Data Review Reports and Quick Links for Teachers 1-17-2019
	
	EC 6.4-24 EOCEP ISR Sample – Spanish
	
	EC 6.4-25 EOCEP_19-20-Assessment Brochure_Spanish
	
	EC 6.4-26 EOCEP ISR Sample – Mandarin
	
	EC 6.4-27 EOCEP_19-20-Assessment Brochure_Mandarin
	
	EC 6.4-28 EOCEP ISR Sample - Russian
	
	EC 6.4-29 EOCEP_19-20-Assessment Brochure_Russian	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	EC 6.4-30 Cost of Foreign Language Translated Brochures-email	
	EC 6.4-31 Foreign Language Translations-written approval-email	
	EC 6.4-32 DTC Weekly Update July 2-6, 2019	
	EC 6.4-33 EOCEP Fall_Winter 2018-19 Reports Posted-email	
	EC 6.4-34 EOCEP Spring 2019 Reports Posted-email	
	EC 6.4-35 EOCEP Summer 2019 Reports Posted-email	
	EC 6.4-36 EOCEP Score Report User's Guide and Parent Brochure Posted-email	
	Sections 59-18-360 and 59-18-900 of the South Carolina Code of Laws (EC 6.4-1) mandates that the state and district report cards must be furnished to parents and the public by October 1 the next school year. The Education Oversight Committee and the SCDE produces the Accountability Manual (EC 6.4-2) which indicates the proficiency targets that must be included on the report cards. See also the South Carolina Education Oversight Committee School Report Card Guide (EC 6.4-3).	
	EOCEP math and science (Algebra 1 and Biology 1) accountability data are included on the South Carolina State Report Card (EC 6.4-4); District Report Cards (EC 6.4-5); and School Report Cards (EC 6.4-6). All are posted on the SCDE Website for public viewing. Performance levels for subgroups of students and reporting categories (standards or combinations of standards) are also posted (EC 6.4-7 through EC 6.4-15).	
	Committees of teachers from across the state conduct analyses and provide reports of performance for test items each year, for each test subject.	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	• Committee members (EC 6.4-16 and EC 6.4-17) • The teachers are trained on statistical terms (EC 6.4-18) and provided with additional training through a PowerPoint presentation (EC 6.4-19 and EC 6.4-20) • Their reports are posted for educators to access and presented to various statewide educational leadership organizations (EC 6.4-21, EC 6.4-22 and EC 6.4-23). The EOCEP Score Report User's Guide (EC 1.3-6) provides a description of the types of score reports and key measurement concepts. The guide also includes test blueprints, and cut scores. The EOCEP Individual Student Reports (paper and electronic) provide an overall scale score for each subject and a performance level (Does Not Meet Expectations, Minimally Meets Expectations, Meets Expectations and Exceeds Expectations). Performance by Reporting Category is also provided in the Individual Student Report (Low, Middle, or High). An annotated sample of the EOCEP Individual Student Report is shown on pages 4 & 5 in the User's Guide (EC 1.3-7). Additionally, districts receive student labels, student rosters, and a variety of summary reports. The student rosters and summary reports are described in the User's Guide (EC 1.3-7). Beginning in 2018-19, Braille, large print, and foreign language translations of the Individual Student Report and the Student and Parent Brochure were available to schools for distribution to students and parents who are non-native English speakers or parents, and students	

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	who are blind or have limited eyesight. Translations into three languages were produced (EC 6.4-24 through EC 6.4-29) and posted on the contractor's secure website for schools to download. Evidence of cost and approval documentation for these translations is included (EC 6.4-30 and EC 6.4-31). Data files, electronic and paper versions of the Individual Student Reports, and Score Report User's Guides are provided to districts as soon as possible after scoring, but no later than August 1. Sections 59-18-360 and 59-18-900 of the South Carolina Code of Laws (EC 6.4-1) outline the minimum criteria for reporting student, school, district and state assessment results. The law specifically states that assessment results must be disseminated by August first each year. It also states that schools and districts are responsible for disseminating this information to parents. Timelines for the delivery of reports are published in the District Test Coordinator Weekly Update, which is a newsletter sent to districts (EC 6.4-32). Also included are e-mail notifications that data files, rosters and summary reports were posted online for the Fall/Winter, Spring and Summer EOCEP administrations (EC 6.4-33 through EC 6.4-35) and a notification indicating posting of the Score Report User's Guide and Assessment Brochure (EC 6.4-36).	
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
__X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • The state needs to provide evidence of a method for parents to request reports in alternate formats or languages.		

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