



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

July 28, 2020

The Honorable Frank Edelblut  
Commissioner  
New Hampshire Department of Education  
101 Pleasant Street  
Concord, NH 03301-3860

Dear Commissioner Edelblut:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education's (the Department) assessment peer review process under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). I appreciate the efforts of the New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE) to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in August 2019.

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 NHDOE'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:

- Reading/ language arts (R/LA) and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (NH SAS): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- R/LA and mathematics general assessments in high school (SAT): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- R/LA and mathematics alternate assessments of alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in grades 3-8 and 11 (Dynamic Learning Maps Year-End (DLM YE): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- AA-AAAS for science in grades 4, 7, and 11 (DLM Science): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**

The assessments that substantially meet requirements of the ESEA meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. The Department expects that NHDOE may be able to provide this additional information within one year.

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.*

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

Because NHDOE must submit additional information, the Department will continue the 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. If adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action.

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

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

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

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank T. Brogan  
Assistant Secretary  
for Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Melissa A. White, Administrator for Academics and Assessment

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

Critical Element	Evidence Needed
<b>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</b>	For NHDOE’s reading/language arts, mathematics, and science standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence (e.g., policies, procedures and relevant data) that NHDOE ensures that each LEA that does not apply the State’s academic content standards meets all of the criteria in ESEA section 1111(b)(1) and 34 CFR § 200.1 regarding the standards used by the LEA and that the LEA applies these standards to all students in the LEA.</li> </ul>
<b>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</b>	For all assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 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. Specifically, policies state that all English learners (ELs) must be included in all aspects of the content assessment system unless the State has chosen the statutory option for recently arrived ELs under which such ELs are exempt from one administration of its reading/language arts assessment.</li> </ul>
<b>1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments</b>	For NHDOE’s science standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education).</li> <li>○ Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas).</li> <li>○ Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State.</li> <li>○ Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b>	For the NH SAS in R/LA and mathematics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results.</li> <li>• Documentation of processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills).</li> <li>• Documentation confirming that all proficiency determinations are based only on grade-level content.</li> </ul> For the NH SAS in R/LA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design and intended uses and interpretations of results.</li> </ul> For the SAT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards for the grade that is being assessed and includes processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Evidence Needed
	<p>academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (e.g., a plan and a timeline to address and remedy the alignment issues identified in the existing alignment studies, particularly in mathematics).</p> <p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of an overall test design and test blueprints that measure the depth and breadth of the State’s grade-level academic content standards in science (e.g., evidence that the test design adequately samples the essential elements in science).</li> </ul>
<p><b>2.2 – Item Development</b></p>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</li> </ul> <p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that clarifies how the development and review process for Essential Element Concept Maps (EECMs) contributes to a technically sound test item development process.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p>	<p>For the NH SAS in R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of 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, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities</li> <li>• Evidence of contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul> <p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the SEA has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, specifically administration with the read-aloud and scribing accommodations.</li> </ul> <p>For DLM YE and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a contingency plan to address possible technology challenges during test administration</li> </ul>
<p><b>2.5 – Test Security</b></p>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of policies and procedures for remediation following test security incidents involving the SAT assessments.</li> <li>• Evidence of policies and procedures for prevention of assessment irregularities in the administration of the SAT, specifically annual training requirements for test security policies and procedures, including how NHDOE ensures that all test coordinators receive training.</li> </ul>
<p><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b></p>	<p>For the NH SAS in R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A plan and timeline for meeting areas with identified weak alignment.</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Evidence Needed
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards.</li> </ul> <p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence in 2.1 will satisfy this critical element.</li> </ul> <p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence requested in critical element 2.1 will satisfy this critical element.</li> </ul>
<b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for high school as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</li> </ul>
<b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</li> </ul>
<b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b>	<p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the science tests are related as expected with similar variables (e.g., other measures of science achievement).</li> </ul>
<b>4.1 – Reliability</b>	<p>For the NH SAS in R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of adequate reliability evidence each student group (e.g., ethnicity, English learners, and students with disabilities).</li> <li>Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests (e.g., overall and conditional standard errors of measurement for each reported sub-score).</li> </ul> <p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of updated reliability for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the student population overall and each student group once certain conditions have been met (e.g., expansion of the item pool, increase of number of items per testlet, increase in the number of linkage levels).</li> </ul>
<b>4.2 – Fairness and accessibility</b>	<p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that the assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments, including additional analysis by student subgroup to analyze test fairness.</li> </ul>
<b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b>	<p>For the NH SAS in R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sufficient information about the score distributions to assess CSEMs for high- and low-achieving (high- and low-scoring) students.</li> </ul>
<b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b>	<p>For the NH SAS in R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Empirical evidence of comparability of different versions of the assessments.</li> </ul>
<b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b>	<p>For the NH SAS in R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system.</li> <li>Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website.</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Evidence Needed
	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of a system for monitoring and 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.</li> </ul> <p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of a plan to monitor the science test before, during, and after the inclusion of Phase II development items to the test item banks, including clear and technically sound criteria.</li> </ul>
<b>5.3 –Accommodations</b>	<p>For the NH SAS in R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs.</li> <li>Evidence that 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.</li> </ul> <p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</li> </ul>
<b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</b>	<p>For the NH SAS in R/LA and mathematics, the SAT, and the DLM YE and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State formally adopted academic achievement standards in reading/language arts and mathematics in high school that include at least three levels of achievement, descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level, and achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</li> </ul>
<b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b>	<p>For DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its alternate academic achievement standards in science to ensure they are valid and reliable.</li> </ul>
<b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b>	<p>For the NH SAS in R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State’s academic achievement standards in grades 3-8 are part of an overall system that is challenging and 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 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.</li> </ul> <p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Evidence Needed
	<p>school 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>For the DLM YE and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the DLM alternate academic achievement standards ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act. NHDOE should provide this evidence by December 31, 2020.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p>	<p>For the NH SAS in R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State reports to the public its assessment results on student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level</li> <li>• Reports, to the extent practicable, are written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if that is not practicable, are orally translated for such parent or guardian</li> <li>• Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), as amended, reports are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.</li> <li>• The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul> <p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors).</li> <li>○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Evidence of a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul> <p>For the DLM science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State provides individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide information to help parents interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students.</li> <li>○ Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian.</li> <li>○ Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## August 2019 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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



Contents

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

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

**Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content Standards ..... 6**

**Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments ..... 8**

**Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments 10**

**Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments..... 12**

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS.....14**

**Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development ..... 14**

**Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development ..... 18**

**Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration..... 19**

**Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration ..... 22**

**Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security ..... 23**

**Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy .. 26**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY .....29**

**Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content29**

**Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes ..... 33**

**Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure..... 35**

**Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables..... 37**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER.....38**

**Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability ..... 38**

**Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility ..... 41**

**Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum ..... 43**

**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring..... 44**

**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms..... 46**

**Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment ..... 47**

**Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance ..... 50**

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS.....51**

**Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 51**

**Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments..... 56**

**Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations ..... 60**

**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.

..... 66

**SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING.....71**

**Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students..... 71**  
**Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting ..... 74**  
**Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards ..... 75**  
**Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting ..... 78**

**SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS..83**

**Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments ..... 83**  
**Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments ..... 85**  
**Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State Assessments ..... 87**

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b><u>For academic content standards:</u></b></p> <p>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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-117 Section 186:8 Rule Making Authority; Standards; Employee Qualifications</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The state board of education shall adopt rules, pursuant to RSA 541-A, relative to: academic standards for all grades of the public schools</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-110 June 2010 NH State Board of Education Meeting Minutes</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ New Hampshire Department of Education and the New Hampshire State Board of Education formally adopted the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) June 2010</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-111 Common Core State Standards for ELA</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CCSS for ELA adopted by New Hampshire Department of Education</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-112 Common Core State Standards for Mathematics</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CCSS for Mathematics adopted by New Hampshire Department of Education</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-119 School Administrators Association Regional Groups</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Presentation by then commissioner on the process and adoption of the CCSS (slides 3-6)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-109 NH Department of Education Consolidated State Plan</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ “NH is committed to continuing to adopt challenging State academic standards...The NH DOE will also continue to implement challenging assessments aligned to its State academic standards as one measure of how well our educational system is doing on behalf of all students”. (pp. 15)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: New Hampshire legislator with concurrence by the Governor, assigns responsibility for the supervision of the state academic content standards.</p> <p>In June 2010, New Hampshire formally adopted challenging academic standards in the content areas of English language arts &amp; literacy and mathematics which define the skills all New Hampshire public school students are expected to learn and demonstrate.</p> <p>The introductory sections of the ELA and mathematics content standards explain the application of the content standards for all students.</p> <p>The CCSS define rigorous skills and knowledge all student should know and be able to do to prepare for college and careers. The standards were developed using well defined criteria and best practices.</p> <hr/> <p>Peers would like to provide the following general feedback to the state on their submission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many of the documents provided as evidence were inconsistently labeled or easily confused between the various components of the State’s submission (SAT, DLM, and SAS).</li> <li>• Some of the documents were extremely large PDFs (e.g., 1,000 pages or more) that peers found difficult to navigate within to locate relevant evidence.</li> <li>• The State sometimes provided documents as evidence but then did not specifically cite relevant pages where the evidence was located. This made it difficult for</li> </ul>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-121 Common Core State Standards Initiative Criteria</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ “The Common Core State Standards define the rigorous skills and knowledge in English Language Arts and Mathematics that need to be effectively taught and learned for students to be ready to succeed academically in credit-bearing, college-entry course and in workforce training programs. The standards have been developed to be...” (pp 1)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-122 Common Core State Standards Report</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The report summarized the work of the validation committee, which reviewed the standards and found them: Reflective of the core knowledge and skills in ELA and mathematics that students need to be college- and career-ready. Appropriate in terms of their level of clarity and specificity. Comparable to the expectations of other leading nations. Informed by available research and evidence. The result of processes that reflect best practices for standards development. (pp. 2-3)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>peers to locate evidence or and to determine if the critical element had been addressed.</p> <p>NH-117 States that the state board of education has the authority to adopt rules relative to academic standards for all grades of the public schools</p> <p>NH-110 June 2010 NH State Board of Education meeting minutes. However, only the motion is included in the minutes provided. A final vote is not included that indicates the CCSS were formally adopted.</p> <p>NH-119 PowerPoint Presentation shared with School Administrators. Slide 4: “In July 2010, after six months of review, the NH State Board of Education “adopted” the Common Core State Standards.” It is not clear if there is significance with the way this is presented, e.g., “adopted”.</p>
<b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has 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 all public-school students in the State.</li> <li>• Evidence that explicitly indicates the State applies its formally adopted content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State; OR Documentation regarding the policies and procedures New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDE) uses to ensure that a local educational agency (LEA) that does not apply the State’s academic content standards meets all of the criteria in section 1111(b)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and 34 CFR 200.1 regarding such standards and that the standards apply to all students in the LEA.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b><u>For academic content standards:</u></b>                      The State’s challenging academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science are aligned with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-110 June 2010 NH State Board of Education Meeting Minutes</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ New Hampshire Department of Education and the New Hampshire State Board of Education formally adopted the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) June 2010</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-122 Common Core State Standards Report</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The report summarized the work of the validation committee, which reviewed the standards and found them: Reflective of the core knowledge and skills in ELA and mathematics that students need to be college- and career-ready. Appropriate in terms of their level of clarity and specificity. Comparable to the expectations of other leading nations. Informed by available research and evidence. The result of processes that reflect best practices for standards development. (pp. 2-3)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-121 Common Core State Standards Initiative Criteria</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ “The Common Core State Standards define the rigorous skills and knowledge in English Language Arts and Mathematics that need to be effectively taught and learned for students to be ready to succeed academically in credit-bearing, college-entry course and in workforce training programs. The standards have been developed to be...” (pp 1)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-120 Report from the NH Math Task Force</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The New Hampshire math task force included representatives from various stakeholder groups from NH schools, institutions of higher</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: New Hampshire adopted the Common Core State Standards for ELA and mathematics, which included higher education representatives in the standards development process.                      New Hampshire conducted standards reviews and forums which included higher education representatives.</p> <hr/> <p>See CE 1.1.                      If the State formally adopted CCSS, then it would meet CE 1.2.</p> <p>NH-122 Common Core State Standards Report, p. 3. Validation committee asserted in May 2010 that, these are “. . . Reflective of the core knowledge and skills in ELA and mathematics that students need to be college- and career-ready . . .” However, this is not specifically stated for the system of public higher education and relevant career and technical education standards in New Hampshire.</p> <p>NH-120 Math Task Force Report recommendations assert that implementation of the mathematics CCSS, and other supporting recommendations are implemented, students will meet entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of higher education in NH and relevant State career and technical education standards.</p> <p>NH-118 ELA Crosswalk with CCSSI and previous state grade level expectations: Asserts alignment among CCSS and various NH standards. However, there is not an accompanying Task Force Report similar to mathematics pertaining to criteria in 1.2.</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>education, and state organizations. The report describes instructional recommendations and articulates support and alignment to the Common Core State Standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-119 School Administrators Association Regional Groups</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Presentation, by then commissioner, on the process and adoption of the CCSS. Slide 6 summarizes standards review and forums where NH higher education faculty and K-12 educators examined their relevance to success in college.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the entire assessment system in the State, NHDE must provide: See evidence requested under element 1.1.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS

### Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments aligned with <b><u>grade-level academic achievement standards</u></b> or alternate academic achievement standards in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 9-12);</li> <li>• Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12).</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <p>The State’s <b><u>academic content assessments</u></b> must be the same assessments administered to all students in the tested grades, with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may take an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards.</li> <li>• A State may permit an LEA to administer a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in lieu of the State high school assessment if certain conditions are met.</li> <li>• A State that administers an end-of-course high school mathematics assessment may exempt an 8<sup>th</sup> grade student from the mathematics assessment typically administered in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-109 NH Department of Education Consolidated State Plan</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-140 Assessment FAQ</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-124 Test Security Assurances</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-139 NH Test Administration Manual</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-125 Statewide Regional Trainings</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-163 NH Assessment Requirements webpage</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-137 Press Release Assessment</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-159 NH TAC Meeting Notes</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-160 NH TAC Notes</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-171 Science letter</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-115 Letters of Approval for IADA, DLM, and SAT</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-116 Decision Making Worksheet</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-113 Letters of Approval for IADA, DLM, and SAT</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-126 NH Department of Education SAT Webpage</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-109 NH Department of Education Consolidated State Plan</i></li> </ul>	<p>Department staff determined that NHD OE’s website and Test Administration Manual describes the required assessments in all three subject areas, including alternate 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 New Hampshire SAS

<p>eight grade and allow the student to take the State end-of-course mathematics test instead.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Department may have approved the State, under the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority, to permit students in some LEAs to participate in a demonstration assessment system in lieu of participating in the State assessment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-114 Letters of Approval for IADA, DLM, and SAT</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-127 Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority Application</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Section 1.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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



## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For students with disabilities, policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including those children with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system;</li> <li>• For ELs:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Policies state that all ELs must be included in all aspects of the content assessment system, unless the State has chosen the statutory option for recently arrived ELs under which such ELs are exempt from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment.</li> <li>○ If a State has developed native language assessments for ELs in R/LA, ELs must be assessed in R/LA in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except, if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-163 NH Assessment Requirements webpage</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-125 Statewide Regional Trainings</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-139 NH Test Administration Manual</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-134 NH Business Rules</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-133 NH Accountability Rules</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-Assessment Registration</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-129 Minimum Standards for Public School Approval</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-130 Letter to parents about assessment process and results</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-105 Technical Report Volume 5</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-163 NH Assessment Requirements webpage</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-116 Decision Making Worksheet</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-131 NH SAS Accommodations Guide</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-139 NH Test Administration Manual</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-109 NH Department of Education Consolidated State Plan</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-129 Minimum Standards for Public School Approval</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-105 Technical Report Volume 5</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-139 NH Test Administration Manual</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-153 NH State Guidance on English Language Learners</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-155 NH Department of Education Statewide Assessment Exemptions and Special Consideration Form</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-129 Minimum Standards for Public School Approval</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-133 Accountability Rules</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-109 NH Department of Education Consolidated State Plan</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-133 NH Accountability Rules</i></li> <li>• <a href="#"><u>NH-135 Assessment Registration</u></a></li> <li>• <i>NH-134 NH Business Rules</i></li> </ul>	<p>Department staff determined that NHD OE’s Test Administration Manual specifies that all students are required to take statewide assessments in the required grades and in all three subject areas, including students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who meet the criteria for taking an alternate assessment.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

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

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State has developed or amended challenging <b>academic</b> standards and assessments, the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education).</li> <li>• Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas).</li> <li>• Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State.</li> <li>• Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-109 NH Department of Education Consolidated State Plan</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-119 School Administrators Association Regional Groups</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-110 June 2010 NH State Board of Education Meeting Minutes</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-136 Education Improvement and Assessment Program Chapter 193-C</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-110 June 2010 NH State Board of Education Meeting Minutes</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-125 Statewide Regional Trainings</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-163 NH Assessment Requirements webpage</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-139 NH Test Administration Manual</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-138 FAQ on Standards Based Education</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-118 Crosswalk with CCSS and previous state grade level expectations</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-120 Math Task Force Report</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-119 School Administrators Association</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-125 Statewide Regional Trainings</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-163 NH Assessment Requirements webpage</i></li> </ul>	<p>New Hampshire adopted its mathematics and reading/language arts standards prior to the passage of ESSA, so this critical element does not apply.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-138 FAQ on Standards Based Education</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-139 NH Test Administration Manual</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-140 Assessment FAQ</i></li> </ul>	
<b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement</b>		
x No additional evidence is required.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to <b><u>the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards</u></b> for the grade that is being assessed and includes:</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>(CE 2.1.1)</b> Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>NH-101 Technical Report Volume 1</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 1 – Introduction (pp. 1-4)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 1 Section 1 lists the purpose of the statewide assessment and provides details on how the assessment was developed with multiple partners to ensure that all requirements are satisfied. The statewide assessment provides educators, stakeholders, and policymakers with information that can be used to inform instruction and monitor education trends.</p> <hr/> <p>NH-101, section 1.2 describes the purpose and intended uses of the NH SAS 3-8.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>(CE 2.1.2)</b> Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of <b><u>the State’s grade-level academic content standards</u></b> and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>NH-102 Technical Report Volume 2</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 1.1 – Claim Structure (pp. 1-2)</li> <li>○ Section 2 – Item Development Process That Supports Validity of Claims (pp. 3-23)</li> <li>○ Section 4.1 – Test Blueprints (pp. 37-46)</li> <li>○ ELA Blueprints (Appendix H)</li> <li>○ Mathematics Blueprints (Appendix I)</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <i>NH-104 Technical Report Volume 4</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 5 – Evidence on Internal-External Structure (pp. 31-42)</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <i>NH-106 Technical Report Volume 6</i></li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 2 provides a complete description of the blueprint development process, including how blueprints were developed to align specifically to the statewide assessment. Blueprints for all statewide tests are provided as Appendices A and B to this report.</p> <p>Technical Report Volume 4 Section 5 includes analyses of the internal structure of each blueprint and reporting structures in support of the intended interpretations and uses of the statewide assessment results.</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 2 – Interpretation of Reported Scores (pp. 36-41)</li> <li>● <i>NH-164 ELA Blueprints</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ NH ELA blueprints publicly posted on the NH assessment portal</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <i>NH-165 NH Math Blueprints</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ NH math blueprints publicly posted on the NH assessment portal</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <i>NH-111 Common Core State Standards for ELA</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CCSS for ELA adopted by New Hampshire Department of Education</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <i>NH-112 Common Core State Standards for Mathematics</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CCSS for Mathematics adopted by New Hampshire Department of Education</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <i>NH-141 NH SAS ELA Performance Level Descriptors</i></li> <li>● <i>NH-142 NH SAS Math Performance Level Descriptors</i></li> </ul>	<p>Technical Report Volume 6 Section 2 provides a detailed description of all scores and score types provided for the statewide assessment. It lists the intended use and interpretation of each score type and also describes the limits of each score type.</p> <hr/> <p>2.1.2 is NOT MET based on the evidence provided. The blueprints provided do not ensure that the breadth and depth of the content standards are covered in the assessments. There are ELA standards, for example, where the allowable minimum number of items is zero. In Math, the blueprints do not specify test content down to the standard level – that is, the blueprints specify coverage the reporting category level only.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>(CE 2.1.3)</b> Processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <b><u>the State’s academic content standards</u></b>, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>NH-102 Technical Report Volume 2</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 1.1 – Claim Structure (pp. 1-2)</li> <li>○ Section 2 – Item Development Process That Supports Validity of Claims (pp. 3-23)</li> <li>○ Section 3 – AIRCore Item Bank Summary (pp. 23-37)</li> <li>○ Section 4.1 – Test Blueprints (pp. 37-46)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 2 describes how the statewide tests are all specifically tailored to the state’s academic standards using an array of item types and higher levels of cognitive complexity.</p> <hr/> <p>2.1.3 is NOT MET based on the evidence provided. See comments in 2.1.2.</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>(CE 2.1.4)</b> If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design and intended uses and interpretations of results.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-101 Technical Report Volume 1</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 1.2 – Purpose and Intended Uses of the New Hampshire Statewide Assessment System (p. 2)</li> <li>○ Section 2.2 – Simulations (pp. 5-6)</li> <li>○ Section 3.2 – Operational Test Design for ELA and Mathematics (pp. 24-31)</li> <li>○ Section 7.1.2 – Blueprint Match Report (pp. 73-74)</li> <li>○ Appendix F – Simulation vs. Operational Blueprint Match</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-102 Technical Report Volume 2</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 2 – Item Development Process That Supports Validity of Claims (pp. 3-23)</li> <li>○ Section 4 – NH SAS Test Construction (37-48)</li> <li>○ Appendix J – AIRCore Adaptive Algorithm Design</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-141 NH SAS ELA Performance Level Descriptors</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-142 NH SAS Math Performance Level Descriptors</i></li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 1 Section 1.2 lists the purpose of the statewide assessment. The statewide assessment provides educators, stakeholders, and policymakers with information that can be used to inform instruction and monitor education trends. Section 2.2 describes how simulations are used to configure the adaptive algorithm, supporting the test design by maximizing test score precision while meeting blueprint specifications. Section 7.1.2 and Appendix F show how the adaptive algorithm successfully met blueprint requirements both in simulations and in operational testing.</p> <p>Technical Report Volume 2 describes the complete process of choosing items aligned to the state’s academic content standards. The statewide ELA and mathematics tests draw all items from the AIRCore item bank. This is a rigorously developed bank of items using principles of evidence-centered and universal design. The test item pools were built by content experts drawing from this bank to measure specific state academic content standards. Appendix J describes the AIRCore adaptive item selection algorithm in detail.</p> <hr/> <p>CE 2.1.4 is MET for mathematics and NOT MET for ELA. The ELA test events do not all meet the blueprint constraints for DOK. The issue is present in every grade assessed.</p> <p>Peers note, however, that even though the CAT algorithm for math matches the blueprints, the blueprints themselves are problematic for other reasons (see CE 2.1.2)</p>
--	---	---

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS

		See Appendix F – Simulation vs. Operational Blueprint Match
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>(CE 2.1.5)</b> If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the student is enrolled and uses that determination for all reporting.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-101 Technical Report Volume 1</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 6.1 – Maximum Likelihood Estimation for ELA and Mathematics (pp. 58-65)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-103 Technical Report Volume 3</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 1.2 – Results of the ELA and Mathematics Standard-Setting Workshops (pp. 2-7)</li> <li>○ Section 4.4.4 – Performance Level Descriptors (pp. 20-21)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 1 Section 6.1 provides a description of how scale scores are generated.</p> <p>Technical Report Volume 3 Section 1.2 shows how every student scale score is compared to an on-grade proficiency cut score. Section 4.4.4 describes how performance level descriptors are developed for each individual grade level.</p> <hr/> <p>Can the State clarify or confirm that all proficiency determinations are based on on-grade content?</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>(CE 2.1.6)</b> If the State administers a content assessment that includes portfolios, such assessment may be partially administered through a portfolio but may not be <i>entirely</i> administered through a portfolio.</li> </ul>	Not Applicable	<p>New Hampshire assessments do not include portfolios.</p> <hr/> <p>2.1.6 – N/A</p>
<p><b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of <b><u>the State’s grade-level academic content standards</u></b> and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results.</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <b><u>the State’s academic content standards</u></b>, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills).</li> <li>• For ELA, all grades: 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. See peer notes in 2.1.4 for a clarification about blueprint issues, which are independent of the extent to which the CAT matches those blueprints.</li> <li>• Confirmation that all proficiency determinations are based on on-grade content, or clarification.</li> </ul>		

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



**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

**Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess student achievement based on the <b>State’s academic content standards</b> in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-102 Technical Report Volume 2</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 1.1 – Claim Structure (pp. 1-2)</li> <li>○ Section 2 – Item Development Process That Supports Validity of Claims (pp. 3-23)</li> <li>○ Section 3 – AIRCore Item Bank Summary (pp. 23-37)</li> <li>○ Section 4 – NH SAS Test Construction (pp. 37-48)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 2 describes the complete process of choosing items aligned to the state’s academic content standards. The statewide ELA and mathematics tests draw all items from the AIRCore item bank. This is a rigorously developed bank of items using principles of evidence-centered and universal design. The test item pools were built by content experts drawing from this bank to measure specific state academic content standards.</p> <hr/> <p><i>For NH SAS 3-8 Reading and Math:</i> NH-102, Sections 2, 3, and 4, provides evidence that the state uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to measure students’ achievement of the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive processes.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>x No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

**Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State:		
<p><b>(CE 2.3.1)</b> Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-105 Technical Report Volume 5</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 3 – Administrator Training (pp. 6-9)</li> <li>○ Appendix A – Test Administrator User Guide</li> <li>○ Appendix C – Test Administration Manual</li> </ul> </li>   <li>• <i>NH-139 NH Test Administration Manual</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Overview of the New Hampshire Statewide Assessments and general test administration information.</li> </ul> </li>   <li>• <i>NH-167 TA User Guide</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This user guide supports personnel responsible for test administration for students participating in the New Hampshire Statewide Assessment System.</li> </ul> </li>   <li>• <a href="#"><u>NH-132 NH TIDE Guide</u></a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <a href="#"><u>This user guide is intended for state, district, and school-level- test administrators and coordinators who manage the assessment efforts.</u></a></li> </ul> </li>   <li>• <i>NH-133 NH Accountability Rules</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Assessment and Accountability rules for math, ELA, and science.</li> </ul> </li>   <li>• <a href="#"><u>NH-135 Assessment Registration</u></a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <a href="#"><u>Process for assessment registration</u></a></li> </ul> </li>   <li>• <a href="#"><u>NH-131 NH SAS Accommodations Guide</u></a></li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 5 Section 3 describes in detail the standardized test administration procedures. This section lists and summarizes the training manuals provided to those involved in test administration (Table 2). Appendices A and C have specific information regarding the standardized testing procedures that test administrators followed, including accommodations.</p> <p>Collectively, the administration manuals and resources available to New Hampshire educators communicate and facilitate the expected standardized administration procedures.</p> <hr/> <p>CE 2.3.1 is MET based on the evidence provided.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <a href="#">New Hampshire Statewide Assessment System: Designated Supports, Accommodations, and Universal Tools Guide</a></li> <li>● <i>NH-134 NH Business Rules</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Definitions and terms for assessments</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <i>NH-125 Statewide Regional Trainings</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Assessment presentation presented at regional trainings and posted to the NH DOE website</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <i>NH-158 NH Assessment Calendar</i></li> <li>● <i>NH-166 NH SAS Testing Times</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>(CE 2.3.2)</b> 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;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>NH-105 Technical Report Volume 5</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 3 – Administrator Training (pp. 6-9)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Also see manuals and resource materials for test administration above in CE.2.3.1</p>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 5 Section 3 describes in detail the standardized test administration procedures. This section lists and summarizes the training manuals provided to those involved in test administration (Table 2).</p> <hr/> <p>Peers could not locate evidence that training occurred, participants in training, or slides (if used in training) and whether there is monitoring of training or any other follow up.</p> <p>Peers were unclear as to the requirements for who can be a test administrator. For example, would a para-professional qualify?</p> <p>It was not clear to peers when the “designated supports” should be provided, and to whom.</p> <p>CE 2.3.2 NOT MET.</p>
<p><b>(CE 2.3.3)</b> If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>NH-105 Technical Report Volume 5</i></li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 5 Section 3.1 provides an overview of the technology-based</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS

<p>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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 3.1 – Computer-Based Administration (pp. 6-7)</li> <li>○ Appendix A – Test Administrator User Guide</li> <li>○ Appendix E – Technical Specifications Manual for Online Testing</li> <li>○ Appendix F – System Requirements for Online Testing</li> <li>○ Appendix G – Secure Browser Installation Manual</li> <li>● <i>NH-143 2018-2019 Technology Requirements of Online Testing Webinar</i></li> <li>● <i>NH-168 Systems Requirements for Online Testing</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This document outlines the basic technology requirements for administering an online assessment, including operating system requirements and supported web browsers.</li> </ol> </li> <li>1. <i>NH-169 Technical Specifications Manual for Online Testing</i></li> <li>2. This manual provides technology staff with the technical specifications for online testing, including information on Internet and network requirements, general hardware and software requirements, and the text-to-speech function.</li> <li>3. <i>NH-170 Braille Requirements Manual</i></li> <li>4. Information about supporting operating systems and required hardware and software for Braille testing.</li> </ul>	<p>test administration procedures. Appendices A, E, F, and G list the system and technical requirements for the online statewide assessment.</p> <hr/> <p>Evidence documents show the State has defined technology requirements. However, peers could not locate established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. CE 2.3.3. is PARTIALLY MET.</p>
<b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  </u> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities</li> <li>● Contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS

### 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-105 Technical Report Volume 5</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 4 – Test Security Procedures (pp. 9-13)</li> <li>○ Appendix A – Test Administrator User Guide (pp. 44-45)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-123 NH Statewide Assessment Monitoring Guide</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The New Hampshire Department of Education’s Statewide Assessment System incorporates appropriate policies and procedures to ensure test validity, reliability, and integrity. The local school districts will read, confirm understanding of, and abide by all NH DOE test security policies and procedures. Local school district principals will annually submit test security assurances to certify that they have read, understand, and will abide by all NH DOE test security policies and procedures</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-124 Test Security Assurances</i></li> </ul>	<p>NHDOE provided a Statewide Assessments Test Security and Monitoring Guide for school year 2018-19. The guide provides that all districts will be monitored at least once during a five year cycle and scheduled through a random selection process. The guide includes forms for desk and onsite monitoring and sample letters to States.</p> <p>NHDOE should provide confirmatory evidence that monitoring occurred, such as a 2018-19 monitoring schedule or a follow-up letter or report to a district. NHDOE should also make clear that its monitoring process applies to all Statewide assessments, including SAT and the alternate assessments.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: For all assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 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 (e.g., evidence that monitoring occurred and that it applies to all Statewide assessments).</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

**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>		
<p><b>(CE 2.5.1)</b> 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;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-105 Technical Report Volume 5</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 3 – Administrator Training (pp. 6-9)</li> <li>○ Section 4 – Test Security Procedures (pp. 9-13)</li> <li>○ Appendix A – Test Administrator User Guide (pp. 44-45)</li> <li>○ Appendix B – Designated Supports, Accommodations, and Universal Tools Guide</li> <li>○ Appendix C – Test Administration Manual</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-123 NH Statewide Assessment Monitoring Guide</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-139 NH Test Administration Manual</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ All test items and test materials are secure and must be appropriately handled. Secure handling protects integrity, validity, and confidentiality of assessment items, prompts, and student information. Any deviation in test administration must be reported as a test security incident to ensure the validity of the assessment results. (pp 5-8)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-124 Test Security Assurances</i></li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 5 Section 3 describes how prevention of irregularities occurs by first establishing clear procedures for test administration. Section 4 focuses on test security procedures in detail. Appendices A and C include specific test security procedures for test administrators. Appendix B provides test security instructions for students using embedded or non-embedded accessibility tools.</p> <hr/> <p>CE 2.5.1. is MET.</p>
<p><b>(CE 2.5.2)</b> Detection of test irregularities;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-105 Technical Report Volume 5</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 4 – Test Security Procedures (pp. 9-13)</li> <li>○ Appendix A – Test Administrator User Guide (pp. 44-45)</li> <li>○ Appendix C – Test Administration Manual</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 5 Section 4 describes how detection of irregularities is accomplished via a quality assurance monitoring system that detects anomalies in item behavior and flags individual students and schools for test irregularities. Appendices A and C include specific test security procedures for test</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-123 NH Statewide Assessment Monitoring Guide</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-144 NH SAS Test Security Incident Log</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Procedure for investigating, tracking, and reporting of alleged test irregularities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-124 Test Security Assurances</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ NH SAS test security assurances document to be signed each year by test administrators and building principals.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>administrators, including detection of forbidden applications.</p> <hr/> <p>Documents show CE 2.5.2 is MET.</p>
<p><b>(CE 2.5.3)</b> Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-105 Technical Report Volume 5</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 4 – Test Security Procedures (pp. 9-13)</li> <li>○ Appendix C – Test Administration Manual</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-123 NH Statewide Assessment Monitoring Guide</i></li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 5 Section 4 and Appendix C detail the procedures for investigation, remediation, and application of test security protocols applied by the state and the vendor AIR.</p> <hr/> <p>2.5.3 – NH-105, page 10 – 11 provides examples of remediation that may be required as part of a test security incident. Section 4.3 on page 14 also provides guidelines followed for test invalidation. The Test Administration Manual (pages 5 – 8 of Appendix C) also provides test security guidelines.</p> <p>2.5.3 is met.</p>
<p><b>(CE 2.5.4)</b> Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-105 Technical Report Volume 5</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 4 – Test Security Procedures (pp. 9-13)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-123 NH Statewide Assessment Monitoring Guide</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The NH DOE will regularly monitor test administration in local school districts by conducting annual on-site visits and/or assessment desk audits at a sampling of local</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 5 Section 4 details the procedures for investigation, remediation, and application of test security protocols applied by the state and the vendor AIR.</p> <hr/> <p>2.5.4 – NH-105, section 4.2, page 14, describes the procedures followed for investigating test irregularities. NH-123 describes the monitoring procedures in place to</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

	<p>school districts in the state. The NH DOE will analyze test data to identify schools with possible test administration irregularities. (pp 8)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-144 NH SAS Test Security Incident Log</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Procedure for investigating, tracking, and reporting of alleged test irregularities.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>ensure test security. NH-144 provides the blank template showing the kinds of information gathered for test security incident investigations. CE 2.5.4 is MET.</p>
<p><b>(CE 2.5.5)</b> Application of test security procedures to all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-105 Technical Report Volume 5</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 4 – Test Security Procedures (pp. 9-13)</li> <li>○ Appendix C – Test Administration Manual</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 5 Section 4 and Appendix C detail the procedures for investigation, remediation, and application of test security protocols applied by the state and the vendor AIR.</p> <p>In the Test Administration Manual it states all test items and test materials are secure and must be appropriately handled. Secure handling protects the integrity, validity, and confidentiality of assessment items, prompts, and student information. Any deviation in test administration must be reported as a test security incident to ensure the validity of the assessment results.</p> <hr/> <p>2.5.5 – NH 123, pages 4, 5, and 8, provide evidence of the applicability of test security procedures to all state assessments.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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



**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

**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><b>(CE 2.6.1)</b> To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-105 Technical Report Volume 5</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 4 – Test Security Procedures (pp. 9-13)</li> <li>○ Appendix A – Test Administrator User Guide (pp. 44-45)</li> <li>○ Appendix C – Test Administration Manual</li> <li>○ Appendix H – User Role Permissions Guide</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-106 Technical Report Volume 6</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 1.1 – Overview of New Hampshire’s Score Reports (p. 1)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-145 Data Governance Policy</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data policies, rules, and procedures.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-146 FAQ Privacy</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No personally identifiable information about a pupil including name and social security number, shall be collected or maintained by the state in such a manner as to allow such information to be connected with the unique pupil identifier. Under no circumstances shall the department of education obtain or use a social security number as an identifier for any pupil. The department shall not use unique pupil identifiers except in connection with the data warehouse and such use shall not be accessible to the public.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 5 Section 4 describes how AIR provides a secure testing system that conforms to FERPA (p. 13) and protects all student confidentiality. Appendices A and C include specific test security procedures for test administrators, including detection of forbidden applications. Appendix H lists the permissions for AIR’s secure systems, such as TIDE, ORS, and the TA Interface.</p> <p>Technical Report Volume 6 provides details on the secure procedures used in the online scoring system granting specific privileges to users based on their roles within the state. Section 1.1 lists the privileges granted to different users and what data they can access.</p> <hr/> <p>2.6.1 - Technical Report Volume 5 Section 4 describes how AIR provides a secure testing system that conforms to FERPA (p. 13) and protects all student confidentiality. Appendices A and C include specific test security procedures for test administrators, including detection of forbidden applications. Appendix H lists the permissions for AIR’s secure systems, such as TIDE, ORS, and the TA Interface.</p> <p>Technical Report Volume 6 provides details on the secure procedures used in the online scoring system granting specific privileges to users based on their roles within the state. Section 1.1 lists the privileges granted to different users and what data they can access.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-123 NH Statewide Assessment Monitoring Guide</i></li> </ul>	<p>NH-145 and NH-146 describe the policies and procedures to prevent sharing of student PII.</p> <p>Evidence documents demonstrate that CE 2.6.1 is MET.</p>
<p><b>(CE 2.6.2)</b> To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-105 Technical Report Volume 5</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 4 – Test Security Procedures (pp. 9-13)</li> <li>○ Appendix C – Test Administration Manual</li> <li>○ Appendix D – TIDE User Guide</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-105 Technical Report Volume 5</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 3 – FERPA compliance (pp. 13-16)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-146 FAQ Privacy</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No personally identifiable information about a pupil including name and social security number, shall be collected or maintained by the state in such a manner as to allow such information to be connected with the unique pupil identifier. Under no circumstances shall the department of education obtain or use a social security number as an identifier for any pupil. The department shall not use unique pupil identifiers except in connection with the data warehouse and such use shall not be accessible to the public.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-145 Data Governance Policy</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data policies, rules, and procedures.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 5 Section 4 and Appendix D describe how AIR provides a secure testing system and Appendix C provides specific test administration procedures, all of which conform to FERPA (p. 13) and protect all student confidentiality.</p> <p>Technical Report Volume 5 section 3 describes how AIR provides a secure system that conforms to FERPA and protects all student confidentiality.</p> <hr/> <p><i>NH-106 Technical Report Volume 6</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 1.1 – Overview of New Hampshire’s Score Reports (p. 1). Indicates which school personnel have access to which student score reports</li> </ul> <p><i>NH-145 Data Governance Policy</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data policies, rules, and procedures.</li> </ul> <p>Technical Report Volume 5 Section 4 and Appendix D describe how AIR provides a secure testing system and Appendix C provides specific test administration procedures, all of which conform to FERPA (p. 13) and protect all student confidentiality.</p> <p>Technical Report Volume 5 section 3 describes how AIR provides a secure system that conforms to FERPA and protects all student confidentiality.</p> <p>The TIDE User Guide constitutes guidance for districts and schools on securing student-level assessment data.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

<p><b>(CE 2.6.3)</b> 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-105 Technical Report Volume 5</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 3 – FERPA compliance (pp. 13-16)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-146 FAQ Privacy</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Individual pupil names or codes contained in the statewide assessment results, scores, or other evaluative materials shall be deleted for the purposes of records maintenance and storage of such results or scores at the department of education, unless a parent or legal guardian provides written authorization otherwise, or as required under federal law. Individual pupil results shall be made available to a parent, a legal guardian, or the pupil's school in accordance with the Family Educational and Privacy Rights Act, 20 U.S.C. 1232g</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-145 Data Governance Policy</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data policies, rules, and procedures.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>CE 2.6.2 is MET.</p> <p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 5 section 3 describes how AIR provides a secure system that conforms to FERPA and protects all student confidentiality.</p> <hr/> <p>2.6.3 <i>NH-146 FAQ Privacy.</i> There are explicit, general statements related to PII. Also, the FAQs refer to SBAC. It appears this document needs to be updated to specifically reflect NHDEs current assessment system.</p> <p>NH-146 FAQ Privacy document includes evidence meeting this requirement. Minimum N is 12, per p.6 of that document.</p> <p>Is this up to date (FAQ is from 2015) and does it apply to all assessments (FAQ addresses SBAC)?</p> <p>Technical Report Volume 5 section 3 describes how AIR provides a secure system that conforms to FERPA and protects all student confidentiality.</p> <p>NH-146 also describes how the state keeps PII secure and confidential.</p> <p>NH ESSA plan (Jan 2018) says min N is 11.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>x No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. The State’s validity evidence includes evidence that:</p> <p><b><u>The State’s academic assessments</u></b> measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p>		
<p><b>(CE 3.1.1)</b> 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;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-102 Technical Report Volume 2</i></li> <li>• Section 4 – NH SAS Test Construction (pp. 37-48)</li> <li>• <i>NH-103 Technical Report Volume 3</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 4.4.4 – Performance-level Descriptors (pp. 20-21)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH 172 NH SAS Alignment Study Report</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Third party alignment study</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH 173 Alignment Study Appendix A-D for ELA</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Third party alignment study</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH 174 Alignment Study Appendix A-D for mathematics</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Third party alignment study</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 2 Section 4 describes the process used to develop the blueprints and alignment of reporting categories to the standards. The statewide test specifications and blueprints were all developed by content experts with items aligned specifically to the academic content standards.</p> <p>Technical Report Volume 3 Section 4.4.4 describes how the performance level descriptors (PLDs) were collaboratively established with educators in a rigorous review and development process to ensure that statewide assessment scores express a student’s performance aligned to the state’s specific standards and performance expectations.</p> <p>WebbAlign conducted an alignment analysis of New Hampshire general summative assessment for ELA and Mathematics Grades 3-8 with corresponding grade level New Hampshire College and Career Ready Standards. The report provides information about the degree of alignment of the computer adaptive NH statewide general summative</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

		<p>assessment, as pertains to fulfilling requirements as states in Federal statute.</p> <hr/> <p>3.1.1  <i>NH 172 NH SAS Alignment Study Report, p. 4</i>          “Based on the results of the independent analysis, all mathematics test forms analyzed were considered fully aligned or acceptably aligned with the corresponding grade-level New Hampshire mathematics standards.”</p> <p>“Overall, the results of a two-part content alignment analysis along with a consideration of blueprints, information about the item selection algorithm, and aggregate data from administered test events suggest that the New Hampshire statewide general summative computer adaptive test (CAT) program for Grades 3-8 ELA has the capacity to generate aligned test events across a range of proficiency.”</p> <p>3.1.1 – NH-102, Technical Report Volume 2 Section 4 describes the process used to develop the blueprints and alignment of reporting categories to the standards.</p> <p>NH-103 includes a description of the various PLDs and the PLD development process on page 20-21.</p> <p>NH 172 is the alignment study for ELA and Math with supporting details in NH 173 and NH174 for ELA and Math, respectively.</p> <p>Peers noted areas of poor alignment, some of which run through the grades. For example (from NH 172) Range of the “Writing and Language” area is consistently poor for all ELA grades.</p> <p>Peers request a plan and timeline for meeting the areas of poor / weak alignment.</p>
--	--	--

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

<p><b>(CE 3.1.2)</b> Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-102 Technical Report Volume 2</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 4 – NH SAS Test Construction (pp. 37-48)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH 172 NH SAS Alignment Study Report</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Third party alignment study</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH 173 Alignment Study Appendix A-D for ELA</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Third party alignment study</li> </ul> </li> <li>• NH 174 Alignment Study Appendix A-D for mathematics           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Third party alignment study</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 2 Section 4 provides the number of items within each reporting category along with the types of items and DOK levels used in the assessment to ensure that the breadth and depth of the standards are measured as expected.</p> <hr/> <p>3.1.2  <i>NH 172 NH SAS Alignment Study Report, pp. 3-4</i>          “Based on a consideration of the aggregate statistics of administered test events and assessment documentation, including test blueprints and narrative information about the item selection algorithm, the New Hampshire Statewide Assessment System demonstrates the capacity to generate aligned test events for both mathematics and ELA. The CAT algorithm takes into consideration appropriate alignment factors including item complexity, breadth of sampling, and has constraints to limit overemphasis of a particular standard. All administered test events met blueprint specifications. Independent reviewers agreed with the internally coded standards but not with the internally coded DOKs. However, the independent analysis of test forms found that although there was disagreement in coding all test forms met the criterion of Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency.”</p> <p>NH-102, pages 37-48, as well as the three alignment study documents (NH-172, NH-173, and NH-174), provide evidence that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards.</p> <p>It is not enough to indicate the number of items within each reporting category to ensure that the assessments address the breadth and depth of the content standards. This is because there are several standards within each RC, and two tests may both meet the N items within RC constraint but sample very different standards within that RC. If some standards are systematically or inadvertently avoided in test</p>
---	--	--

