



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Matthew L. Blomstedt
Commissioner of Education
Nebraska Department of Education
301 Centennial Mall South
P.O. Box 94987
Lincoln, NE 68509-4987

August 4, 2020

Dear Commissioner Blomstedt:

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 Nebraska Department of Education (NDE) to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in March 2020. Specifically, NDE submitted evidence regarding its general State assessments in reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics in grades 3-8, its alternate assessments in grades 3-8 and high school in R/LA and mathematics, and its general high school assessment 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 NDE'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 R/LA for grades 3-8 (NSCAS R/LA): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- Alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) in R/LA for grades 3-8 and high school (NSCAS Alternate R/LA): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- General assessments in mathematics, R/LA, and science for high school (ACT): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- General assessments in mathematics for grades 3-8 (NSCAS Mathematics): **Partially meets requirements of the ESEA.**

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

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

- AA-AAAS for grades 3-8 and high school mathematics (NSCAS Alternate Mathematics): **Partially meets requirements of the ESEA.**

Substantially meets requirements means that these assessments meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. Partially meets requirements means that these assessments do not meet a number of the requirements of the statute and regulations and/or the NDE will need to provide substantial additional information to demonstrate it meets the requirements. The Department expects that the NDE may not be able to submit all of the required information within one year.

Because NDE must submit substantial additional information, the Department is placing a condition on the State's 2020 Title I, Part A grant award. This condition will remain until the assessments in this review 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. The Department also notes that many of the concerns raised in the 2018 peer review were not resolved in this peer review. If adequate progress is not made in subsequent reviews, the Department may take additional action.

The specific list of items required for the NDE to submit is enclosed with this letter. I request that the NDE 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: Jeremy Heneger, Director of Statewide Assessment

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

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments	<p>For the State assessment system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of policies stating that all students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services must be included in the assessment system.
1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments	<p>For Nebraska’s science standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education). ○ Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas). ○ Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State. ○ Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents.
2.1 – Test Design and Development	<p>For the ACT in science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the test design is aligned to the depth and breadth of the State’s high school academic content standards (e.g., evidence of alignment of the test design blueprint to academic content standards). <p>For the NSCAS mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). • Evidence that the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design and intended uses and interpretations of results. • Evidence that the State makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the student is enrolled and uses that determination for all reporting. <p>For the NSCAS alternate mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results. • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of the State’s grade-level academic content standards and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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).
2.2 – Item Development	<p>For the NSCAS mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence provided for critical element 2.1 will address this critical element.
2.3 – Test Administration	<p>For the NSCAS alternate R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear and consistent administration procedures for determining when a student is not responsive. <p>For the NSCAS R/LA and mathematics and the NCAS alternate mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of a contingency plan to address possible technology challenges during online test administration. <p>For the NSCAS mathematics and NSCAS alternate mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of a process for ensuring that relevant staff receive necessary training to administer assessments.
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	<p>For the NSCAS alternate R/LA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A plan and timeline for addressing the issues raised in the State’s alignment study. <p>For the ACT science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the State’s academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity. <p>For the NSCAS mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), balance of content, and cognitive complexity. Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards. <p>For the NSCAS alternate mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A plan and timeline for addressing issues identified in the alignment report.
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes	<p>For the NSCAS R/LA, alternate R/LA, mathematics, and alternate mathematics:</p>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	<p>For the ACT (R/LA, mathematics and science):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the scoring and reporting structures are consistent with subdomain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based (such as a factor analysis). <p>For the NSCAS mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of 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	<p>For the NSCAS alternate R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the scores are related as expected with other variables.
4.1 – Reliability	<p>For the NSCAS mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of 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 including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population. Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results. For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s academic achievement. <p>For the NSCAS alternate mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of 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 (e.g., sub-score reliability).
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum	<p>For the NSCAS mathematics and alternate mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence it 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.
4.4 – Scoring	<p>For the NSCAS mathematics and alternate mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>
<p>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</p>	<p>For the NSCAS mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the computer adaptive testing adequately represents the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.
<p>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</p>	<p>For the NSCAS general and alternate assessments in R/LA mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For multiple versions, 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; and documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.
<p>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</p>	<p>For the NSCAS alternate mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of technical quality is made publicly available, including on the State’s website.
<p>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</p>	<p>For the ACT in R/LA, mathematics and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence provided for critical element 5.3 will address this critical element. <p>For the NSCAS alternate mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State provides information for IEP Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that 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. • Evidence that the State ensures that parents of students assessed with an AA-AAAS are informed that their child’s achievement will be measured based on alternate academic achievement standards. • Evidence that the State does not preclude a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who takes an AA-AAAS from attempting to complete the requirements for a regular high school diploma.
<p>5.2 – Procedures for Including ELs</p>	<p>For the ACT in R/LA, mathematics and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence provided for critical element 5.3 will address this critical element.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
5.3 – Accommodations	<p>For the NSCAS R/LA and alternate R/LA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence demonstrating the accommodations provided: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments. ○ Do not alter the construct being assessed. ○ Allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations. <p>For the ACT in R/LA, mathematics and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that children with disabilities and English learners are not denied the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment. <p>For the NSCAS mathematics and alternate mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a process to review and allow exceptional requests for students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	<p>For all assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State monitors test administration in districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, students covered by Section 504, and English learners, to ensure that accommodations are administered with fidelity and State test administration procedures are followed.
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	<p>For the ACT in R/LA, mathematics and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards. <p>For the NSCAS alternate in R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. NDE should provide this evidence by December 31, 2020.
6.4 – Reporting	<p>For the NSCAS alternate R/LA and alternate mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that translated versions of the score reports and interpretive documents are available for students and parents in languages commonly spoken in the State, such as Spanish. <p>For the NSCAS mathematics and alternate mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • A process and timeline for delivering reports to students, parents, teachers, principals, and other stakeholders as soon as practicable after each test administration.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence the State reports to the public its assessment results on student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level.

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 NEBRASKA

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS4

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

Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content Standards 5

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

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

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

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS11

Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development 11

Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development 13

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

Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration 16

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

Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy .. 18

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....19

Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content19

Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes 21

Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure..... 22

Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables..... 23

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER24

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability 24

Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility 26

Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum 27

Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring..... 28

Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms..... 29

Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment..... 30

Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance 31

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS32

Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 32

Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments..... 35

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations 36

Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations

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

..... 38

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING40

Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students 40
Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting 41
Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 42
Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting 44

SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS..47

Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments 47
Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments 49
Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State Assessments 51

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic content standards:</u> The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public schools and public school students in the State.</p>		<p>This critical element was met in the previous peer review.</p>
<p>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content Standards

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic content standards:</u> The State’s challenging academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science are aligned with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards.</p>		<p>This critical element was met in the previous peer review.</p>
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For students with disabilities, policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including those children with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system; • For ELs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policies state that all ELs must be included in all aspects of the content assessment system, unless the State has chosen the statutory option for recently arrived ELs under which such ELs are exempt from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment. ○ If a State has developed native language assessments for ELs in R/LA, ELs must be assessed in R/LA in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except, if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native 	<p>State Assessment Plan: [All] 2017_033_Annual Assessment Plan.pdf (pages 3)</p> <p>Adopted State Rule on Assessment: [All] 2017_034_Standards Assessment and Accountability (SAA).pdf (pages 15-16, 61-66)</p> <p>Reporting policy: [All] 2017_018_Rule 51.pdf (pages 14-15)</p> <p>Business rules describing responsibility for reporting assessment results: [All] 2017_019_Who Reports What.pdf (pages 17-19)</p>	<p>Nebraska provided sufficient evidence that it has clear policies regarding the inclusion of all students in the Statewide assessment system, and that it communicates those policies.</p> <p>However, the State did not provide clear evidence of policies stating that all students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services must be included in the assessment system. The document “Who Reports What” did not seem to have a category that pertained to students placed in private schools for the purpose of receiving special education and related services, and for that reason this policy was unclear. Further clarification is needed from the State.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