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

		<p>construction, a test can look aligned from the RC perspective and yet not be fully aligned to the content standards.</p> <p>How is this issue addressed in determining whether test events are aligned to the full set of content standards (as opposed to just the blueprints)?</p>
<p><b>(CE 3.1.3)</b> If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards and administers alternate assessments aligned with those standards, the assessments show adequate alignment to the State’s academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	<p>Alternate assessments are not being reviewed at this time.</p> <hr/>
<p><b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3.1.1: A plan and timeline for meeting the areas of poor / weak alignment</li> <li>• 3.1.2: A description of how, during test construction and assembly, standards are sampled within RC in such a way as to ensure that all standards are addressed – that is, that no standard is systematically excluded.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap: <b><u>the intended cognitive processes</u></b> appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-107 Cognitive Laboratories Technical Report</i></li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: The state is submitting evidence from an existing qualifying study that generalizes to our current testing program. The Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) cognitive lab uses the same test delivery engine, interaction types and online features (e.g., text-to-speech, equation editors) and also draws items from the AIRCore item bank. The SBAC Cognitive lab focused on 14 research questions for both English Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics tests involving 700 cognitive labs to examine a range of questions related to item validity and the validity of interaction types offered by the online system. The labs were completed for two primary reasons: 1) formatively so that information could be collected on items and interaction types in order to revise them in development as needed, and 2) on finished items and interactions types to collect validity evidence to support claims that items measure the intended cognitive process and any available features of the system do not alter the measured construct in any way.</p> <p>The major findings from the study generally supported the claim that items and various item types were measuring the intended constructs at the intended cognitive level of complexity and that interaction types enhanced the testing experience and did not create impediments or construct irrelevant variance. At the same time, the formative study also highlighted areas where the items and interaction types needed additional refinements to better target the intended constructs and improve the overall testing experience. Because the AIRCore item bank and the State’s vendor (AIR) delivers tests on the same platform as SBAC using the same online features, and because the study showed no evidence that students in different states responded differently to the items, the results from this cognitive lab study generalize to our student population.</p>

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



**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

		<p><i>NH-107 Cognitive Laboratories Technical Report</i>                  These cognitive laboratories were conducted by Smarter Balanced to investigate questions that arise from such an automated design. The report acknowledges that the sample sizes are small and that “should a more rigorous investigation of any of the research questions be of interest, specifically designed studies with large samples will be needed.”</p> <p>The research questions related to use of the automated design do not appear to address the critical element related to the intended cognitive processes of the SAS.</p> <p>NH is submitting evidence from an existing qualifying study that they believe generalizes to the current testing program, since the same test delivery engine is used, interaction types and online features (e.g., text-to-speech, equation editors) are the same, and the SAS also draws items from the AIRCore item bank. This study focused on 14 specific research questions with a small population of student participants. While the study does provide some insights into the cognitive processes that the SAS taps, the study itself notes that “Due to the small number of subjects studied and the ad hoc nature of the achieved sample of participants, the findings should be used to point the way to more systematic studies, rather than be cited as an authoritative source of scientific findings.” As such, it seems that the state should pursue additional evidence to support this critical element.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s <b><u>academic content standards</u></b>.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>NH-104 Technical Report Volume 4</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 5.1 – Correlation among Reporting Category Scores (pp. 31-33)</li> <li>○ Section 5.2 – Convergent and Discriminant Validity (pp. 33-39)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 4 Section 5 provides studies describing the internal structure of the statewide assessment. This section provides the following studies and conclusions: Section 5.1 provides observed score and deattenuated correlations between all subscores on the statewide assessment. All correlations are within industry standard expected patterns. These studies provide support for the reporting structure of the statewide tests. Section 5.2 provides convergent and discriminant validity using an MTMM matrix. The patterns of correlations are consistent with industry expected patterns.</p> <hr/> <p><i>NH-104 Technical Report Volume 4, Section 5.1 – Correlation among Reporting Category Scores (pp. 31-33), Tables 21-23</i>  The report states that “. . . as previously noted, the correlations were subject to a large amount of measurement error at the strand level, given the limited number of items from which the scores were derived. Consequently, over-interpretation of these correlations, as either high or low, should be made cautiously.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 5.2 – Convergent and Discriminant Validity (pp. 33-39), Tables 24-29.</li> </ul> <p>The report states that “observed and disattenuated subscore correlations were calculated both within and across subjects for grades 3–8 mathematics and ELA. Generally, the pattern is consistent with the a priori expectation that subscores within a test correlate more highly than correlations between tests measuring a different construct with a few small notes on the writing dimensions.”</p> <p>NH-104, Section 5.3 provides observed and disattenuated correlations between the current test and a prior SBAC test.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

		<p>The results provide evidence of SAS scores related as expected with other variables.</p> <p>The evidence provided show that this CE is MET.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

**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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>NH-104 Technical Report Volume 4</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 5.3 – Relationship of Test Scores to External Variables (pp. 39-40)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 4 Section 5.3 provides a study that correlates statewide assessment scores to a prior year’s SBAC test. The state does not currently implement a second test in addition to the statewide assessment, but the prior year SBAC test measures a common construct. These correlations provide support that the statewide assessment is related with an external variable to the degree expected by industry standards.</p> <hr/> <p><i>NH-104 Technical Report Volume 4, Section 5.3 – Relationship of Test Scores to External Variables (pp. 39-40), Tables 33 and 34.</i></p> <p>Correlations between two different tests, SBAC and SAS, measuring a common construct but measured using the same students one year apart, are presented. “We expect the correlations to be high to suggest that the NH SAS has a high relationship with an externally developed measure, though the time gap between the two different assessments is greater than if the two tests were measured within a similar testing window. . . Observed correlations are between 0.77 and 0.86 and disattenuated correlations are between 0.86 and 0.93, both of which can be considered relatively high compared to industry standards.”</p> <p>NH-104, Section 5.3 provides observed and disattenuated correlations between the current test and a prior SBAC test. The results provide evidence of SAS scores related as expected with other variables.</p> <p>Evidence provided demonstrate this CE is MET.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>x No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS

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>		
<p><b>(CE 4.1.1)</b> Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-104 Technical Report Volume 4</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 3 – Reliability (pp. 5-29)</li> <li>○ Table 2 – Reliability Coefficients, ELA &amp; Mathematics (p. 5)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 4 Section 3 provides information about the test reliabilities. All reliability coefficients are at or above 0.88 (Table 2).</p> <hr/> <p>4.1.1 <i>NH-104 Technical Report Volume 4</i>, Table 2, p. 5 presents the reliability coefficients for all students. The reliability coefficients for all subjects and grades range from 0.88 to 0.92. This appears to be reasonable.</p> <p>Missing: reliability coefficients for each student group: By ethnicity, for ELs, and for SWDs.</p>
<p><b>(CE 4.1.2)</b> Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-104 Technical Report Volume 4</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 3.3 – Test Information Curves and Standard Error of Measurement (pp. 6-13)</li> <li>○ Section 3.5 – Precision at Cut Scores (pp. 17-19)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 4 Section 3.3 provides overall and conditional standard errors as visual displays with performance cuts superimposed on the plots. This shows that the SEMs are smallest at score points near the performance cuts. Section 3.5 provides the</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>mean conditional standard errors. The SEMs are disaggregated by performance level for each statewide test.</p> <hr/> <p>4.1.2  <i>NH-104 Technical Report Volume 4</i>, pp. 12-13                      “Overall, the standard error curves suggest that students are measured with a high degree of precision, given that the standard errors are consistently low. However, larger standard errors are observed at the lower ends of the score distribution relative to the higher ends. This occurs because the item pools currently have a shortage of easy items that are better targeted toward these lower achieving students. Content experts use this information to consider how to further target and populate item pools.”</p> <p>Overall TIF and SEM appear reasonable, however overall and conditional SEMs for each RC score are missing.</p>
<p><b>(CE 4.1.3)</b> Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-104 Technical Report Volume 4</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 3.4 – Reliability of Performance Classification (pp. 13-17)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 4 Section 3.4 provides both classification accuracy and classification consistency studies. The studies show the accuracy and consistency at each cut score and all values in Tables 4-9 are high and consistent with industry-expected values.</p> <hr/> <p>4.1.3  <i>NH-104 Technical Report Volume 4</i>, p. 14                      “The overall classification accuracy of the test ranges from 75% to 79% for ELA and from 79% to 80% for mathematics. The cut accuracy rates are high across all grades and subjects with the minimum value of 90.7% for ELA and 90.9% for mathematics . . .” Including science, “this denotes that more than 87% of the time we can accurately differentiate students between adjacent</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
		achievement levels in the spring 2018 NH SAS.” This is reasonable.
<p><b>(CE 4.1.4)</b> For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of <b><u>a student’s academic achievement</u></b>.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-104 Technical Report Volume 4</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 1.1 – Reliability (p. 2)</li> <li>○ Section 3.1 – Reliability for ELA and Math (p. 5)</li> <li>○ Section 3.3 – Test Information Curves and Standard Error of Measurement (pp. 6-13)</li> <li>○ Section 3.5 – Precision at Cut Scores (pp. 17-19)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 4 Sections 1.1 and 3.1 explain the SEM and TIF measurements used. All reliability coefficients are at or above 0.88 (Table 2). Section 3.3 summarizes the precision of student scores. These are provided as visual displays (Figures 2 and 3) showing the expected pattern of SEMs in IRT. Section 3.5 shows the CSEM for all performance levels and their cut scores (Tables 10 and 11).</p> <hr/> <p>4.1.4 <i>NH-104 Technical Report Volume 4</i> The evidence provided supports this critical element. 4.1.4 – The information presented in NH-104 in support of this critical element all appears reasonable.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.1.1.: Reliability coefficients for each student group: By ethnicity, for ELs, and for SWDs.</li> <li>• 4.1.2.: Overall and conditional SEMs for each reported sub-score.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS

### Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><i>For all State academic assessments,</i> assessments should be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (see definition<sup>1</sup>).</p> <p><b>For academic content assessments,</b> the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in their design, development and analysis.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-102 Technical Report Volume 2</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 2.3 – Selection and Training of Item Writers (pp. 15-16)</li> <li>○ Section 2.4 – Internal Review (pp. 16-18)</li> </ul> </li>   <li>• <i>NH-105 Technical Report Volume 5</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 2.2 – Testing Accommodations (pp. 3-5)</li> <li>○ Appendix A – Test Administrator User Guide</li> <li>○ Appendix B – Designated Supports, Accommodations, and Universal Tools Guide</li> <li>○ Appendix C – Test Administration Manual</li> <li>○ Appendix D – TIDE User Guide</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 2 Section 2.3 provides details on how item writers are extensively trained in principles of universal design using the specific methods of Thompson, Johnstone, and Thurlow (2002).</p> <p>Technical Report Volume 5 Section 2.2 provides all testing accommodations and features available for the testing population. Appendix B provides comprehensive details on the designated supports, accommodations, and universal tools available. Appendices A, C, and D provide additional information on the use and availability of accommodations.</p> <p>(See response to Critical Elements 2.1 and 2.2 for further detail and evidence demonstrating that test items were developed to ensure fairness and accessibility.)</p> <hr/> <p><i>NH-102 Technical Report Volume 2, pp. 15-19.</i> Item writers are trained in principles of universal design for learning (p. 15). All items are reviewed multiple times by different reviewers – both internal and external reviewers; the item reviews include the review for language accessibility, bias, and sensitivity.</p> <p>The State should provide empirical evidence that the UDL principles and processes it is employing are ensuring fairness. DIF analyses with ELs and SWDs as focal groups, for example, assuming no DIF is present, would provide such evidence.</p>

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

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



**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

		<p><i>NH-105 Technical Report Volume 5</i></p> <p>The SAS incorporates access, both embedded and non-embedded accommodations for students with disabilities, designated supports, and universal tools for all students, and two supports/accommodations specifically available to ELs. Item development incorporates concepts of universal design. TIDE User Guide instructs the STC how to set access for student use of accommodations.</p> <p>NH-102, sections 2.3 and 2.4 describe how fairness and accessibility were considered in the test development process.</p> <p>NH-105 describes how accommodations and accessibility are provided or built into the assessment</p> <p>Peers are unclear who has access to designated supports.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Empirical evidence, such as through DIF analyses, that the UDL principles and processes it is employing are ensuring fairness.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

**Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for <b>academic assessments</b>, including performance for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-104 Technical Report Volume 4</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 3.3 – Test Information Curves and Standard Error of Measurement (pp. 6-13)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 4 Section 3.3 summarizes the precision of student scores. These are provided as visual displays (Figures 2 and 3) showing the expected pattern of SEMs in IRT.</p> <hr/> <p><i>NH-104 Technical Report Volume 4, pp. 6-13</i> Overall, the standard error curves suggest that students are measured with a high degree of precision, given that the standard errors are consistently low. However, larger standard errors are observed at the lower ends of the score distribution relative to the higher ends.</p> <p>NH-104 section 3.3 presents the TIF and CSEM which appear reasonable.</p> <p>Without additional information about the score distributions, it is difficult to know if the test is providing precise estimates of student performance for high- and low-achieving students. How large are the CSEMs at the 10<sup>th</sup> and 90<sup>th</sup> percentiles, for example? Are there any observed floor or ceiling effects for any of the tests?</p>
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sufficient information about the score distributions to assess CSEMs for high- and low-achieving (high- and low-scoring) students.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s <b><u>academic achievement standards</u></b>.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>NH-101 Technical Report Volume 1</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 4 – Classical Analyses Overview (pp. 40-46)</li> <li>○ Section 5.1 – Item Calibration and Equating for ELA and Mathematics (pp. 46-52)</li> <li>○ Section 6 – Scoring (pp. 59-72)</li> <li>○ Section 7 – Quality Control Procedures (pp. 71-74)</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <i>NH-102 Technical Report Volume 2</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 2.7.2 – Rubric Validation (pp. 21-22)</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <i>NH-103 Technical Report Volume 3</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 3 – Introduction (p. 11)</li> <li>○ Section 4 – Standard Setting (pp. 11-51)</li> <li>○ Section 5.1 – Evidence of Adherence to Professional Standards and Best Practices (pp. 52-53)</li> <li>○ Appendix B – ELA Performance Level Descriptors</li> <li>○ Appendix C – Mathematics Performance Level Descriptors</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <i>NH-104 Technical Report Volume 4</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 3.6 – ELA Writing Prompts Inter-Rater Reliability (pp. 19-29)</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <i>NH-106 Technical Report Volume 6</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Figure 21 – Supplemental Interpretive Guide (p. 34)</li> <li>○ Section 1.2 – Overall Scores and Reporting Categories (pp. 2-4)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 1 describes all of the scoring methods used in detail. This includes rationale, methods for calculating overall scores, strand scores, and cut scores for all performance levels, and how AIR’s quality monitoring system captures all item statistics in real time and flags items when they deviate from expected scoring rules.</p> <p>Technical Report Volume 2 Section 2.7.2 explains how technology enhanced items are reviewed for the score accuracy using a process referred to as rubric validation.</p> <p>Technical Report Volume 3 provides details on the standard setting method, development of the PLDs, and the use of the bookmark procedure for setting standards. This process results in performance level scores that express a student’s statewide assessment score as it relates to the state’s academic content standards. Evaluation results provide additional procedural validity.</p> <p>Technical Report Volume 4 Section 3.6 fully describes the methods used to train, score and monitor items scored by AIR’s vendor’s scoring engine (e.g., writing items). The scoring engine is trained and machine rater agreement with human scores are computed, with rater agreement between machine and human always about as high as rater agreement between two independent humans, and usually higher (Table 16).</p> <p>Technical Report Volume 6 describes in detail all scores and their intended uses and interpretations (Figure 21). Section 1.2 states NH procedures for determining valid scores.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