<p>language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If the State uses the flexibility for Native American language schools and programs: (1) the State provides the content assessment in the Native American language to all students in the school or program; (2) the State submits such content assessment for peer review as part of its State assessment system; and (3) the State continues to provide ELP assessments and services for ELs as required by law. The State must assess in English the students' achievement in R/LA in high school. 		
<p>Section 1.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of policies stating that all students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services must be included in 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.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State has developed or amended challenging academic standards and assessments, the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education). • Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas). • Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State. • Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents. 		<p>Department staff note that Nebraska’s math and reading/language arts standards were adopted prior to the passage of ESSA. Nebraska’s science standards were adopted in 2017. Evidence is needed to address this critical element for the adoption of the science standards</p>
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State conducted meaningful and timely consultation with the required entities during its adoption of 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.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to <u>the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards</u> for the grade that is being assessed and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of <u>the State’s grade-level academic content standards</u> and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results. • Processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <u>the State’s academic content standards</u>, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills). • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design and intended uses and interpretations of results. 	<p>2017_011_NE ACT ELA Alignment Report.pdf 2017_020_NE ACT Math Alignment Report.pdf 2017_026_NE ACT Alignment Study 2017.pdf 2017_042_NE-ACT Science Alignment Results.pdf 2017_045_DRC Disaster Recovery Procedures.pdf</p>	<p>ACT ACT’s alignment studies note that ACT is designed to predict college success rather than align with a state’s adopted content standards. As such, the alignment studies submitted provided evidence of alignment between the assessment and many of the State’s high school academic content standards but also indicated gaps in coverage with some standards not being addressed.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the student is enrolled and uses that determination for all reporting. • If the State administers a content assessment that includes portfolios, such assessment may be partially administered through a portfolio but may not be <i>entirely</i> administered through a portfolio. 		
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the ACT, evidence that the test design is aligned to the depth and breadth of the State’s high school academic content standards (e.g., evidence of alignment of the test design blueprint to academic content standards). 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

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.		Met in previous peer review.
Section 2.2 Summary Statement		
x No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>No documentation was cited as evidence for this element but “2017_045_DRC Disaster Recovery Procedures.pdf” provides relevant information.</p> <p>2017_041_Alt Test Admin Manual.pdf (pages 10-11)</p>	<p>RLA General Documentation was not cited for this element providing evidence of contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during online test administration. The disaster recovery plan provided for the RLA Alt assessments identifies what DRC will do to safeguard the data. However, there isn’t any direction about communicating with the state or a process for those in schools who are administering assessments if/when an issue occurs.</p> <p>RLA Alternate Peers’ previously requested, “Clear and consistent administration procedures for determining when a student is not responsive.”</p> <p>Alt Test Admin Manual (pg. 6) “Student was administered one or more items but did not provide a response (ANR)—should be filled in if the Test Administrator attempts to administer the NSCAS Alternate to a student but the student does not provide a response.” “One or more items” does not provide a consistent administration rule for determining a student is non-responsive. Are all tests stopped after one non-response? Do some test administrators allow 2, 3 or more non-responses and if so should the administrator consider total or sequential non-responses?</p>
Section 2.3 Summary Statement		
<p>x The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

- For the RLA General and Alternate, evidence of a contingency plan to address possible technology challenges during online test administration.
- For the RLA Alternate assessment the state must provide clear and consistent administration procedures for determining when a student is not responsive.
(E.g. “One or more items” does not provide a consistent administration rule for determining a student is non-responsive.)

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. Monitoring of test administration should be demonstrated for all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS.</p>	<p>[All] 2017_002_2019 NSCAS Summative Observer Checklist.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[All] 2017_003_Criteria for selecting NSCAS Monitoring Observation Schools.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>Observation notes from spring 2019: [All] 2017_001_Monitoring Test Administration.pdf (pages All)</p>	<p>Nebraska provided a spreadsheet showing all of the assessment monitoring notes from visits conducted in spring 2019, as well as a blank copy of the form that monitors complete and a protocol for selecting LEAs and schools to visit. From this evidence it is clear that all assessments are included in the monitoring system. This evidence is sufficient to address this critical element.</p>
<p>Section 2.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. • Application of test security procedures to all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS. 		
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.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <p>To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results;</p> <p>To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</p> <p>To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.</p>		<p>Met in previous peer review.</p>
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>x No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. The State’s validity evidence includes evidence that:</p> <p><u>The State’s academic assessments</u> measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards; • If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards and administers alternate assessments aligned with those standards, the assessments show adequate alignment to the State’s academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content 	<p>2017_035_NeSA ELA Third Party Independent Alignment Report Responses.pdf</p> <p>2017_011_NE ACT ELA Alignment Report.pdf 2017_020_NE ACT Math Alignment Report.pdf 2017_026_NE ACT Alignment Study 2017.pdf</p>	<p>RLA Alternate 2017_35 (PDF pg. 2), response to the independent alignment study, acknowledged deficiency in coverage for writing and indicates additional items were being field tested to improve coverage. The Response to the Alignment Study appeared to be written in 2016, and focused on categorical concurrence in writing, documentation should be submitted describing the results of the work done by the State since then to address all findings of the alignment study.</p> <p>ACT Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the State’s academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.		
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• For the ACT, documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the State’s academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity.• For the RLA Alternate, documentation of the State’s implementation of the 2016 plan and timeline for addressing the issues raised in the State’s alignment 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.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap: <u>the intended cognitive processes</u> appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>Evidence was not submitted for this element</p> <p>2017_021_ACT CogLab June 19.pdf</p>	<p>RLA General & Alternate</p> <p>Documentation was not submitted to demonstrate “Evidence that NDE’s assessment items (and item types) tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.”</p> <p>ACT</p> <p>The ACT Cog Lab study provided evidence that the ACT assessment items (and item types) tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards, to the degree that the assessment covers the state academic content standards (see elements 2.1 and 3.1).</p> <p>If possible, peers would suggest the Cog Lab study be conducted by a third party to provide more support for the findings.</p>
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u><u> </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the RLA General and Alternate, evidence that NDE’s assessment items (and item types) tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

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 <u>academic content standards</u> .	2017_025_VValidity Based on Internal Structure.pdf 2017_043_2017 ACT Peer Review Report for Nebraska.pdf	ACT Documentation submitted did not provide evidence demonstrating that the scoring and reporting structures are consistent with subdomain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based (such as a factor analysis).
Section 3.3 Summary Statement		
<p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the ACT, evidence that NDE’s assessment items (and item types) tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>Evidence was not cited for this element</p> <p>Supporting evidence 2017_036_2018 NSCAS Alternate Technical Report.pdf 2019_067_2018 NSCAS Alternate Technical Report.pdf</p>	<p>RLA – Alt</p> <p>While the submission cited no documentation for this element, some support for the claim that the scores are related as expected with other variables could be found in the NSCAS Alternate Technical Report (2017_036) correlations between ELA, Mathematics and Science.</p> <p>Additional evidence was found in 2019_067 (pgs. 58-60). The prevalence of values at or near 1 (one) call into question the reporting of sub-scores. The State should examine the rationale for reporting sub-scores when they note “that some strand scores might not provide unique information about the strengths or weaknesses of students”.</p>
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the RLA Alternate assessment the State must provide the rationale for continued sub-score reporting in light of the lack of differentiation identified in the Alternate Technical Manual or provide a strategy for addressing the high correlations of sub-scores. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. If the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, measures of reliability for the assessment overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a <u>student’s academic achievement</u>. 		<p>Met in previous peer review.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

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.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><i>For all State academic assessments,</i> assessments should be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (see definition¹).</p> <p>For academic content assessments, the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in their design, development and analysis.</p>		Met in previous peer review.
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>x No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

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.		Met in previous peer review.
Section 4.3 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

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 <u>academic achievement standards</u> .		Met in previous peer review.
Section 4.4 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State administers multiple forms of academic assessments within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>		<p>Met in previous peer review.</p>
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State administers any of its assessments in multiple versions within a subject area (e.g., online versus paper-based delivery; <u>or a native language version of the academic content assessment</u>), grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<p>Evidence was not cited for this element</p>	<p>RLA General & Alt Documentation was not cited for this critical element. For the RLA General assessment, pencil and paper, Spanish and Braille versions are available as accommodations. For these forms, documentation should be submitted identifying the number of each provided each year and how and when these forms were developed.</p> <p>For the RLA Alternate assessment, the state should identify which of these forms are available and provide documentation requested as appropriate.</p>
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u> <u> </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the RLA General and Alternate assessments, if the State administers multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, evidence that the State followed a design and development process and evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. (E.g. paper & pencil, Spanish language and Braille) 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments), and Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website. 	<p>2017_037_Proposed NSCAS-AAM 2018 Standard Setting.pdf 2017_038_NSCAS-AAM Stanset Plan for TAC Feb 2019.pdf 2017_040_2.12.18 TAC Agenda.pdf 2017_035_NeSA ELA Third Party Independent Alignment Report Responses.pdf</p>	<p>RLA General & Alt Documentation submitted provides some evidence of an ongoing process for monitoring, maintaining, and improving as needed, the technical quality of its assessment system.</p> <p>The one TAC Agenda document submitted was of limited utility as: 1) notes were inserted into the agenda requiring readers to scroll through the entire document to find the topics covered; 2) a formatting issue cut off the ends of lines for the first several pages; and 3) the notes were not edited for clarity. The state should provide evidence of a comprehensive system, including documentation of steps taken to implement suggestions of the TAC or address issues identified by the TAC.</p> <p>The state should have cited their efforts to improve alignment for the RLA Alternate assessment (2017_035).</p>
Section 4.7 Summary Statement		
<p><u> </u><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of an ongoing process for monitoring, maintaining, and improving as needed, the technical quality of its 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.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system. Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, the placement team under Section 504, or the individual or team designated by a district to make that decision under Title II of the ADA, as applicable, based on each student’s individual abilities and needs.</p> <p>If a State adopts alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and administers an alternate assessment aligned with those standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(1)(E) and (b)(2)(D), respectively, the State must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish guidelines for determining whether to assess a student with an AA-AAAS, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A State definition of “students with the most significant cognitive disabilities” that addresses factors related to cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior; • Provide information for IEP Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that: 	<p>2017_018_Rule 51.pdf 2017_023_ACT Accommodations Documentation for IEP.pdf 2017_024_Nebraska ACT Accommodations Crosswalk .pdf 2017_027_ACT Administration Manual Accommodation and ELL.pdf</p>	<p>ACT Documentation submitted provided evidence demonstrating the State’s process for ensuring that students with disabilities are included in the ACT with clear guidelines for accommodations and the receipt of college-reportable scores.</p> <p>Documentation submitted provided evidence demonstrating that children with disabilities are not denied the opportunity to participate in the assessment, but rules denying college reportable scores to students requesting some accommodations do prevent some students from receiving the benefits from participation in the assessment. The peers have concerns regarding the fairness of students being denied college reportable scores because of the use of accommodations that are used for classroom instruction and are approved for use in the State’s other assessments.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>for the grade in which the student is enrolled; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop, disseminate information on, and promote the use of appropriate accommodations to ensure that a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who does not take an AA-AAAS participates in academic instruction and assessments for the grade in which the student is enrolled. • The State has in place and monitors implementation of guidelines for IEP teams to apply in determining, on a case-by-case basis, which students with the most significant cognitive disabilities will be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, if applicable. Such guidelines must be developed in accordance with 34 CFR § 200.6(d).² 		
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u>_x_</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State must provide evidence that children with disabilities taking the ACT assessment are not denied the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment. 		

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all ELs in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s academic content assessments and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed with a linguistic accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for ELs; • Assistance regarding selection of appropriate linguistic accommodations for ELs, including to the extent practicable, assessments in the language most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what those students know and can do to determine the students’ mastery of skills in academic content areas until the students have achieved English language proficiency. 	<p>2017_027_ACT Administration Manual Accommodation and ELL.pdf 2017_028_Rule 15.pdf 2017_031_Testing Supports for English Learners.pdf</p>	<p>ACT Documentation submitted provided evidence of the State’s process for ensuring that ELs are included in the ACT with clear guidelines for allowable supports and the receipt of college-reportable scores.</p> <p>Documentation submitted provided evidence demonstrating that children with disabilities are not denied the opportunity to participate in the assessment, but rules denying college reportable scores to students requesting some accommodations do prevent some students from receiving the benefits from participation in the assessment. The peers have concerns regarding the fairness of students being denied college reportable scores because of the use of accommodations that are used for classroom instruction and are approved for use in the State’s other assessments.</p>
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State must provide evidence that children with disabilities taking the ACT assessment are not denied the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in 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.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and ELs, including ELs with disabilities. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures that appropriate accommodations, such as, interoperability with, and ability to use, assistive technology, are available to measure the <u>academic achievement</u> of students with disabilities. • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs; • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. • Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny 	<p>Evidence was not cited for this element</p> <p>2017_030_ACT Technical Manual.pdf 2017_032_Examining the Validity of ACT Composite Score.pdf</p> <p>2017_027_ACT Administration Manual Accommodation and ELL.pdf 2017_039_Nebraska Peer Review Report July 2019 DIF.pdf</p>	<p>RLA General, Alternate Documentation was not cited for this critical element.</p> <p>ACT Documentation submitted demonstrated ACT only allows a few select accommodations that are widely used in state assessment programs and with considerable research demonstrating their validity for ELs and students with disabilities. Rather than citing the body of research supporting the use of these accommodations, ACT analyzed assessment results for accommodated vs. non-accommodated ACT administrations relationships to college GPA. ACT noted that small sample sizes, diverse characteristics of the population and institutional variations impacting GPA made analysis difficult and required grouping multiple accommodations.</p> <p>ACT research was able to demonstrate that scores for accommodated students were correlated with college GPA scores, though not as closely as non-accommodated student scores.</p> <p>Peers felt that the documentation submitted by the State demonstrated accommodations allowed by ACT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments. • Do not alter the construct being assessed. • Allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

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.		Peers recommend the State consider the ACT accommodations that are available and permitted for college reportable scores. See critical element 5.1.
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
<p><u> </u> <u> </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the RLA General and Alternate, evidence demonstrating the accommodations provided: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments. ○ Do not alter the construct being assessed. ○ Allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures; • Monitored for administrations of all required academic content assessments and AA-AAAS. 	<p>2017_001_Monitoring Test Administration.pdf 2017_002_2019 NSCAS Summative Observer Checklist.pdf 2017_003_Criteria for selecting NSCAS Monitoring Observation Schools.pdf 2017_039_Nebraska Peer Review Report July 2019 DIF.pdf</p>	<p>RLA General, Alternate & ACT Documentation submitted provides evidence that the State monitors test administration in districts and schools. Documentation failed to provide evidence demonstrating monitoring ensures that appropriate assessments and students’ identified accommodations are provided for students with disabilities and English learners.</p> <p>“Did you observe any accommodations given to students?” provides no indication that all required accommodations were provided to all students identified for accommodations.</p> <p>Computer based assessments provide a number of means to validate students’ access to required accommodations.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 5.4 Summary Statement		
<p>_x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For all assessments, evidence that the State monitors test administration in districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, students covered by Section 504, and English learners, to ensure that accommodations are administered with fidelity and State test administration procedures are followed. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

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

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards.</u> 		Met in previous peer review.
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.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic achievement standards:</u></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards and with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards such that a student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards (1) are aligned with the State’s challenging academic content standards for the grade in which a student is enrolled; (2) promote access to the general curriculum consistent with the IDEA; (3) reflect professional judgment as to the highest possible standards achievable for such students; (4) are designated in the IEP for each student for whom alternate academic achievement standards apply; and (5) are aligned to ensure that a student who meets the alternate academic achievement standards is on track to pursue</p>	<p>Evidence was not cited for this element</p> <p>Supporting evidence not cited 2017_036_2018 NSCAS Alternate Technical Report.pdf 2017_037_Proposed NSCAS-AAM 2018 Standard Setting.pdf</p> <p>2017_026_NE ACT Alignment Study 2017.pdf</p>	<p>RLA Alternate Evidence was not submitted by the state to demonstrate that the alternate academic achievement standards ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. NDE should provide this evidence by December 31, 2020.</p> <p>ACT Issues of alignment between the ACT and the State academic content standards prevented demonstrating that the State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
postsecondary education or competitive integrated employment.		
Section 6.3 Summary Statement		
<p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the ACT, evidence that the State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards. • For the RLA Alternate assessment, evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. NDE should provide this evidence by December 31, 2020. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State reports its assessment results for all students assessed, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public.</p> <p>The State reports to the public its assessment results on <u>student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level³</u></p> <p>For <u>academic content assessments</u>, the State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the <u>specific academic needs of students</u>, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its academic content assessments that: 	<p>2017_012_Individual Student Report (ISR) Parent Letter.pdf 2017_013_Individual Student Report (ISR) Spanish Parent Letter.pdf 2017_014_NSCAS Spanish Interpretive Guide for Parents.pdf 2017_015_Accountability New Release 10.9.19.pdf 2017_017_NSCAS Interpretive Guide for Parents.pdf</p> <p>2017_005_Rule 10 Appendix E.pdf (page 210) 2017_016_District Assessment Coordinator (DAC) Update 5.22.19 Reporting Timeline.pdf</p>	<p>RLA General & Alternate Documentation submitted by the state provided evidence demonstrating that translated versions of the score reports and interpretive documents for the general assessment are available for students and parents in languages commonly spoken in the State, such as Spanish.</p> <p>Documentation was not found to demonstrate availability of score reports and interpretive documents for the alternate assessment in languages other than English.</p> <p>Neither document submitted by the state (2017_005 & 2017_016) provided sufficient evidence of a process and timeline for delivering reports to students, parents, teachers, principals, and other stakeholders as soon as practicable after each test administration.</p> <p>2017_005 provides a timeline for reporting assessment scores to the State Department of Education rather than to students, parents, teachers, principals, and other stakeholders.</p> <p>2019_048_District Assessment Coordinator (DAC) Update 5.22.19 Reporting Timeline.pdf indicated technical issues resulted in a delay in reporting assessment results but that assessment results for school year 2019-20 should be available for distribution in a timely manner. Documentation demonstrating timely delivery of the 2019-2020 assessment results should be submitted by the state.</p>

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
<p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the RLA Alternate assessment, evidence that translated versions of the score reports and interpretive documents are available for students and parents in languages commonly spoken in the State, such as Spanish. • For all assessments, the state must provide documentation demonstrating a process and timeline for delivering reports to students, parents, teachers, principals, and other stakeholders as soon as practicable after each test administration. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS
 (if **applicable**; evidence for this section would be submitted in ADDITION to evidence for sections 1 through 6)

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

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

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

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

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

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA

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

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

U. S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

March 2020 State Assessment Peer Review Notes (Mathematics General and Alternate)



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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

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.