		<p><i>NH-104 Technical Report Volume 4, Section 3.6 – ELA Writing Prompts Inter-Rater Reliability (pp. 19-29).</i>  The thorough description of AIR’s essay scoring engine, AutoScore, and data from inter rater reliabilities between human scorers and human scorers and machine scores indicate that these processes produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p> <p><i>NH-106 Technical Report Volume 6, p. 2</i>  Description of how scores are derived:  “Each student receives a single scale score for each subject tested if there is a valid score to report. The validity of a score is determined using invalidation rules, which define a set of parameters under which a student’s test may be counted. A student’s score will be automatically invalidated if he or she fails to respond to at least five test items. Failure to provide a response in the written portion of ELA/writing tests will also result in an invalidated score. Normally, a student takes a test in the test delivery system (TDS) and then submits it. The TDS then forwards the test for scoring before the ORS reports the scores. However, tests may also be manually invalidated before reaching the ORS if testing irregularities occur (e.g., cheating, unscheduled interruptions, loss of power or Internet). A student’s score is based only on the operational items on the assessment.”</p> <p>Documents show this CE is MET.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State administers multiple forms of <b>academic assessments</b> within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s <b>academic content standards</b> and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>NH-101 Technical Report Volume 1</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 5 – Item Calibration and Equating (pp. 46-59)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 1 Section 5 describes how the item bank from which the items are drawn for test construction is a pre-equated item bank with all items placed onto the common scale prior to operational use. Because all items in the bank are pre-equated, all tests using those items yields scores that are comparable with respect to the intended interpretation.</p> <hr/> <p><i>NH-101 Technical Report Volume, 46</i>                      For English language arts (ELA) and mathematics, AIRCore is a pre-equated item bank with item parameters estimated under the multigroup item response theory framework.</p> <p>This CE is MET.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State administers any of its assessments in multiple versions within a subject area (e.g., online versus paper-based delivery; <b><u>or a native language version of the academic content assessment</u></b>), grade level, or school year, the State:</p>		<p><i>NH-101 Technical Report Volume 1, p. 3</i>                      The NH SAS ELA and mathematics assessments were administered to students in grades 3–8 as online assessments using an adaptive item selection algorithm (Volume 2, Appendix J) with several technology-enhanced item types such as those shown in Table 12 and Table 13. Students in each grade responded to one writing prompt, administered online. Reading and Writing item responses were combined so that the data could be scored together to form an overall ELA score.</p> <p>Page 5                      “For ELs, Spanish language versions of the NH SAS mathematics and science are available. TAs and SCs in New Hampshire are responsible for ensuring that arrangements for accommodations are made before the test administration dates. During test development, it was ensured that scores obtained on the Spanish language version or other alternative modes of administrations are comparable to those received on the standard online test adhering to the same blueprints.”</p> <p>Page 6                      Accommodations are available for students for whom there is documented need on an IEP or Section 504 Plan. Accommodations are changes in procedures or materials that ensure equitable access to instructional and assessment content and generate valid assessment results for students who need them. State-approved accommodations do not compromise the learning expectations, constructs, or grade-level standards. Such accommodations help students with a documented need in an IEP or Section 504 Plan generate valid testing results so that they can fully demonstrate what students know and are able to do. From the psychometric</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

		<p>point of view, the purpose of providing accommodations is to “increase the validity of inferences about students with disabilities by offsetting specific disability-related, construct-irrelevant impediments to performance”</p> <p>Comparability studies for these assessment versions discussed above were not submitted.</p> <p><i>NH-108 Device Comparability Study, p. 4</i>          “These results indicate that all regression coefficients on the devices are statistically equivalent, meaning that there are no statistically significant differences among the scores for students participating in the NH SAS on the different types of devices. The data support the notion that no systematic differences exist in the scores for students when administered the NH SAS on different devices.”</p>
<p><b>(CE 4.6.1)</b> Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>NH-101 Technical Report Volume 1</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 1.4 – Test Design (pp. 3-4)</li> <li>○ Section 2.1 – Test Administration (pp. 4-5)</li> <li>○ Section 2.3 – Designated Supports and Accommodations (pp. 6-10)</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <i>NH-102 Technical Report Volume 2</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 1.1 – Claim Structure (pp. 1-2)</li> <li>○ Section 1.2 – Underlying Principles Guiding Development (pp. 2-3)</li> <li>○ Section 2 – Item Development Process That Supports Validity of Claims (pp. 3-23)</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <i>NH-108 Device Comparability Study</i></li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 1 describes that Spanish (math only), braille, and print-on-request are available. These are the same tests as the online version, so by definition, the tests align to the same test blueprint as the online, English counterpart.</p> <p>Technical Report Volume 2 describes the principles of universal design which were fully adopted for the items used in the statewide assessment. Considerations for accessibility and comparability are embedded in the item development process for each item as described in the technical report.</p> <p>The device comparability study examines whether different devices used to administer the statewide assessment advantage or disadvantage students in their testing experience. The results of this study show that all scores across different devices are comparable, supporting the claim that the testing experience is unaffected by which device is used to administer the test.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

		<hr/> <p>CE 4.6.1 is MET.</p>
<p><b>(CE 4.6.2)</b> Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-101 Technical Report Volume 1</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 2.1 – Test Administration (pp. 4-5)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 1 Section 2.1 describes that print-on-demand and Braille tests use the same item parameters for student scoring and the same performance level cut scores are used. Scores are then on the same scale and have the same interpretation in terms of student performance vis-à-vis the academic standards.</p> <hr/> <p>Empirical evidence is needed for 4.6.2. For example, results of back-translations of the Spanish version; verification by experts that the print-on-demand test elicits the same types of responses as the online test; confirmation by sighted Braille readers that the Braille version is correct, and not introducing any sources of confusion or cluing.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.6.2.: Empirical evidence of comparability of different versions of the assessments.</li> </ul>		

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



**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>(CE 4.7.1)</b> Has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments), and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-101 Technical Report Volume 1</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 7 – Quality Control Procedures (pp. 71-74)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-105 Technical Report Volume 5</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 4 – Test Security Procedures (pp. 9-13)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 1 Section 7 lists the quality control procedures used for monitoring test scoring methods for the statewide assessment.</p> <p>Technical Report Volume 5 Section 4 describes the quality monitoring system used by AIR to monitor the behavior of items in real time and to detect test irregularities. All statistics computed are commonly used in the industry.</p> <hr/> <p><i>NH-101 Technical Report Volume 1, Section 7 – Quality Control Procedures (pp. 71-74)</i></p> <p><i>NH-105 Technical Report Volume 5, Section 4 – Test Security Procedures (pp. 9-13)</i></p> <p>In addition to the QC procedures, the State should have a process for reviewing the assessment system overall. For example, a TAC that reviews new technical information and addresses critical issues on at least an annual basis. CE 4.7.1 is PARTIALLY MET.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>(CE 4.7.2)</b> Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website.</li> </ul>		No evidence is provided of CE 4.7.2.
<b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system.</li> <li>• Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS

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><b>(CE 5.1.1)</b> 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-147 Standards for the Education of Students with Disabilities</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The purpose of Ed 1100, adopted by the state board of education, is to ensure that all children with disabilities have available to them a free, appropriate, public education pursuant to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), 20 U.S.C 1400, et seq., as amended by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEIA) and the implementing regulations found in 34 CFR 300 et seq. and RSA 186-C.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <a href="#"><u>NH-131 NH SAS Accommodations Guide</u></a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <a href="#"><u>New Hampshire Statewide Assessment System: Designated Supports, Accommodations, and Universal Tools Guide</u></a></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-116 Decision Making Worksheet</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Decision making working to guide IEP teams in determining participation of students with disabilities in statewide assessments.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-163 NH Assessment Requirements webpage</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ New Hampshire Department of Education Assessment homepage defines the assessment requirements for all public-school students.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-148 Guide to Special Education in NH</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-130 Letter to parents about assessment process and results</i></li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: New Hampshire has established an accessibility and accommodations framework with the goal of including all students in the statewide assessment system. This framework includes universal accessibility features that are available to all students; designated supports that are available to any student upon determination by an educator, and accommodations that are available to students with disabilities in accordance with their IEP, 504 plan, or Individual Language Plan. New Hampshire students participate under one of three general assessment options: NH SAS, NH SAS with accommodations, or NH alternate assessment for students with significant cognitive disabilities who are served under IDEA.</p> <hr/> <p>The New Hampshire Standards for the Education of Children with Disabilities were adopted on March 23, 2017 by the State Board of Education.</p> <hr/> <p><a href="#"><u>NH-131 NH SAS Accommodations Guide Details the descriptions and users for accommodations, designated supports, and universal tools.</u></a></p> <p><a href="#"><u>It is not clear, however, why students who do not have disabilities would have access to accommodations that are typically permitted only by students with disabilities.</u></a></p> <p><i>NH-116 Decision Making Worksheet</i> Guides IEP teams in determining if a student with a disability is eligible to participate in the AA-AAAS.</p> <p><i>NH-163 NH Assessment Requirements webpage</i></p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>Lists the assessments in which NH students must participate.</p> <p><i>NH-148 Guide to Special Education in NH</i>            This Guide to the NH Standards for the Education of Children with Disabilities includes the text of Chapter Ed 1100, Standards for the Education of Children with Disabilities that were adopted by the State Board of Education on March 23, 2017 and amended on August 8, 2018. It also includes supplemental text for each reference cited in the NH Standards (formerly referred to as the NH Rules). Supplemental text is included in a textbox following each reference. This Guide is not an official document; it is offered as a resource for parents, educators and others through a partnership between the NH Department of Education, Bureau of Special Education and the Parent Information Center.</p> <p><i>NH-130 Letter to parents about assessment process and results</i>            This letter is sent to all parents to inform them of the NH assessments, purpose of the assessments, and process to request exemption from the assessments.</p> <p>No evidence submitted for IEP teams related to critical elements related to AA-AAAS, other than the participation guidelines, NH 116.</p> <p>NH-147, NH-131, NH-116, NH-163, NH-148, and NH-130 set forth the state’s policies and procedures regarding inclusion of all students including those with disabilities.</p> <p>Peers request evidence that 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</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
		that decision under Title II of the ADA, as applicable, based on each student’s individual abilities and needs.
<p>If a State adopts alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and administers an alternate assessment aligned with those standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(1)(E) and (b)(2)(D), respectively, the State must:</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>(CE 5.1.2)</b> Establish guidelines for determining whether to assess a student with an AA-AAAS, including: A State definition of “students with the most significant cognitive disabilities” that addresses factors related to cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior;</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable New Hampshire’s alternate assessment is not being submitted for consideration under this Peer Review.</p>	<p>Peers believe this is applicable, because it concerns the assessment system overall. Evidence not submitted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>(CE 5.1.3)</b> Provide 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;</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable New Hampshire’s alternate assessment is not being submitted for consideration under this Peer Review.</p>	
<p><b>(CE 5.1.4)</b> Ensure that parents of students assessed with an AA-AAAS are informed that their child’s achievement will be</p>	<p>Not applicable New Hampshire’s alternate assessment is not being submitted for consideration under this 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 New Hampshire SAS**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
measured based on alternate academic achievement standards;		
<b>(CE 5.1.5)</b> 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	Not applicable New Hampshire’s alternate assessment is not being submitted for consideration under this Peer Review.	
<b>(CE 5.1.6)</b> Promote, consistent with requirements under the IDEA, the involvement and progress of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in the general education curriculum that is based on the State’s academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled; and	Not applicable. New Hampshire’s alternate assessment is not being submitted for consideration under this Peer Review.	
<b>(CE 5.1.7)</b> 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.	Not applicable New Hampshire’s alternate assessment is not being submitted for consideration under this Peer Review	
<b>(CE 5.1.8)</b> 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	Not applicable New Hampshire’s alternate assessment is not being submitted for consideration under this Peer Review.	