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

Contents

<u>SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS</u>	4
<u>Critical Element 1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</u>	4
<u>Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content Standards</u>	5
<u>Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments</u>	6
<u>Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</u> ..	8
<u>Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments</u>	10
<u>SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS</u>	11
<u>Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development</u>	11
<u>Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development</u>	13
<u>Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration</u>	14
<u>Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</u>	16
<u>Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security</u>	17
<u>Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</u> ..	18
<u>SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY</u>	19
<u>Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content</u>	19
<u>Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</u>	21
<u>Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</u>	22
<u>Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables</u>	23
<u>SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER</u>	24
<u>Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability</u>	24
<u>Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</u>	26
<u>Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</u>	27
<u>Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring</u>	28
<u>Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</u>	29
<u>Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</u>	30
<u>Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</u>	31
<u>SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS</u>	32
<u>Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</u>	32
<u>Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments</u>	35
<u>Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations</u>	36
<u>Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</u>	

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

..... 38

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING40

Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students 40
Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting 41
Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 42
Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting 44

SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS..47

Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments 47
Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments 49
Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State Assessments 51

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic content standards:</u> The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public schools and public school students in the State.</p>	<p>[All] 2019_001_Nebraska Revised Statute 79-760.01.pdf (pages All) [All] 2019_002_Nebraska Revised Statute 79-760.02.pdf (pages All) [All] 2019_003_Rule 51.pdf (pages 14-15) [All] 2019_004_9/4/2015 Math Standards Approval Board Minutes.pdf (pages 3, 7)</p>	<p>Mathematics Documentation submitted by the state demonstrated adoption of challenging Mathematics content standards for all students.</p>
<p>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content Standards

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic content standards:</u> The State’s challenging academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science are aligned with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards.</p>	<p>[All] 2019_008_Postsecondary System Designation_Mathematics.pdf (pages All) [All] 2019_009_Standards Writing Team_Math.pdf (pages All) [All] 2019_010_Nebraska College and Career Ready Standards_Math.pdf (pages All) [All] 2019_029_Public Input Meeting Nebraska Math Standards.pdf (pages All)</p>	<p>Mathematics Documentation submitted provided evidence demonstrating the adopted academic content standards for mathematics meet the entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the State higher education system.</p>
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments aligned with <u>grade-level academic achievement standards</u> or alternate academic achievement standards in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 9-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). <p>AND</p> <p>The State’s <u>academic content assessments</u> must be the same assessments administered to all students in the tested grades, with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may take an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards. • A State may permit an LEA to administer a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in lieu of the State high school assessment if certain conditions are met. • A State that administers an end-of-course high school mathematics assessment may exempt an 8th grade student from the mathematics assessment typically administered in 		<p>This critical element was met in 2018 for all subject areas.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For students with disabilities, policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including those children with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system; • For ELs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policies state that all ELs must be included in all aspects of the content assessment system, unless the State has chosen the statutory option for recently arrived ELs under which such ELs are exempt from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment. ○ If a State has developed native language assessments for ELs in R/LA, ELs must be assessed in R/LA in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except, if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native 	<p>Nebraska policy:</p> <p>[All] 2019_134_2019-20 Statewide Assessment and Accountability (SAA).pdf (pages 15-16, 61-66)</p> <p>[All] 2019_003_Rule 51.pdf (pages 14-15)</p> <p>[All] 2019_013_RULE-15-A-GUIDE-FOR-IMPLEMENTATION_July_2018.pdf (pages 30-34)</p> <p>[All] 2019_019_Rule 10 Appendix E.pdf (pages 210)</p> <p>[All] 2019_035_Who Reports What.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>Administration manuals:</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_083_Test Administration Manual Online.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_084_Test Administration Manual PaperPencil.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_014_NSCAS Summative and Alternate Accessibility Short Form.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen, Alt] 2019_015_NSCAS-Summative-and-Alternate-Accessibility-Manual-2.8.19.pdf (pages 11, 16-17)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_016_Online Test Administration Manual - Spanish.pdf (pages All)</p>	<p>Nebraska provided sufficient evidence that it has clear policies regarding the inclusion of all students in the Statewide assessment system, and that it communicates those policies.</p> <p>However, the State did not provide clear evidence of policies stating that all students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services must be included in the assessment system. The document “Who Reports What” did not seem to have a category that pertained to students placed in private schools for the purpose of receiving special education and related services, and for that reason this policy was unclear. Further clarification is needed from the State.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

<p>language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If the State uses the flexibility for Native American language schools and programs: (1) the State provides the content assessment in the Native American language to all students in the school or program; (2) the State submits such content assessment for peer review as part of its State assessment system; and (3) the State continues to provide ELP assessments and services for ELs as required by law. The State must assess in English the students' achievement in R/LA in high school. 		
<p>Section 1.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of policies stating that all students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services must be included in 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.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

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

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

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to <u>the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards</u> for the grade that is being assessed and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of <u>the State’s grade-level academic content standards</u> and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results. • Processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <u>the State’s academic content standards</u>, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills). • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design and intended uses and interpretations of results. 	<p>[Gen] 2019_085_G3-8 NSCAS Math TOS.pdf (pages All) [Gen] 2019_086_NE Year 2 UAT Plan.pdf (pages All) [Gen] 2019_087_2019 NSCAS CAT Simulation Report 2019-04-02.pdf (pages 12-21) [Gen] 2019_127_Rough Draft NWEA 2019 Technical Report.pdf (pages 20-46, 145-146)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_050_Grade 3 NSCAS Alternate Math TOS.pdf (pages All) [Alt] 2019_051_Grade 4 NSCAS Alternate Math TOS.pdf (pages All) [Alt] 2019_052_Grade 5 NSCAS Alternate Math TOS.pdf (pages All) [Alt] 2019_053_Grade 6 NSCAS Alternate Math TOS.pdf (pages All) [Alt] 2019_054_Grade 7 NSCAS Alternate Math TOS.pdf (pages All) [Alt] 2019_055_Grade 8 NSCAS Alternate Math TOS.pdf (pages All) [Alt] 2019_056_Grade 11 NSCAS Alternate Math TOS.pdf (pages All) [Alt] 2019_057_Alternate Math Style Guide.pdf (pages All) [Alt] 2019_058_Math 3-8, 11 Alternate Test Design.pdf (pages All)</p>	<p>Mathematics General Documentation submitted provide evidence of a test development process that is technically sound but does not ensure assessments fully cover the State’s academic content standards.</p> <p>Peers question whether the assessments measure the depth and breadth of the State’s grade level academic content standards given that DOK 3 is minimally used in the table of specifications for the assessments.</p> <p>Based on the evidence provided it appears that the CAT is considering items by strand rather than standard however, the table of specifications includes items by standard. The State should provide evidence of the blueprint match rate by standard. Based on 2019_087 it appears that the CAT engine is using an operational blueprint that is different than the Table of Specifications provided. The State should provide the Operational Blueprint utilized by the CAT engine.</p> <p>The State should provide a plan and timeline for improving the item pool to include higher difficulty items.</p> <p>Evaluate item exposure rates (2019_087) and the rate of unused items to improve selection procedures.</p> <p>Documentation provided did not provide evidence demonstrating the CAT only includes assessment items for the grade level being assessed to make proficiency determinations.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the student is enrolled and uses that determination for all reporting. • If the State administers a content assessment that includes portfolios, such assessment may be partially administered through a portfolio but may not be <i>entirely</i> administered through a portfolio. 		<p>Document 2019_088 (Operational CAT Engine Evaluation Report) indicates the constraint engine used DOK level as a guideline or a "nice to have" given the limited number of items at a specified DOK level for some indicators. To measure the depth and breadth of the State's academic content standard DOK should be a constraint for the CAT engine.</p> <p>Mathematics Alternate Documentation submitted did not provide sufficient evidence of a test development process that is technically sound and aligns the assessments to the State's academic content standards. Because the Table of Specifications item ranges include zero (0) for most cells they lack sufficient detail to provide evidence the assessments measure the depth and breadth of the State's grade level academic content standard.</p> <p>The State should provide an explanation of Stages within the Table of Specifications.</p> <p>The State should provide narrative explaining the relevance of document 2019_058.</p>
--	--	--

Section 2.1 Summary Statement

<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the Mathematics General assessment the State must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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 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. • For the Mathematics Alternate assessment the State must provide:
--

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

- 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).