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
developed in accordance with 34 CFR § 200.6(d). <sup>2</sup>		
<b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5.1.1.: Evidence that 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.</li> <li>• 5.1.3.: Provide 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</li> <li>• 5.1.4.: Ensure that parents of students assessed with an AA-AAAS are informed that their child’s achievement will be measured based on alternate academic achievement standards.</li> <li>• 5.1.5.: 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</li> <li>• 5.1.6.: Promote, consistent with requirements under the IDEA, the involvement and progress of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in the general education curriculum that is based on the State’s academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled.</li> <li>• 5.1.7.: Develop, disseminate information on, and promote the use of appropriate accommodations to ensure that a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who does not take an AA-AAAS participates in academic instruction and assessments for the grade in which the student is enrolled</li> <li>• 5.1.8.: 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.</li> </ul>		

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS

**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>		<p>No evidence was submitted related to procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed with a linguistic accommodation(s).</p> <p><i>NH-153 NH State Guidance on English Learners</i> p. 3 “Students enrolled for less than one full academic year are exempt from taking the Reading/Language Arts portion of the State content assessment. However, they must Participate in the Math and Science assessments.”</p> <p><i>NH-155 NH Department of Education Statewide Assessment Exemptions and Special Consideration Form</i> p. 1</p> <p><i>NH-133 Accountability Rules.</i> pp. 6-7</p> <p><i>NH-131 NH SAS Accommodations Guide</i> p. 2 Universal Tools are available to all assessed students.</p> <p>p. 16 Indicates permissible use of bilingual/dual language word-to-word dictionary during assessments.</p> <p>p. 7 Indicates that if an English learner has a disability some displays of test content are available in available alternate languages (Spanish) or that a human translator could translate the test orally, for some portions of the test (English).</p> <p>Do ELs have access to “designated supports”?</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>(CE 5.2.1)</b> Procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed with a linguistic accommodation(s);</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-153 NH State Guidance on English Learners</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Students enrolled for less than one full academic year are exempt from taking the Reading/Language Arts portion of the State content assessment. However, they must participate in the Math and Science assessments.</li> </ul> </li>   <li>• <i>NH-131 NH SAS Accommodations Guide</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ For students whose primary language is not English and who use dual language supports in the classroom, use of a bilingual/dual language word-to-word dictionary may be appropriate. Students participate in the assessment regardless of the language. The use of this support may result in the student needing additional overall time to complete the assessment.</li> </ul> </li>   <li>• <i>NH-133 Accountability Rules</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 1<sup>st</sup> Year LEP (L)- First Year ELL students exempt from ELA exam. This is determined by ESOL submissions, data collected at SASID creation or by an approved “LEP” exemption by the state (pp 6)</li> </ul> </li>   <li>• <i>NH-155 NH Department of Education Statewide Assessment Exemptions and Special Consideration Form</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Exemption from the ELA portion only of the statewide assessment system for EL students who have been in the country 12 months or less.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>5.2.1 – NH-153 relates to accountability rules and procedures, not provision of accommodations. NH-131 only addresses the use of a bilingual dictionary, and does not describe any procedures for determining whether an accommodation for an EL is appropriate. NH-133 relates to accountability rules, not accommodations. NH-155 relates again to accountability rules, not determining appropriate linguistic accommodations. As a result, The evidence provided does not adequately address the critical element.</p> <p>Could not locate evidence of this CE 5.2.1. NOT MET</p>
<p><b>(CE 5.2.2)</b> Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-105 Technical Report Volume 5</i></li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 5 and its appendices provide a full list of the available</p>

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



**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>and assessment accommodations available for ELs;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 2 – Testing Procedures and Testing Windows (pp. 1-5)</li> <li>○ Appendix A – Test Administrator User Guide</li> <li>○ Appendix B – Designated Supports, Accommodations, and Universal Tools Guide</li> <li>○ Appendix C – Test Administration Manual</li> <li>○ Appendix D – TIDE User Guide (pp. 32-35)</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>NH-131 NH SAS Accommodations Guide</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ For students whose primary language is not English and who use dual language supports in the classroom, use of a bilingual/dual language word-to-word dictionary may be appropriate. Students participate in the assessment regardless of the language.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>accommodations including those for ELs and a description for each one. Section 2.1 discusses testing requirements specific to ELs. Appendix A includes accommodation rules and TA instructions for updating student accommodations. Appendix B provides comprehensive details on the designated supports, accommodations, and universal tools available. Appendix C provides additional information on the use and availability of accommodations. Appendix D lists test setting options for the tools available to students, including language and accommodation features.</p> <hr/> <p>5.2.2 – While the documents provided discuss available accessibility tools and accommodations, none of them address how these would be appropriate or available for ELs. In addition, the critical element includes a requirement that the EL accommodations be clearly communicated to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, and none of the documents provided address this communication requirement. Additional evidence is required for this critical element.</p> <p>Translated versions of a test do not appear among the list of available accommodations, even though there is a Spanish version of the mathematics test. PARTIALLY MET.</p>
<p><b>(CE 5.2.3)</b> 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</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>NH-131 NH SAS Accommodations Guide</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ English Language Disability-related needs affecting accessibility decisions</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <i>NH-153 NH State Guidance on English Learners</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Students enrolled for less than one full academic year are exempt from taking the Reading/Language Arts portion of the State</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: New Hampshire’s accommodations guide, EL guidance, and ESSA plan provide guidance on selecting appropriate linguistic supports for ELs and accommodations for ELs with disabilities.</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>areas until the students have achieved English language proficiency.</p>	<p>content assessment. However, they must participate in the Math and Science assessments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-109 NH Department of Education Consolidated State Plan</i> English language acquisition and language enhancement (pp 91-92)</li> </ul>	<p>5.2.3 – the evidence provided does not address the critical element</p> <p>Could not find evidence of assistance in selecting linguistic accommodations. NOT MET.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed with a linguistic accommodation(s)</li> <li>• Information assessment accommodations available for ELs, including a translated version of the test, if a translated version is available.</li> <li>• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for ELs;</li> <li>• Assistance regarding selection of appropriate linguistic accommodations for ELs, including to the extent practicable, assessments in the language most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what those students know and can do to determine the students’ mastery of skills in academic content areas until the students have achieved English language proficiency.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

**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>		
<p><b>(CE 5.3.1)</b> 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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>NH-101 Technical Report Volume 1</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 2.3 - Designated Supports and Accommodations (pp. 6-11)</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <i>NH-102 Technical Report Volume 2</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 1.2 – Underlying Principles Guiding Development (pp. 2-3)</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <i>NH-105 Technical Report Volume 5</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 2 – Testing Procedures and Testing Windows (pp. 1-5)</li> <li>○ Appendix A – Test Administrator User Guide</li> <li>○ Appendix B – Designated Supports, Accommodations, and Universal Tools Guide</li> <li>○ Appendix C – Test Administration Manual</li> <li>○ Appendix D – TIDE User Guide (pp. 32-35)</li> <li>○ Appendix E – Technical Specifications Manual for Online Testing</li> <li>○ Appendix F – System Requirements for Online Testing</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 1 Section 2.3 provides an overview of special test versions, accommodations, and designated supports for the statewide assessment, including tables of all accommodations and designated supports used by students during the testing administration and how many students used each.</p> <p>Technical Report Volume 2 describes how the principles of universal design are used from the outset to ensure that items are accessible to all test takers and that they are amenable to accommodations without altering the measured construct. All accessibility and accommodations begin with the item development process.</p> <p>Technical Report Volume 5 and its appendices provide a full list of the available accommodations and a description for each one. Appendix A includes accommodation rules and TA instructions for updating student accommodations. Appendix B provides comprehensive details on the designated supports, accommodations, and universal tools available. Appendix C provides additional information on the use and availability of accommodations. Appendix D lists test setting options for the tools available to students, including language and accommodation features. Appendices E and F contain instructions for using accommodations such as print-on-request and text-to-speech.</p> <p>AIR's test delivery platform has received WCAG 2.0 certification, which certifies that it adheres to the standards</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>that allow assistive technologies to function properly. Some security features can inhibit some assistive technologies, so an additional embedded support is offered, permissive mode, which disables security features that may interfere with correct operation with assistive technologies.</p> <hr/> <p><i>NH-101 Technical Report Volume 1, pp. 6-11</i> Table 3 through Table 11 list the number of testing sessions in which a student was provided with each accommodation or designated support during the spring 2018 test administration.</p> <p><i>NH-102 Technical Report Volume 2, p. 2</i> “Items were written with the goal that virtually every item would be accessible to all students, either by itself or in conjunction with accessibility tools, such as text-to-speech, translations, or assistive technologies. This goal is supported by the delivery of the items on AIR’s test delivery platform, which has received Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.0 AA certification, offers a wide array of accessibility tools, and is compatible with most assistive technologies.”</p> <p>The documents provided show evidence of the availability of accommodations</p> <p>There is lack of clarity about the rationale of “designated supports.” As previously noted, it’s not clear who is permitted to access these designated supports. In addition, many designated supports are also accommodations with students with disabilities. What’s the rationale for providing accommodations for students other than those with disabilities?</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>(CE 5.3.2)</b> Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>NH-102 Technical Report Volume 2</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 1.2 – Underlying Principles Guiding Development (pp. 2-3)</li> <li>○ Section 2.5.4 – Markup for Translation and Accessibility Features (p. 20)</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <i>NH-105 Technical Report Volume 5</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 2 – Testing Procedures and Testing Windows (pp. 1-5)</li> <li>○ Appendix A – Test Administrator User Guide</li> <li>○ Appendix B – Designated Supports, Accommodations, and Universal Tools Guide</li> <li>○ Appendix C – Test Administration Manual</li> <li>○ Appendix D – TIDE User Guide (pp. 32-35)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 2 Section 1.2 describes how the principles of universal design are used from the outset to ensure that items are accessible to all test takers and that they are amenable to accommodations without altering the measured construct. Section 2.5.4 further shows how accessibility and accommodations are built into the item development process.</p> <p>Technical Report Volume 5 and its appendices provide a full list of the available accommodations including those for ELs and a description for each one. Section 2.1 discusses testing requirements specific to ELs. Appendix A includes accommodation rules and TA instructions for updating student accommodations. Appendix B provides comprehensive details on the designated supports, accommodations, and universal tools available. Appendix C provides additional information on the use and availability of accommodations. Appendix D lists test setting options for the tools available to students, including language and accommodation features.</p> <hr/> <p>5.3.2 <i>NH-102 Technical Report Volume 2, p. 20</i> “Currently, AIRCore items are tagged with Spanish translations and text-to-speech, including Spanish text-to-speech.”</p> <p>There are no other accommodations available to ELs other than bi-lingual dictionaries.</p> <p>The references in the document provided do not adequately address the accommodations availability for English Learners – they address participation of ELs in the assessment system.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>Peers could not find mention of a translated version of the test. This Index (see CE 4.6) indicates there is a Spanish version of the math test. It was not clear to peers what Spanish versions of the tests exist nor how they are used, due to inconsistencies in the documents referring to translated versions of the test. In relation to this, it was not clear who could provide an oral translation of the test, when that accommodation was needed. What training would they require? Who would ensure accuracy / appropriateness of the translation?</p>
<p><b>(CE 5.3.3)</b> 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;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>NH-102 Technical Report Volume 2</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 1.2 – Underlying Principles Guiding Development (pp. 2-3)</li> <li>○ Section 2.5.4 – Markup for Translation and Accessibility Features (p. 20)</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <i>NH-101 Technical Report Volume 1</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 4.4 – Differential Item Functioning Analysis (pp. 41-44)</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <i>NH-116 Decision Making Worksheet</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Decision making working to guide IEP teams in determining participation of students with disabilities in statewide assessments.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 2 describes how the principles of universal design are used from the outset to ensure that items are accessible to all test takers and that they are amenable to accommodations without altering the measured construct. Section 2.5.4 further shows how accessibility and accommodations are built into the item development process.</p> <p>AIR annually reports the frequency of use of available accommodations to ensure valid comparisons of scores for those students receiving accommodations to scores for those students not receiving accommodations.</p> <hr/> <p>5.3.3 Evidence submitted does not support this critical element.</p> <p><i>NH-101 Technical Report Volume 1, p. 43</i> <b>For AIRCore ELA and mathematics items, DIF analysis was not conducted on the spring 2018 data.</b> The NH SAS operational item pools for spring 2018 ELA and mathematics were built with items selected from AIRCore item bank. The items in AIRCore bank went through DIF analysis by using the generalized MH procedure. However, due to the adaptive nature of New Hampshire Statewide</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>Assessment System (NH SAS) ELA and mathematics, the sample sizes of some items' response data in most subgroups are relatively small and did not reach the minimum sample size requirement of 200 responses (Zwick, 2012) so that DIF analysis was not feasible for the spring 2018 NH SAS ELA and mathematics data.</p> <p>The documents provided do not provide evidence that the accommodations are appropriate to meet students' needs, do not alter the construct, and allow for meaningful interpretation of scores.</p>
<p><b>(CE 5.3.4)</b> Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-155 NH Department of Education Statewide Assessment Exemptions and Special Consideration Form</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-116 Decision Making Worksheet</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Decision making working to guide IEP teams in determining participation of students with disabilities in statewide assessments.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-131 NH SAS Accommodations Guide</i></li> </ul>	<p>From the State's submission: Each year, students with very serious, chronic, and fragile medical or other conditions can and do participate successfully in New Hampshire's Statewide Assessment System.</p> <hr/> <p>5.3.4 – NH 155 and NH 116 address participation in/exemption from the assessment system, not consideration of exceptional accommodations.</p> <p>NH 131 addresses available accommodations, not a process of consideration of exceptional accommodations.</p> <p>The required evidence has not been provided to meet this critical element.</p>
<p><b>(CE 5.3.5)</b> Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-131 NH SAS Accommodations Guide</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-123 NH Statewide Assessment Monitoring Guide</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The NH DOE will regularly monitor test administration in local school districts by conducting annual on-site visits and/or</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>None of the documents provided address the issue of accommodations denying participation in the assessment system or any benefits from participation in the assessment.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	assessment desk audits at a sampling of local school districts in the state. The NH DOE will analyze test data to identify schools with possible test administration irregularities. (pp 8)	
<b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs.</li> <li>• The State has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations</li> <li>• Evidence that 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.</li> <li>• Evidence that the state ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment</li> </ul>		