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills. 	<p>[Gen] 2019_020_Math General Item Writer Evaluation 2019.pdf (pages 12-25)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_088_2019 Operational CAT Engine Evaluation Report.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_089_NE bias review binder_2019.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_090_NE content bias training PPT_gen+Math_2019.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_091_NE content review binder_2019.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_092_NE IWW binder_2019.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_093_NE IWW training PPT_gen+Math_2019.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_094_NE Math 3-8 Item Spec_11.11.19.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_095_2018 NE IWW Evaluation Results.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_096_2019 NE IWW Evaluation Results 2019-06-17.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_127_Rough Draft NWEA 2019 Technical Report.pdf (pages 37-46)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_018_AA Item Writing 2019.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_021_Depth Of Knowledge (DOK) Chart.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_022_Style Guide for Math Item Writers.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_023_Item Writing Guidelines.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_024_Math SPED Depth of Knowledge Levels and Stages.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_028_Math Alternate Item Writing Training PP.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_036_DOK Level to Stage Comparison.pdf (pages All)</p>	<p>Mathematics General Documentation submitted demonstrates reasonable and technically sound item development processes but the table of specifications’ minimal use of DOK 3 limits the coverage of higher order thinking skills.</p> <p>Document 2019_088 (Operational CAT Engine Evaluation Report) indicates the constraint engine used DOK level as a guideline or a "nice to have" given the limited number of items at a specified DOK level for some indicators. To measure the State’s academic content standards in terms of cognitive process DOK should be a constraint for the CAT engine.</p> <p>Peers are uncertain as to the purpose of maximum DOK in the Table of Specifications.</p> <p>Mathematics Alternate Documentation submitted demonstrates reasonable and technically sound item development processes.</p> <p>The State should provide an explanation of Stages within the Table of Specifications.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

	[Alt] 2019_037_Nebraska Alternate Item Writing Reference.pdf (pages All) [Alt] 2019_067_2018 NSCAS Alternate Technical Report.pdf (pages 9-18, 21-22)	
Section 2.2 Summary Statement		
<u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• For the Mathematics General assessment, 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.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>[All] 2019_134_2019-20 Statewide Assessment and Accountability (SAA).pdf (pages 5-21) [All] 2019_135_NITC Report for NSCAS.pdf (pages All) [Gen] 2019_084_Test Administration Manual PaperPencil.pdf (pages All) [Gen] 2019_104_SystemTechnologySummative.pdf (pages All) [Gen] 2019_105_AC_NSCAS_Supplement.pdf (pages All) [Gen] 2019_106_AssessmentCoordGuideSum.pdf (pages All) [Gen] 2019_107_Item Type Sampler Manual.pdf (pages All) [Gen] 2019_108_NDE and NWEA Regional Workshop Fall 2018.pdf (pages All) [Gen] 2019_109_NDE and NWEA Summative Training Spring 2019.pdf (pages All) [Gen] 2019_110_NDE Scheduling Guidance.pdf (pages All) [Gen] 2019_111_Paper Pencil Tips Sheet.pdf (pages All) [Gen] 2019_112_Paper Pencil Order Training Document.pdf (pages All) [Gen] 2019_113_Schedule Guidance for the Spring 2019 Summative Assessment.pdf (pages All) [Gen] 2019_114_Summative Students Staff Management Guide.pdf (pages All) [Alt] 2019_136_DRC Disaster Recovery Procedures.pdf (pages All) [Gen] 2019_083_Test Administration Manual Online.pdf (pages All)</p>	<p>Mathematics General Documentation submitted for the state Mathematics general assessments provided generally clear and appropriate policies and procedures for assessment administration but were unable to find evidence for some critical components.</p> <p>Peers were unable to find evidence of contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during online test administration. The disaster recovery plan provided for the Mathematics Alt assessments identifies what DRC will do to safeguard the data. However, there isn't any direction about communicating with the state or a process for those in schools who are administering assessments if/when an issue occurs.</p> <p>The State provided evidence of training materials that can be used for test administrators (2019_108 & 2019_109) however, the processes by which the State ensures test administrators receive this information is unclear.</p> <p>Mathematics Alternate Documentation submitted for the State Mathematics alternate assessment provided appropriate policies and procedures for assessment administration, but lacked clarity in one area. Assessment administration materials need to identify clear and consistent Mathematics alternate assessment administration procedures for determining when a student is not responsive.</p> <p>Alt Test Admin Manual (pg. 6) "Student was administered one or more items but did not provide a response (ANR)—should be filled in if the Test Administrator attempts to administer the NSCAS Alternate to a student but the student does not provide a response." "One or more items"</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

	<p>[Alt] 2019_059_NSCAS Alternate Administration Directions.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_060_2019 NSCAS Alternate Test Administration Training PP.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_061_NSCAS Alternate Training for Proctors PP.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>2019_015_NSCAS-Summative-and-Alternate-Accessibility-Manual-2.8.19.pdf</p>	<p>does not provide a consistent administration rule for determining a student is non-responsive. Are all tests stopped after one non-response? If 2 or 3 non-responses are encountered should it be total non-responses or sequential non-responses?</p> <p>Peers were concerned by the 2019_059 (pg. 5) “the district may provide tests in large print or another format that supports the student’s primary mode of communication.” The State should provide guidance on acceptable formats or a process for requesting approval from the state for an administration in an alternate format.</p>
<p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the Mathematics General and Alternate assessments, evidence of a contingency plan to address possible technology challenges during online test administration. • For the Mathematics General and Alternate assessments the State must provide evidence of a process for ensuring test administration training. • For the Mathematics Alternate assessment the state must provide clear and consistent administration procedures for determining when a student is not responsive. (E.g. “One or more items” does not provide a consistent administration rule for determining a student is non-responsive.) 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. Monitoring of test administration should be demonstrated for all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS.</p>	<p>[All] 2019_005_2019 NSCAS Summative Observer Checklist.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[All] 2019_006_Criteria for selecting NSCAS Monitoring Observation Schools.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[All] 2019_007_Monitoring Test Administration.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[All] 2019_129_School districts who had IEP Monitoring for 2019.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[All] 2019_130_SPED District Monitoring Protocol 2019.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_100_NDE Report Year 2.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_101_NSCAS Report Year 2.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_102_2019 NSCAS Vertical Scale Evaluation Report 2019-07-22.pdf (pages 6)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_103_Memo to NDE 2019 Consistency Checks and Scaling Considerations.pdf (pages All)</p>	<p>Nebraska provided a spreadsheet showing all of the assessment monitoring notes from visits conducted in spring 2019, as well as a blank copy of the form that monitors complete and a protocol for selecting LEAs and schools to visit. From this evidence it is clear that all assessments are included in the monitoring system. This evidence is sufficient to address this critical element.</p>
<p>Section 2.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>x No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. • Application of test security procedures to all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS. 	<p>[Gen] 2019_083_Test Administration Manual Online.pdf (pages All) [Gen] 2019_084_Test Administration Manual PaperPencil.pdf (pages All) [Gen] 2019_097_2018 NSCAS Test Duration Study Report 2018-12-18.pdf (pages All) [Gen] 2019_098_NDE_DF_Report_Spring_2019_NSCAS_2019-Oct-02.pdf (pages All) [Gen] 2019_099_NWEA Test Security Handbook.pdf (pages All) [Alt] 2019_059_NSCAS Alternate Administration Directions.pdf (pages 7, 10-18) [Alt] 2019_060_2020 NSCAS Alternate Test Administration Training PP.pdf (pages Slides 7-9) [Alt] 2019_062_eDirect UG_NSCAS Alternate Assessment_10_03_18_2.5.pdf (pages All) [Alt] 2019_063_2019 Alternate Test Development Security Plan.pdf (pages All) 2019_127_Rough Draft NWEA 2019 Technical Report.pdf</p>	<p>Mathematics General & Alternate While documentation submitted by the State generally describe an appropriate set of policies and procedures to minimize test irregularities and strengthen the integrity of test results but the materials provided did not adequately describe processes and procedures for investigating reported testing irregularities and security breaches.</p> <p>2019_099, Test Security Handbook, outlines NWEA’s guidelines for item security, but the peers were unable to find documentation demonstrating how those guidelines were implemented for the State’s assessment program. [E.g. processes for ensuring item security during Item Review and other test & item development meetings.]</p>
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the Mathematics General and Alternate assessments the State must provide evidence of: 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

- Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.
- Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State's assessments.
- Application of test security procedures to all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS. (E.g. evidence demonstrating item and test security procedures were followed during the development process.)