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



STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-123 NH Statewide Assessment Monitoring Guide</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The NH DOE will regularly monitor test administration in local school districts by conducting annual on-site visits and/or assessment desk audits at a sampling of local school districts in the state. The NH DOE will analyze test data to identify schools with possible test administration irregularities. (pp 8)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-131 NH SAS Accommodations Guide</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-116 Decision Making Worksheet</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Decision making working to guide IEP teams in determining participation of students with disabilities in statewide assessments.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-167 TA User Guide</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This user guide supports personnel responsible for test administration for students participating in the New Hampshire Statewide Assessment System.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: The NH DOE is responsible for development and implementing methods to ensure public agencies comply with requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.</p> <p>CE 5.1 and 5.2 specify state’s response to ensure all students with disabilities and English learners receive appropriate assessment accommodations to meet the needs of their IEP and language plan, respectively.</p> <p>The AIR student record and test delivery systems, provide the state with a means to enter each student and monitor the proper administration of these assessments and any post assessment quality assurance.</p> <hr/> <p>None of the documents provided in this critical element address the monitoring of test administrator for special populations.</p>
<p><b>(CE 5.4.1)</b> Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-123 NH Statewide Assessment Monitoring Guide</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The NH DOE will regularly monitor test administration in local school districts by conducting annual on-site visits and/or assessment desk audits at a sampling of local school districts in the state. The NH DOE will analyze test data to identify schools with possible test administration irregularities. (pp 8)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: As described throughout Section 5 of the NH SAS Peer Review submission, New Hampshire’s <i>Accommodations Manual</i>, <i>Decision Making Worksheet</i>, and <i>Guidance on English Learner Programming</i> describe the State’s policies for accommodations. Monitoring to ensure that appropriate assessments are selected for all students with disabilities</p> <hr/> <p>5.4.1 Evidence submitted does not support this critical element. Although desk monitoring asks for information about the</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>number of accommodations administered, these do not appear to be reviewed at the student level for appropriateness.</p> <p>Statewide monitoring guide on-site monitoring procedures include the following checklist item:</p> <p>“Students are working independently or under approved accommodation requirements.”</p> <p>How does the monitor know, for every student in the class monitored,</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Any observed accommodation provided is consistent with State policy and procedures – that is, that it is an approved accommodation, and it is being provided in the way that accommodation is specified?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Those that are receiving accommodations are receiving those and only those are in the IEP / 504 plan?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Those that are not receiving accommodations are not scheduled to test with accommodations?</p> <p>It seems that a more detailed monitoring protocol is required, one which includes a review of IEPs for the group being monitored and a description of each approved accommodation.</p>
<p><b>(CE 5.4.2)</b> Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-131 NH SAS Accommodations Guide</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-152 IEP Team Facilitator Definition and Guidelines</i></li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: As described throughout Section 5 of the NH SAS Peer Review submission, New Hampshire’s <i>Accommodations Manual, Decision Making Worksheet, and Guidance on English Learner Programming</i> describe the State’s policies for</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-123 NH Statewide Assessment Monitoring Guide</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-123 NH Statewide Assessment Monitoring Guide</i></li> <li>• The New Hampshire Department of Education’s Statewide Assessment System incorporates appropriate policies and procedures to ensure test validity, reliability, and integrity. The local school districts will read, confirm understanding of, and abide by all NH DOE test security policies and procedures. Local school district principals will annually submit test security assurances to certify that they have read, understand, and will abide by all NH DOE test security policies and procedures</li> <li>• <i>NH-124 Test Security Assurances</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-139 NH Test Administration Manual</i></li> </ul>	<p>accommodations. Monitoring to ensure that appropriate assessments are selected for all students with disabilities</p> <hr/> <p>See notes under 5.4.1.</p> <p>IEP team facilitator guidelines indicates IEP facilitators can be provided “upon request”. Whose request? The State’s? Is this part of a systematic monitoring plan?</p> <p>5.4.2 is NOT MET</p>
<p><b>(CE 5.4.3)</b> Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-105 Technical Report Volume 5</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 2.2 – Testing Accommodations (pp. 3-5)</li> <li>○ Section 3.2.2 – NH SAS Training Tests (p. 9)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 5 Section 2.2 and Section 3.2.2 discuss how to use designated supports and accommodations during assessment practice activities.</p> <hr/> <p>See notes under 5.4.1.</p> <p>CE 5.4.3 is NOT MET.</p>
<p><b>(CE 5.4.4)</b> 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,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-105 Technical Report Volume 5</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 2 – Testing Procedures and Testing Windows (pp. 1-5)</li> <li>○ Section 3 – Administrator Training (pp. 5-9)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 5 Section 2 and appendices provide a full list of the available accommodations including those for ELs and a description for each one. Section 3 describes the standardized test administration procedures, including monitoring</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Appendix A – Test Administrator User Guide (pp. 4, 15-18, 46-47)</li> <li>○ Appendix B – Designated Supports, Accommodations, and Universal Tools Guide</li> <li>○ Appendix C – Test Administration Manual (pp. 4, 9-10, 15-16, 23, 32, 37-38)</li> <li>○ Appendix D – TIDE User Guide (pp. 3, 15-16, 29-35, 54)</li> <li>○ Appendix E – Technical Specifications Manual for Online Testing (pp. 13-15, 23-24, 35, 54)</li> <li>○ Appendix F – System Requirements for Online Testing (pp. 9, 12)</li> <li>○ Appendix H – User Role Permissions Guide</li> </ul>	<p>responsibilities. Appendices A, B, C, D, E, F, and H include specific instructions for implementing, monitoring, and updating designated supports and accommodations for students.</p> <hr/> <p>See notes under 5.4.1.</p> <p>CE 5.4.4 is NOT MET</p>
<p><b>(CE 5.4.5)</b> Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-105 Technical Report Volume 5</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 3 – Administrator Training (pp. 6-9)</li> <li>○ Section 4 – Test Security Procedures (pp. 9-13)</li> <li>○ Appendix A – Test Administrator User Guide (pp. 44-45)</li> <li>○ Appendix B – Designated Supports, Accommodations, and Universal Tools Guide</li> <li>○ Appendix C – Test Administration Manual</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 5 Section 3, along with Appendices A, B, and C, describe NH’s clear procedures for test administration. Section 4 focuses on the statewide plan for monitoring all tests and detecting fidelity of administration.</p> <hr/> <p>See notes under 5.4.1.</p> <p>CE 5.4.5 is NOT MET.</p>
<p><b>(CE 5.4.6)</b> Monitored for administrations of all required academic content assessments and AA-AAAS.</p>		<p>From the State’s submission: As described in CE 5.4.5, all students are held to the same general expectations for the NH SAS; therefore, the general expectations for monitoring for fidelity as described in CE 2.4 apply to all test administrations, including administrations with accommodations for students with disabilities.</p> <hr/> <p>See notes under 5.4.1.</p> <p>CE 5.4.6 is NOT MET</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Hampshire monitors test administration to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Consistent with the State's policies for accommodations;</li> <li>○ Appropriate for addressing a student's disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>○ Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>○ Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student's individualized education programs team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; and</li> <li>○ Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b><u>For academic content standards:</u></b> The State formally adopted <b><u>challenging academic achievement standards</u></b> in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for all students, specifically:</p>		
<p><b>(CE 6.1.1)</b> 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;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-103 Technical Report Volume 3</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 1.2 – Results of the ELA and Mathematics Standard Setting Workshops (pp. 2-7)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-157 Proficiency Cut Scores</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-156 Standard Setting Executive Summary</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-137 Press Release Assessment</i></li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 3 Section 1.2 provides the performance standard cut scores recommended by participants at the standard setting workshop, which were subsequently adopted by the state.</p> <hr/> <p>6.1.1 – The documents provided show the cut scores, but they do not provide evidence that the achievement standards were formally adopted.</p>
<p><b>(CE 6.1.2)</b> 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-109 NH Department of Education Consolidated State Plan</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-157 Proficiency Cut Scores</i></li> </ul> <p><i>NH-156 Standard Setting Executive Summary</i></p>	<p>From the State’s submission: New Hampshire shall administer assessments aligned to the state’s content and achievement standards in ELA and math to all students in grades 3-8. NH meets the requirements for this statute.</p> <hr/> <p>6.1.2 <i>NH-109 NH Department of Education Consolidated State Plan, p. 15</i> NH is committed to <u>continuing to adopt challenging State academic standards and provide implementation support to local education agencies (LEAs) and schools (per ESEA Section 1111(b)(1)). The adoption of such standards provides a quality roadmap and resource for LEAs as they develop their locally developed curriculum and instructional strategies to ensure all students in their schools are ready for their next learning experience.</u> The</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>NH DOE will also continue to implement challenging assessments (per ESEA Section 1111(b)(2)) aligned to its State academic standards as one measure of how well our educational system is doing on behalf of all students.</p> <p>This statement does not include academic achievement standards – rather, it references challenging State academic [content] standards.</p>
<p><b>(CE 6.1.3)</b> 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-103 Technical Report Volume 3</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 1.2 – Results of the ELA and Mathematics Standard Setting Workshops (pp. 2-7)</li> <li>○ Appendix B – ELA Performance Level Descriptors</li> <li>○ Appendix C – Mathematics Performance Level Descriptors</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-141 NH SAS ELA Performance Level Descriptors</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-142 NH SAS Math Performance Level Descriptors</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-157 Proficiency Cut Scores</i></li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 3 Section 1.2 indicates the performance standard cut scores adopted by the state. The state’s four levels of performance standards are 1) <i>Below Proficient</i>, 2) <i>Approaching Proficient</i>, 3) <i>Proficient</i>, and 4) <i>Above Proficient</i> for each subject. These standards include two levels that meet or exceed proficiency and two levels that are below proficiency. In order to differentiate among performance levels, cut points (or minimum scores) were established to differentiate among the performance levels. Appendices B and C provide the state’s Performance Level Descriptors (PLDs). PLDs for each grade describe in great detail the competencies associated with each level of performance, determined using the state’s academic content standards.</p> <hr/> <p>6.1.3 <i>NH-157 Proficiency Cut Scores</i></p> <p><i>NH-141 NH SAS ELA Performance Level Descriptors</i></p> <p><i>NH-142 NH SAS Math Performance Level Descriptors</i></p> <p>Evidence submitted addresses the 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 New Hampshire SAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities</li> <li>• Evidence that the State applies its academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply</li> </ul>		

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



STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS

**Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards.</u></b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-103 Technical Report Volume 3</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 3 – Introduction (p. 11)</li> <li>○ Section 4 – Standard Setting (pp. 11-51)</li> <li>○ Section 5.1 – Evidence of Adherence to Professional Standards and Best Practices (pp. 52-53)</li> <li>○ Appendix A – Standard Setting Panelists</li> <li>○ Appendix B – ELA Performance level Descriptors</li> <li>○ Appendix C – Mathematics Performance level Descriptors</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 3 describes the bookmark method used to set performance standards for the statewide assessment. This is an industry accepted method. Table 12 (in Section 4), as well as Appendix A, of this volume demonstrates the panelists’ appropriate qualifications. Evaluation results provide additional procedural validity.</p> <hr/> <p><i>NH-103 Technical Report Volume 3, pp. 11-53</i> AIR used a process of standard setting called the Bookmark method for ELA and mathematics. The Bookmark method is the nation’s most commonly used standard-setting procedure, and it has been used successfully to set performance-level cut scores for previous assessments in New Hampshire (p. 1).</p>
<p><b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>x No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b><u>For academic achievement standards:</u></b></p>		<p>From the State’s submission:  <i>NH-103 Technical Report Volume 3, p. 21</i>                      Description of development of PLDs, starting with CCSS. With the PLDs in place, New Hampshire state standards were reviewed to identify any standards that differed from the Common Core State Standards. In cases where the standards differed, a unique range PLD was written to represent that standard.</p> <p>Peers noted, however, there is not a definitive statement in the submitted evidence that the academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards, etc.</p>
<p><b>(CE 6.3.1)</b> 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>NH-103 Technical Report Volume 3</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 4.3.3 – Table Leaders (pp. 16-17)</li> <li>○ Section 4.3.4 – Educator Participants (pp. 17-18)</li> <li>○ Section 4.4.4 – Performance Level Descriptors (pp. 20-21)</li> <li>○ Section 4.6.4 – Review Content Standards and PLDs (p. 24)</li> <li>○ Section 4.6.5 – Write Target PLDs (p. 24)</li> <li>○ Section 4.6.7 – Training (pp. 25-26)</li> <li>○ Section 4.6.13 – Moderation and results (pp. 34-44)</li> <li>○ Appendix A – Standard Setting Panelists</li> <li>○ Appendix B – ELA Performance Level Descriptors</li> <li>○ Appendix C – Mathematics Performance Level Descriptors</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 3 describes the process used to set performance standards driven by grade level PLDs. Sections 4.3.3 and 4.3.4 provide an outline of the panelist characteristics, with more details in Appendix A. Section 4.4.4 provides the types of PLDs used and the process by which AIR developed the state’s PLDs, including a summary of external review and revision. Sections 4.6.4 and 4.6.5 indicate in greater detail how educator panelists conducted external review of the PLDs, which involved making edits and updates. Section 4.6.7 includes a description of the probability rule used for standard setting. This process results in performance level scores that express a student’s statewide assessment score relative to the state’s standards, shown in Section 4.6.13. This section also explains the empirical role of SBAC benchmark data in the process. The performance level setting and PLD writing processes for the statewide assessment were directly aligned to, and informed by, the state’s content standards.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
		<hr/> <p>Documents provided demonstrate that the State’s academic achievement standards are aligned with the State’s academic content standards (because the content standards were used as the main source for writing the PLDs). However, evidence that the academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with institute of higher education entrance requirements is missing. CE 6.3.1 is PARTIALLY MET.</p>
<p><b>(CE 6.3.2)</b> If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards (1) are aligned with the State’s challenging academic content standards for the grade in which a student is enrolled; (2) promote access to the general curriculum consistent with the IDEA; (3) reflect professional judgment as to the highest possible standards achievable for such students; (4) are designated in the IEP for each student for whom alternate academic achievement standards apply; and (5) are aligned to ensure that a student who meets the alternate academic achievement standards is on track to pursue postsecondary education or competitive integrated employment.</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	<p>Alternate assessments are not being submitted for Peer Review at this time.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<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 New Hampshire SAS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and 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 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.</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

**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><b>(CE 6.4.1)</b> The State reports to the public its assessment results on <b><u>student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level</u></b><sup>3</sup></p> <p>For <b><u>academic content assessments</u></b>, the State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the <b><u>specific academic needs of students</u></b>, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>NH-103 Technical Report Volume 3</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 1.2 – Results of the ELA and Mathematics Standard Setting Workshops (pp. 2-7)</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <i>NH-106 Technical Report Volume 6</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 1.3 – Online Reporting System (p. 4)</li> <li>○ Section 1.4 – Available Reports on the New Hampshire Online Reporting System (pp. 4-5)</li> <li>○ Section 1.6.7 – Individual Student Report (pp. 26-33)</li> <li>○ Section 1.6.8 – Interpretive Guide (pp. 33-34)</li> <li>○ Figures 1-22 – Sample reports for state, district, school, and student (pp. 7-35)</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <i>NH-157 Proficiency Cut Scores</i></li> <li>● <i>NH-156 Standard Setting Executive Summary</i></li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 3 Section 1.2 indicates the performance standard cut scores adopted by the state and shows the overall percentage of the state’s students at and above, as well as within, each performance standard.</p> <p>Technical Report Volume 6 includes report mock-ups and screenshots (Figures 1-22). Sections 1.3 and 1.4 list the availability of various reports at all levels. Data are populated into the scoring system immediately and users can then view and use those scores as described within the report. Section 1.6.7 shows how each student report provides interpretive text on the report itself. Section 1.6.8 includes the interpretive guide (Figure 21), which describes in detail all scores and their intended uses and interpretations. This section shows how language is provided to assist various audiences (e.g., educators, parents) in using the test scores to inform instruction for individual students. Educators can access the interpretive guide and other interpretive resources via AIR’s Test Information and Distribution Engine (TIDE).</p>