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 	<p>[All] 2019_025_NDE Memorandum #707 Data Security.pdf (pages All) [All] 2019_026_NDE Memorandum #711 Data Privacy.pdf (pages All) [All] 2019_027_Data Access and Use Policy and Procedures.pdf (pages 7 & 8)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_099_NWEA Test Security Handbook.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_064_DRC Privacy Policy.pdf (pages All) [Alt] 2019_065_Technical Proposal Excerpts.pdf (pages All) [Alt] 2019_066_eDirect User Guide 2018-19.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>2019_127_Rough Draft NWEA 2019 Technical Report.pdf</p>	<p>Mathematics General & Alternate Documentation submitted demonstrates the State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test related data, and students’ personally identifiable information.</p>
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. The State’s validity evidence includes evidence that:</p> <p><u>The State’s academic assessments</u> measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards; • If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards and administers alternate assessments aligned with those standards, the assessments show adequate alignment to the State’s academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content 	<p>[Gen] 2019_087_2019 NSCAS CAT Simulation Report 2019-04-02.pdf (pages 12-10, 14-16)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_088_2019 Operational CAT Engine Evaluation Report.pdf (pages 5-7, 22-33)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_115_Nebraska Math Alignment Study Tech Report.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_127_Rough Draft NWEA 2019 Technical Report.pdf (pages 144-151)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_030_NSCAS AA Math Alignment Report.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_057_Alternate Math Style Guide.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_067_2018 NSCAS Alternate Technical Report.pdf (pages 31-34, 51-53)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_068_Math 3-8, 11 Extended Standards Development.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_069_Math_point-biserialCorrelations.pdf (pages All)</p>	<p>Mathematics General Documentation submitted identified gaps in alignment between the assessments and the State’s adopted content standards.</p> <p>Peers noted evidence provided indicates the Mathematics General assessment does not reflect the depth and breadth of the State’s content standards (see 2.1).</p> <p>2019_115 (Alignment Study pgs. 19 & 24) identified issues, the State should provide their plans and timeline for addressing these issues.</p> <p>Mathematics Alternate Documentation submitted identified gaps in alignment between the assessments and the State’s adopted content standards. The State should submit a plan and timeline for addressing identified issues with the alternate assessment for mathematics.</p> <p>2019_30 Math alignment report (pg. 7) identified items at grades 4, 7, 8 and 11 which were not measuring academic KSAs included in the extended indicators.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.		
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
<u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• For the Mathematics General assessment, the State must provide evidence that assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), balance of content, and cognitive complexity;○ Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards;• For the Mathematics Alternate assessment, the State must submit a plan and timeline for addressing issues identified in the alignment 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.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap: <u>the intended cognitive processes</u> appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>[Gen] 2019_115_Nebraska Math Alignment Study Tech Report.pdf (pages All) Gen] 2019_127_Rough Draft NWEA 2019 Technical Report.pdf (pages 148)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_021_Depth Of Knowledge (DOK) Chart.pdf (pages All) [Alt] 2019_036_DOK Level to Stage Comparison.pdf (pages All)</p>	<p>Mathematics General & Alternate Documentation submitted failed to demonstrate the assessments tap the intended cognitive processes.</p>
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the Mathematics General and Alternate assessments, the State must submit documentation demonstrating 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. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s <u>academic content standards</u>.</p>	<p>[Gen] 2019_127_Rough Draft NWEA 2019 Technical Report.pdf (pages 125-129)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_050_Grade 3 NSCAS Alternate Math TOS.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_051_Grade 4 NSCAS Alternate Math TOS.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_052_Grade 5 NSCAS Alternate Math TOS.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_053_Grade 6 NSCAS Alternate Math TOS.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_054_Grade 7 NSCAS Alternate Math TOS.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_055_Grade 8 NSCAS Alternate Math TOS.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_056_Grade 11 NSCAS Alternate Math TOS.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_067_2018 NSCAS Alternate Technical Report.pdf (pages 54-59)</p>	<p>Mathematics General Documentation submitted fails to demonstrate adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structure of Mathematics General assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards.</p> <p>2019_127 (pg. 129) double check the values greater than 1.0 in table 8.24.</p> <p>2019_127 (pgs. 128-129) correlations greater than .90 for all reporting categories for grades 3 & 7. Peer suggest commenting on these values in the final version of the Technical Report.</p> <p>Mathematics Alternate Documentation submitted provided evidence for this critical element. Documentation did indicate issues the State should examine for further improvement.</p> <p>2019_067 (pgs. 55-57) includes correlations by strand. Can the State confirm that the strands referenced in table 9.2.1 are the reporting categories.</p> <p>Peer note that correlations in grades 5 & 8 are noticeably low, likely related to sub-score reliabilities (see critical element 4.1).</p> <p>2019_067 (pgs. 29-33) Principal Components Analysis is also relevant to this critical element.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

Section 3.3 Summary Statement

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

- For the Mathematics General assessment the State must submit documentation demonstrating evidence of 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.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>[Gen] 2019_116_NE MAP Growth Linking Study.pdf (pages All) [Gen] 2019_127_Rough Draft NWEA 2019 Technical Report.pdf (pages 130, 148-149) 2019_067_2018 NSCAS Alternate Technical Report.pdf</p>	<p>Mathematics General Documentation submitted provided evidence demonstrating assessment scores are related as expected to other variables.</p> <p>Mathematics Alternate No documentation was cited for this element, however evidence related to this critical element could be found in 2019_067 (pgs. 58-60). The prevalence of values at or near 1 call into question the reporting of sub-scores. The State should examine the rationale for reporting sub-scores when they note “that some strand scores might not provide unique information about the strengths or weaknesses of students”.</p>
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the Mathematics Alternate assessment the State must provide the rationale for continued sub-score reporting in light of the lack of differentiation identified in the Alternate Technical Manual or provide a strategy for addressing the high correlations of sub-scores. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. If the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, measures of reliability for the assessment overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a <u>student’s academic achievement</u>. 	<p>[Gen] 2019_127_Rough Draft NWEA 2019 Technical Report.pdf (pages 134-144) [Gen] 2019_128_Rough Draft NWEA 2019 Technical Report Appendices.pdf (pages M-4-M6, 627-629) [Gen] 2019_128_Rough Draft NWEA 2019 Technical Report Appendices.pdf (pages N2-N4; 633-634)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_079_Appendices NSCAS Alternate Technical Report 2019.pdf (pages All) [Alt] 2019_067_2018 NSCAS Alternate Technical Report.pdf (pages 57-59) [Alt] 2019_070_2018 NSCAS Alternate Technical Report Appendices_4.1.pdf (pages 71-74)</p>	<p>Mathematics General Documentation submitted by the State failed to demonstrate adequate reliability and overall consistency.</p> <p>2019_127 Draft NWEA Technical Report should provide total test reliability as well as by sub-groups.</p> <p>2019_127 (pg. 134) sub-score reliability (marginal) for grade 8 Data is very low (0.39) (see table 9.2). In general, the marginal reliability for the data strand is below 0.7 for grades 4-8.</p> <p>2019_127 (pgs. 139-141) classification accuracy by strand and achievement level values call into question reporting at this level. The State should provide a plan and timeline for improving this. E.g. change the information provided at the strand level or improve the reliability and accuracy of strand scores.</p> <p>2019_127 (pgs. 139-141) in order to produce more precise estimates of students’ academic achievement, specifically those of higher ability, additional items of higher difficulty are needed. (See critical element 2.1)</p> <p>Mathematics Alternate Documentation submitted failed to demonstrate an acceptable overall degree of reliability and classification consistency. 2019_070 (pgs. 255-257) reliability values are low and do not support sub-score reporting. (E.g. Grade 8 M4 = 0, Grade 4 M4 = .34.)</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the Mathematics General assessment the State must provide evidence of 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 including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; ○ 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. • For the Mathematics Alternate assessment the State must provide evidence of adequate reliability: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reliability of the sub-scores. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><i>For all State academic assessments,</i> assessments should be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (see definition⁴).</p> <p>For academic content assessments, the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in their design, development and analysis.</p>	<p>[All] 2019_015_NSCAS-Summative-and-Alternate-Accessibility-Manual-2.8.19.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_086_NE Year 2 UAT Plan.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_089_NE bias review binder_2019.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_090_NE content bias training PPT_gen Math_2019.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_091_NE content review binder_2019.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_092_NE IWW binder_2019.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_093_NE IWW training PPT_gen Math_2019.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_094_NE Math 3-8 Item Spec_11.11.19.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_095_2018 NE IWW Evaluation Results.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_096_2019 NE IWW Evaluation Results 2019-06-17.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_127_Rough Draft NWEA 2019 Technical Report.pdf (pages 37-46, 50-52)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_039_Alt Math Universal Design Manual.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_043_Alt Math Fairness in Testing.pdf (pages All)</p>	<p>Mathematics General Documentation submitted by the state did demonstrate steps in the item development process, including universal design and bias and sensitivity training but peers have identified several areas of concern.</p> <p>Mathematics Alternate Documentation submitted by the state demonstrates steps in the item development process, including universal design and bias and sensitivity training that the state has taken to ensure fairness of the assessment across student groups.</p>
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for academic assessments, including performance for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>[Gen] 2019_127_Rough Draft NWEA 2019 Technical Report.pdf (pages 28-33; 139-141) [Gen] 2019_128_Rough Draft NWEA 2019 Technical Report Appendices.pdf (pages N1-N3) [Alt] 2019_073_2018 NSCAS Alternate Technical Report Appendices_4.3.pdf (pages 104-110)</p>	<p>Mathematics General Documentation provided by the state failed to demonstrate the Mathematics general assessments provide an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum.</p> <p>Mathematics Alternate 2019_073 did not provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate the Mathematics alternate assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the performance continuum.</p>

Section 4.3 Summary Statement

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

- For the Mathematics General and Alternate assessments, the State must provide evidence demonstrating it 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.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s <u>academic achievement standards</u>.</p>	<p>[Gen] 2019_102_2019 NSCAS Vertical Scale Evaluation Report 2019-07-22.pdf (pages All) [Gen] 2019_117_NSCAS Summative Scoring Specs 2019.pdf (pages All) [Gen] 2019_127_Rough Draft NWEA 2019 Technical Report.pdf (pages 59-63) [Alt] 2019_071_Alt Math TD Autoscoring Process.pdf (pages All) [Alt] 2019_072_Alt Math Autoscoring Process Flow Chart.pdf (pages All)</p>	<p>Mathematics General Documentation submitted failed to fully demonstrate the standardized scoring procedures and protocols required to produce reliable and meaningful results and facilitate valid score interpretations.</p> <p>2019_127 Draft NWEA Technical Report indicates student responding to zero (0) questions receives a scale score and performance level. The State should revisit the definition of attemptedness as this does not facilitate valid score interpretation or meaningful results.</p> <p>Given that the State is reporting scale scores at the strand level and applying cut scores to those scale scores, the State should provide technical documentation of strand scaling.</p> <p>2019_119 (pg. 4) provides the cut scores on the vertical scale. In some cases the grade to grade cut score differences appear to be approximately one standard error apart. This may call into questions whether or not the scores provide meaningful results and valid score interpretations.</p> <p>2019_117 (pg. 3) "Blueprint targets are met based on the size and depth of the item bank. Current forms are not an exact match to the blueprint given the constraints in the item bank." The document also notes that "Future forms will adhere more closely to the blueprints as more items are available." The State should submit a plan explaining how this will be addressed and a timeline for implementation.</p> <p>Mathematics Alternate Peers were uncertain as to how the documentation submitted was intended to address this critical element and</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

		demonstrate the standardized scoring procedures and protocols required to produce reliable and meaningful results and facilitate valid score interpretations.
Section 4.4 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the Mathematics General and Alternate assessments, evidence must be submitted demonstrating 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. • For the Mathematics General assessment, the State must provide evidence demonstrating scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, given the vertical scale. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State administers multiple forms of academic assessments within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p>No evidence was cited for this element.</p>	<p>Mathematics General Because the State employs Computer Adaptive Testing, the State must provide evidence demonstrating the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p> <p>Mathematics Alternate The State’s Mathematics Alternate provides a fixed form.</p>
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the Mathematics General assessment, evidence must be submitted demonstrating the State ensures that the Computer Adaptive Testing adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State administers any of its assessments in multiple versions within a subject area (e.g., online versus paper-based delivery; or a native language version of the academic content assessment), grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<p>[Gen] 2019_104_SystemTechnologySummative.pdf (pages All)</p>	<p>Mathematics General and Alternate Documentation submitted by the state does not appear to address this requirement. For the Mathematics General assessment, pencil and paper, Spanish and Braille versions are available as accommodations. For these forms, documentation should be submitted identifying the number of each provided each year and how and when these forms were developed.</p> <p>For the Mathematics Alternate assessment, the state should identify which of these forms are available and provide documentation requested as appropriate.</p>
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the Mathematics General and Alternate assessments, if the State administers multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, evidence that the State followed a design and development process and evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. (E.g. paper & pencil, Spanish language and Braille) 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments), and Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website. 	<p>[Gen] 2019_118_TAC NE Agenda 2019-03-05.pdf (pages All) [Gen] 2019_124_TAC NE Documents 2019-03-22.pdf (pages All) [Gen] 2019_125_TAC NE PPTs 2019-03-22.pdf (pages All) [Gen] 2019_127_Rough Draft NWEA 2019 Technical Report.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_067_2018 NSCAS Alternate Technical Report.pdf (pages 5-12) [Alt] 2019_080_Proposed NSCAS Alternate Math 2018 Standard Setting.pdf (pages All) [Alt] 2019_081_NSCAS Alternate Math Stanset Plan for TAC Feb 2018.pdf (pages All) [Alt] 2019_082_2.12.18 Technical Advisory Meeting (TAC) Notes.pdf (pages 34-42)</p>	<p>Mathematics General & Alternate For both the Mathematics General and Alternate assessments, documentation submitted does not demonstrate a State 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,</p> <p>Documentation submitted provides advice given by the TAC but does not provide documentation of steps taken in response.</p> <p>While documentation submitted failed to provide evidence that this information is made public, peers were able to find this information for the Mathematics General assessment on the State website but were unable to find the most recent Mathematics Technical Report for the Alternate assessment. The State should ensure that the Technical Manuals for all assessments are made publically available.</p> <p>Peer note the TAC advised explaining claims and providing a summary.</p>
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of an ongoing process for monitoring, maintaining, and improving as needed, the technical quality of its 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.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system. Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, the placement team under Section 504, or the individual or team designated by a district to make that decision under Title II of the ADA, as applicable, based on each student’s individual abilities and needs.</p> <p>If a State adopts alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and administers an alternate assessment aligned with those standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(1)(E) and (b)(2)(D), respectively, the State must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish guidelines for determining whether to assess a student with an AA-AAAS, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A State definition of “students with the most significant cognitive disabilities” that addresses factors related to cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior; • Provide information for IEP Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that: 	<p>[All] 2019_003_Rule 51.pdf (pages 39-40) [All] 2019_014_NSCAS Summative and Alternate Accessibility Short Form.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_032_Alternate Assessment Criteria Checklist.pdf (pages All) [Alt] 2019_033_Companion to Alternate Assessment Criteria.pdf (pages All) [Alt] 2019_034_IEP Team Decision Making Guidelines.pdf (pages All) [Alt] 2019_131_Alt Assessment Criteria and IEP Team Flowchart.pdf (pages All) [Alt] 2019_132_IEP Team Decision Making Flowchart.pdf (pages All) [Alt] 2019_133_NDE Training Powerpoint for Alternate Assessment.pdf (pages All)</p>	<p>Mathematics General For the Mathematics General assessments documentation submitted provided evidence of procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system.</p> <p>Mathematics Alternate Peers were unable to find documentation demonstrating the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide information for IEP Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a clear explanation of the differences between assessments aligned with grade-level academic achievement standards and those aligned with alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student's education resulting from taking an AA-AAAS, such as how participation in such assessments may delay or otherwise affect the student from completing the requirements for a regular high school diploma; • Ensure that parents of students assessed with an AA-AAAS are informed that their child’s achievement will be measured based on alternate academic achievement standards; • Not preclude a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who takes an AA-AAAS from attempting to complete the requirements for a regular high school diploma; and • The State has in place and monitors implementation of guidelines for IEP teams to apply in determining,

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>for the grade in which the student is enrolled; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop, disseminate information on, and promote the use of appropriate accommodations to ensure that a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who does not take an AA-AAAS participates in academic instruction and assessments for the grade in which the student is enrolled. • The State has in place and monitors implementation of guidelines for IEP teams to apply in determining, on a case-by-case basis, which students with the most significant cognitive disabilities will be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, if applicable. Such guidelines must be developed in accordance with 34 CFR § 200.6(d).⁵ 		
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the Mathematics Alternate assessment, the State must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide information for IEP Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that: ○ 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 ○ 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. 		

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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).

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all ELs in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s academic content assessments and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed with a linguistic accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for ELs; • Assistance regarding selection of appropriate linguistic accommodations for ELs, including to the extent practicable, assessments in the language most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what those students know and can do to determine the students’ mastery of skills in academic content areas until the students have achieved English language proficiency. 	<p>[All] 2019_014_NSCAS Summative and Alternate Accessibility Short Form.pdf (pages 2) [All] 2019_015_NSCAS-Summative-and-Alternate-Accessibility-Manual-2.8.19.pdf (pages 11-13) [All] 2019_038_Rule 15.pdf (pages 7-8) [All] 2019_126_Linguistic Supports Presentation.pdf (pages All) [All] 2019_134_2019-20 Statewide Assessment and Accountability (SAA).pdf (pages 66-71)</p>	<p>Mathematics General & Alternate Documentation submitted by the State demonstrated processes and procedures to ensure the inclusion of all ELs in the State’s Mathematics assessments.</p> <p>2019_015 indicates Bilingual Word Lists are developed by the districts. The state should work with districts to develop Bilingual Words Lists for each language to be accommodated.</p>
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and ELs, including ELs with disabilities. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures that appropriate accommodations, such as, interoperability with, and ability to use, assistive technology, are available to measure the <u>academic achievement</u> of students with disabilities. • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs; • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. • Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny 	<p>[All] 2019_015_NSCAS-Summative-and-Alternate-Accessibility-Manual-2.8.19.pdf (pages 11-13)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_083_Test Administration Manual Online.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_084_Test Administration Manual PaperPencil.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_120_NSCAS Accommodations Lit Review 2019.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>2019_133_NDE Training Powerpoint for Alternate Assessment.pdf</p>	<p>Mathematics General & Alternate</p> <p>Documentation submitted provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate appropriate accommodations are accessible to students with disabilities and ELs, including ELs with disabilities.</p> <p>Peers were unable to find documentation demonstrating the State has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</p> <p>Peers appreciate the inclusion of the Literature Review, but are concerned the publication dates seem to indicate the Accessibility Manual was completed before the Literature Review. Peers are unclear how the Literature Review informed the development of the Accessibility Manual without additional information from the State.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.		
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the Mathematics General assessment the State must provide documentation a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures; • Monitored for administrations of all required academic content assessments and AA-AAAS. 	<p>[All] 2019_005_2019 NSCAS Summative Observer Checklist.pdf (pages All) [All] 2019_006_Criteria for selecting NSCAS Monitoring Observation Schools.pdf (pages All) [All] 2019_007_Monitoring Test Administration.pdf (pages Column M, S) [All] 2019_014_NSCAS Summative and Alternate Accessibility Short Form.pdf (pages All) [All] 2019_015_NSCAS-Summative-and-Alternate-Accessibility-Manual-2.8.19.pdf (pages 11-13)</p> <p>2019_130_SPED District Monitoring Protocol 2019.pdf</p>	<p>Mathematics General & Alternate Documentation submitted provides evidence that the State monitors test administration in districts and schools. Documentation failed to provide evidence demonstrating monitoring ensures that appropriate assessments and students’ identified accommodations are provided for students with disabilities and English learners.</p> <p>“Did you observe any accommodations given to students?” provides no indication that all required accommodations were provided to all students identified for accommodations.</p> <p>Computer based assessments provide a number of means to validate students’ access to required accommodations.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 5.4 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the Mathematics General and Alternate assessments, evidence that the State monitors test administration in districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, students covered by Section 504, and English learners, to ensure that accommodations are administered with fidelity and State test administration procedures are followed. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic content standards:</u></p> <p>The State formally adopted <u>challenging academic achievement standards</u> in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; <p>The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (1) at least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third for lower achievement; (2) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (3) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</p>	<p>[All] 2019_040_State Board Minutes 8.2.18 Cut Scores Approval.pdf (pages 3, 9)</p> <p>[All] 2019_041_2018-2019 NSCAS Scale Scores.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_042_10.26.18 District Assessment Coordinator Update Cut Scores.pdf (pages All)</p>	<p>Mathematics General and Alternate</p> <p>Documentation was provided by the state demonstrating adoption of academic achievement standards and that the achievement standards apply to all public elementary and secondary school students. Peers were, however, unable to find descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level.</p>
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• For the Mathematics General and Alternate assessment, the State must provide descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards.</u> 	<p>[Gen] 2019_119_Nebraska Math Standard Setting Tech Report.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_074_NSCAS Alt Standard Setting Tech Report.pdf (pages All)</p>	<p>Mathematics General Documentation submitted indicates the State used an ID matching method. Peers were unable to find the ALDs and documentation regarding their development process. Given that the ID Matching Method is dependent upon the ALDs, this information is needed to evaluate this critical element.</p> <p>Mathematics Alternate Documentation submitted provides evidence the State employed a technically sound standard setting process.</p>
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the Mathematics General assessment the State must submit the ALDs and documentation describing their development process. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic achievement standards:</u></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards and with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards such that a student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards (1) are aligned with the State’s challenging academic content standards for the grade in which a student is enrolled; (2) promote access to the general curriculum consistent with the IDEA; (3) reflect professional judgment as to the highest possible standards achievable for such students; (4) are designated in the IEP for each student for whom alternate academic achievement standards apply; and (5) are aligned to ensure that a student who meets the alternate academic achievement standards is on track to pursue</p>	<p>[Gen] 2019_119_Nebraska Math Standard Setting Tech Report.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_074_NSCAS Alt Standard Setting Tech Report.pdf (pages All)</p>	<p>Mathematics General</p> <p>Documentation provided by the state did not provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate the aligned academic achievement standards adopted are challenging and aligned.</p> <p>Peers note that the ALDs are required to demonstrate the Academic Achievement Levels are challenging and aligned.</p> <p>Mathematics Alternate</p> <p>Peers were unable to find documentation to demonstrate that the alternate academic achievement standards ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. NDE should provide this evidence by December 31, 2020.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
postsecondary education or competitive integrated employment.		
Section 6.3 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the Mathematics General assessment, the State must submit the ALDs to demonstrate the adopted academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned. • For the Mathematics Alternate assessment, evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State reports its assessment results for all students assessed, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public.</p> <p>The State reports to the public its assessment results on <u>student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level</u>⁶</p> <p>For <u>academic content assessments</u>, the State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the <u>specific academic needs of students</u>, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its academic content assessments that: 	<p>[All] 2019_031_Nebraska Public Schools State Snapshot for Math (NEP).pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[All] 2019_047_Accountability New Release 10.9.19.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[All] 2019_048_District Assessment Coordinator (DAC) Update 5.22.19 Reporting Timeline.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_044_Individual Student Report (ISR) Parent Letter.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_045_Individual Student Report (ISR) Spanish Parent Letter.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_046_NSCAS Spanish Interpretive Guide for Parents.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_049_NSCAS Interpretive Guide for Parents.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_121_2019 NSCAS Data CleanUp Exception Report Training.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_122_NSCAS Reports Interpretive Guide.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_123_NSCAS Summative Reporting Specs 2019.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Gen] 2019_127_Rough Draft NWEA 2019 Technical Report.pdf (pages 59-69)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_075_2019 Reports Interpretation Guide.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_076_2017-2018 Nebraska Reports Alternate Key Dates.pdf (pages All)</p> <p>[Alt] 2019_077_2018-2019 Nebraska Reports Alternate Key Dates.pdf (pages All)</p>	<p>Mathematics General & Alternate Documentation submitted by the state provided evidence demonstrating that translated versions of the score reports and interpretive documents for the general assessment are available for students and parents in languages commonly spoken in the State, such as Spanish.</p> <p>Documentation was not found to demonstrate availability of score reports and interpretive documents for the alternate assessment in languages other than English.</p> <p>2019_048_District Assessment Coordinator (DAC) Update 5.22.19 Reporting Timeline.pdf indicated technical issues resulted in a delay in reporting assessment results but that assessment results for school year 2019-20 should be available for distribution in a timely manner. Documentation demonstrating timely delivery of the 2019-2020 assessment results should be submitted by the state.</p> <p>2019_031, demonstrates public reporting of percent proficient, however, peers were unable to find evidence demonstrating student academic achievement at each achievement level is reported for all groups.</p>

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a <u>student’s academic achievement</u>; ○ Report the <u>student’s academic achievement</u> in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards; ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific <u>academic needs of students</u>; ○ Are provided in an understandable and uniform format; ○ Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian; ○ Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent. ● The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. 	<p>[Alt] 2019_078_2019-2020 Nebraska Reports Alternate Key Dates.pdf (pages All)</p>	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the Mathematics Alternate assessment, evidence that translated versions of the score reports and interpretive documents are available for students and parents in languages commonly spoken in the State, such as Spanish. • For the Mathematics General and Alternate assessments, the State must demonstrate that 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 Mathematics General and Alternate assessments, the state must provide documentation demonstrating a process and timeline for delivering reports to students, parents, teachers, principals, and other stakeholders as soon as practicable after each test administration. • For the Mathematics General and Alternate assessment, the State must provide evidence demonstrating, it reports to the public its assessment results on student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS
 (if **applicable**; evidence for this section would be submitted in ADDITION to evidence for sections 1 through 6)

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

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

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

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

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

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEBRASKA (Mathematics)

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

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