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
		<p><i>6.4.1</i>  <i>NH-137 Press Release</i>                      It is unclear to peers if all 11 pages were publicly released as this version includes panelists names.</p> <p><i>NH-106 Technical Report Volume 6, p. 4.</i>                      The ORS generates a set of online score reports that describes student performance for students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders. The online score reports are produced after the tests are submitted by the students, hand-scored and machine-scored, and processed into the ORS. In addition to each individual student's score report, the ORS produces aggregate score reports for teachers, schools, districts, and states. The timely accessibility of aggregate score reports helps users monitor student performance in each subject and grade area, evaluate the effectiveness of instructional strategies, and inform the adoption of strategies to improve student learning and teaching during the school year.                      Furthermore, to facilitate comparisons, each aggregate report contains the summary results for the selected aggregate unit, as well as all aggregate units above the selected aggregate.</p> <p>NH-106 provides various examples of reporting for all students and each student group at each achievement level. The examples were mock-ups, and it would be preferable to be provide evidence of actual state reporting (images or downloads from the state web site, for example</p> <p>Peers were unable to locate evidence of reporting the percent of students at each achievement level, for all students, and by student group.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>(CE 6.4.2)</b> The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its academic content assessments that:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a <b><u>student’s academic achievement</u></b>;</li> <li>○ Report the <b><u>student’s academic achievement</u></b> in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards;</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific <b><u>academic needs of students</u></b>;</li> <li>○ Are provided in an understandable and uniform format;</li> <li>○ Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian;</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NH-104 Technical Report Volume 4</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 3 – Reliability (pp. 5-29)</li> <li>○ Section 4 – Evidence of Content Validity (pp. 29-30)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-106 Technical Report Volume 6</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 1.3 – Online Reporting System (p. 4)</li> <li>○ Section 1.4 – Available Reports on the New Hampshire Online Reporting System (pp. 4-5)</li> <li>○ Section 1.6.7 – Individual Student Report (pp. 26-33)</li> <li>○ Section 1.6.8 – Interpretive Guide (pp. 33-34)</li> <li>○ Figures 1-22 – Sample reports for state, district, school, and student (pp. 7-35)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>NH-157 Proficiency Cut Scores</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-130 Letter to parents about assessment process and results</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-137 Press Release</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-154 School and District Report Card</i></li> <li>• <i>NH-156 Standard Setting Executive Summary</i></li> </ul>	<p>From the State’s submission: Technical Report Volume 4 establishes that the score reports provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s score. This validity evidence and the scores reported all have evidence supporting this claim.</p> <p>Technical Report Volume 6 includes report mock-ups and screenshots (Figures 1-22). Sections 1.3 and 1.4 list the availability of various reports at all levels. Data are populated into the scoring system immediately and users can then view and use those scores as described within the report. Section 1.6.7 shows how each student report provides interpretive text on the report itself. Section 1.6.8 includes the interpretative guide (Figure 21), which describes in detail all scores and their intended uses and interpretations. This section shows how language is provided to assist various audiences (e.g., educators, parents) in using the test scores to inform instruction for individual students. Educators can access the interpretive guide and other interpretive resources via AIR’s Test Information and Distribution Engine (TIDE).</p> <hr/> <p>6.4.2  <i>NH-106 Technical Report Volume 6, pp. 26-35</i>          Although models of ISRs are included in this document no information was provided about when these are delivered to parents/guardians. It was stated that an interpretive guide could be printed, but how parents are informed of this is unclear.          A student’s academic achievement is reported in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards and appears that the information is in an understandable and uniform format.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p><i>NH-130 Letter to parents about assessment process and results</i> Provides general information about the assessments and parents will receive results, although not stated when. Included is how a parent may request student be exempted from taking the assessment.</p> <p>Information about alternative formats, written in a language understood by parents and guardians, or orally translated is not located in the evidence submitted.</p> <p>6.4.2 – NH-106 provides sample student reports that meet most components of the critical element.</p> <p>No evidence was clearly provided to document the process and timeline for the production and delivery of student reports to parents, teachers, and principals.</p>
<p><b>(CE 6.4.3)</b> 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>NH-106 Technical Report Volume 6</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 1.3 – Online Reporting System (p. 4)</li> <li>○ Section 1.4 – Available Reports on the New Hampshire Online Reporting System (pp. 4-5)</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <i>NH-162 Assessment Results Protocols Email to Superintendents and Principals</i></li> </ul>	<p>Technical Report Volume 6 Sections 1.3 and 1.4 list the availability of various reports at all levels. Data are populated into the scoring system immediately and users can then view and use those scores as described within the report.</p> <hr/> <p>No evidence of timeline or delivery dates provided. CE 6.4.3 is NOT MET.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The State reports to the public its assessment results on <b><u>student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level</u></b></li> <li>● Reports are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian</li> <li>● Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, reports are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.</li> <li>● The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>		

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



## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS

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

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

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

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS

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

**Academic Assessments**

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

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

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

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR New Hampshire SAS**

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

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

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## August 2019 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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



STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and  
SAT Resubmission

Contents

<b>SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Critical Element 1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content Standards .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy ..</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes .....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure .....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility .....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum .....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring .....</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms .....</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment .....</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance .....</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS .....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities .....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments .....</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations .....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations .....</b>	<b>60</b>

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

..... 66

**SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND  
REPORTING.....71**

**Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All  
Students..... 71**  
**Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting ..... 74**  
**Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards  
..... 75**  
**Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting ..... 78**

**SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY  
RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS..83**

**Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally  
Recognized High School Academic Assessments ..... 83**  
**Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected,  
Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments ..... 85**  
**Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High  
School Academic Assessments with the State Assessments ..... 87**

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b><u>For academic content standards:</u></b></p> <p>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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NH-117 Section 186:8 Rule Making Authority <a href="http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/rsa/html/XV/186/186-8.htm">http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/rsa/html/XV/186/186-8.htm</a> 186:8 Rulemaking Authority; Standards; Employee Qualifications The state board of education shall adopt rules, pursuant to RSA 541-A, relative to: academic standards for all grades of the public schools.</li> <li>• NH-110 June 2010 NH State Board of Education meeting minutes NH Department of Education and the NH State Board of Education formally adopted the Common Core State Standards (6/2010)</li> <li>• NH-111 CCSSI for ELA <a href="http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CCSSI_ELA%20Standards.pdf">http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CCSSI_ELA%20Standards.pdf</a></li> <li>• NH-112 CCSSI for Math <a href="http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CCSSI_Math%20Standards.pdf">http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CCSSI_Math%20Standards.pdf</a></li> <li>• NH-120 Report from the NH Math Task Force: <a href="https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/curriculum/math/documents/math-report.pdf">https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/curriculum/math/documents/math-report.pdf</a> The goal should be to provide support so that all students can reach the college and career ready line by the end of the eleventh grade, ending their high school career with one of several high-quality mathematical courses that allows students the opportunity to deepen their understanding of the college- and career-ready standards.” (CCSS Mathematics Appendix A, 2010, p. 5) p.29 of the report of the NH State Task Force on Mathematics instruction. <b>(Rev. by State Board of Education, 10/17/12)</b> Encourage all students to complete mathematics each of their four years in high school demonstrating proficiency and substantial depth of understanding that is directly aligned to any of the four model course pathways articulated in <i>Common Core State Standards for Mathematics Appendix A : Designing High School Mathematics Courses Based on the Common Core State Standards</i>. In addition, ensure that the high school mathematics curriculum focuses on mathematical practices, quantitative literacy, and statistical reasoning so all students meet rigorous competencies in these areas that are aligned to Common Core State Standards.</li> </ul>	<p>For all assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that explicitly indicates the State applies its formally adopted content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State; OR</li> <li>• Documentation regarding the policies and procedures New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDE) uses to ensure that a local educational agency (LEA) that does not apply the State’s academic content standards meets all of the criteria in section 1111(b)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and 34 CFR 200.1 regarding such standards and that the standards apply to all students in the LEA.</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>For the entire assessment system in the State, NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that explicitly indicates the State applies its formally adopted academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State; OR</li> <li>• Documentation regarding the policies and procedures the NHDE uses to ensure that an LEA that does not apply the State’s academic content standards that meet all of the criteria in ESEA section 1111(b)(1) and 34 CFR § 200.1 regarding such standards and that the standards apply to all students in the LEA.</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>NH-117 Document states that the state board of education has the authority to adopt rules relative</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NH-119 PowerPoint Presentation shared with school administrators <a href="https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/curriculum/documents/regional-meeting.pdf">https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/curriculum/documents/regional-meeting.pdf</a> Presentation by then Commissioner to adopt Common Core State Standards the Department and State Board of Education held an evening session in June 2010. Invited guests included NH Senators and Representatives then on the Education Committees. Slide 5. NH College and Career Readiness Standards are grade level student expectations that have been “adopted” by the State Board of Education to support student success in core academics, career and technical education and other subjects. They are drawn from state and national standards and are meant to guide schools and districts as they set their student expectations, curriculum and instructional practices. Slide 3</li> <li>NH-109 p.1-5 NH Department of Education Consolidated State Plan: <a href="https://www.education.nh.gov/essa/documents/nh_state_plan_final_011918.pdf">https://www.education.nh.gov/essa/documents/nh_state_plan_final_011918.pdf</a> NH is committed to continuing to adopt challenging State academic standards and provide implementation support to local education agencies (LEAs) and schools per ESEA Section 1111(b)(1)). The adoption of such standards provides a quality roadmap and resource for LEAs they develop their locally developed curriculum and instructional strategies to ensure all students in their schools are ready for their next learning experience. The NH DOE will also continue to implement challenging assessments (per ESEA Section 1111(b)(2)) aligned to its State academic standards as one measure of how well our educational system is doing on behalf of all students. See p. 15 of the NH Department of Education Consolidated State Plan.</li> </ul>	<p>to academic standards for all grades of the public schools</p> <p>NH-110 June 2010 NH State Board of Education meeting minutes. However, only the motion is included in the minutes provided. A final vote is not included that indicates the CCSS were formally adopted. Does this motion indicate approval?</p> <p>NH-119 PowerPoint Presentation shared with School Administrators. Slide 4: “In July 2010, after six months of review, the NH State Board of Education “adopted” the Common Core State Standards.” It is not clear if there is significance with the way this is presented, i.e., “adopted”.</p> <p>There is no direct evidence that the State has formally adopted any identifiable set of academic content standards.</p> <p>Science academic content standards are not addressed in the submission.</p>
<b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the State has 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 all public-school students in the State.</li> <li>Evidence that explicitly indicates the State applies its formally adopted content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State; OR Documentation regarding the policies and procedures New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDE) uses to ensure that a local educational agency (LEA) that does not apply the State’s academic content standards meets all of the criteria in section 1111(b)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and 34 CFR 200.1 regarding such standards and that the standards apply to all students in the LEA.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b><u>For academic content standards:</u></b> The State’s challenging academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science are aligned with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NH-121 Common Core State Standards Criteria <a href="http://www.corestandards.org/assets/Criteria.pdf">http://www.corestandards.org/assets/Criteria.pdf</a></li> <li>NH-122 Common Core State Standards Report <a href="http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CommonCoreReport_6.10.pdf">http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CommonCoreReport_6.10.pdf</a> summarizing the work of the validation committee, which reviewed the standards and found them: Reflective of the core knowledge and skills in ELA and mathematics that students need to be college- and career-ready. Appropriate in terms of their level of clarity and specificity; Comparable to the expectations of other leading nations; Informed by available research or evidence; The result of processes that reflect best practices for standards development; A solid starting point for adoption of cross-state common core standards; and A sound basis for eventual development of standards-based assessments</li> <li>NH-120 Report from the NH Math Task Force: <a href="https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/curriculum/math/documents/math-report.pdf">https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/curriculum/math/documents/math-report.pdf</a> Encourage all students to complete mathematics each of their four years in high school demonstrating proficiency and substantial depth of understanding that is directly aligned to any of the four model course pathways articulated in <i>Common Core State Standards for Mathematics Appendix A : Designing High School Mathematics Courses Based on the Common Core State Standards</i>. In addition, ensure that the high school mathematics curriculum focuses on mathematical practices, quantitative literacy, and statistical reasoning so all students meet rigorous competencies in these areas that are aligned to Common Core State Standards.</li> <li>NH-118 Crosswalk with CCSSI and previous state grade level expectations: <a href="https://www.education.nh.gov/spotlight/ccss/side-by-side-english.htm">https://www.education.nh.gov/spotlight/ccss/side-by-side-english.htm</a> The New Hampshire Crosswalk was completed in response to school districts’ requests for guidance in making NH – CCSS connections. Districts/schools who aligned their curriculum documents to NH English Language Arts GLEs/GSEs, may</li> </ul>	<p>For the entire assessment system in the State, NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See evidence requested under element 1.1.</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>For the entire assessment system in the State, NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See evidence requested under element 1.1.</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>NH-122 Common Core State Standards Report, p. 3. Validation committee asserted in May 2010 that, these are “. . . Reflective of the core knowledge and skills in ELA and mathematics that students need to be college- and career-ready . . .” However, this is not specifically stated for the system of public higher education and relevant career and technical education standards in New Hampshire.</p> <p>NH-120 Math Task Force Report recommendations assert that implementation of the mathematics CCSS, and other supporting recommendations are implemented, students will meet entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of higher education in NH and relevant State career and technical education standards.</p> <p>NH-118 ELA Crosswalk with CCSSI and previous state grade level expectations: Asserts alignment among CCSS and various NH standards. However, there is not an accompanying Task Force Report similar to mathematics pertaining to criteria in 1.2.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>find this spreadsheet helpful as they begin the transition to the ELA Common Core State Standards. The document should not replace extensive K-12 articulation around CCSS content and process implementation, it is intended to assist with these on-going professional discussions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NH-132 Frequently Asked Questions Document About Standards Based Education <a href="https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/curriculum/documents/faq-ccrs.pdf">https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/curriculum/documents/faq-ccrs.pdf</a></li> </ul>	<p>However, 1.1 requires evidence of approval</p> <p>Science academic content are standards not addressed in the submission.</p>
<b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For the entire assessment system in the State, NHDE must provide: See evidence requested under element 1.1.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

**Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments**

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

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



**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

<p>eighth grade and allow the student to take the State end-of-course mathematics test instead.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Department may have approved the State, under the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority, to permit students in some LEAs to participate in a demonstration assessment system in lieu of participating in the State assessment.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 1.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>See NH SAS Peer Review notes.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

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

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

<p>language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If the State uses the flexibility for Native American language schools and programs: (1) the State provides the content assessment in the Native American language to all students in the school or program; (2) the State submits such content assessment for peer review as part of its State assessment system; and (3) the State continues to provide ELP assessments and services for ELs as required by law. The State must assess in English the students' achievement in R/LA in high school.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 1.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>See NH SAS Peer Review notes.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>If the State has developed or amended challenging <b>academic</b> standards and assessments, the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education).</li> <li>• Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas).</li> <li>• Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State.</li> <li>• Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents.</li> </ul>	<p>No evidence provided.</p>	<p>New Hampshire’s evidence indicates that its mathematics and English/language arts standards were adopted by the State in 2010. As such, this critical element does not apply.</p> <p>According to its website, NHDOE adopted science standards in November, 2016. No evidence was provided to address this critical element.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For science standards, evidence that the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with the groups required by this critical element.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to <b><u>the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards</u></b> for the grade that is being assessed and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of <b><u>the State’s grade-level academic content standards</u></b> and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results.</li> </ul>	<p>Critical Element 2.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NH-101 SAT Math Test – Alignment with State Geometry Standards Currently, 10 states utilize the SAT Math Test as part of their compliance with the <i>Every Student Succeeds Act</i>1 (ESSA). Many of these states submitted SAT Math Test documentation for the federal peer review process in 2018, including alignment reports between state’s standards and the SAT conducted by independent and external organizations. In the cases submitted to date, the peer review results indicated only a partial alignment in math and required additional evidence regarding alignment of the state standards to the SAT Math Test in section 2.1 and 3.1.</li> <li>• NH-102 Connecticut SAT School Day Alignment Study The purpose of this study was to conduct an independent evaluation of the alignment between the Connecticut SAT School Day and the Connecticut Core Standards for English</li> </ul>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A plan and a timeline to address the alignment issues identified in the existing alignment studies, particularly in mathematics.</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the assessment design measures the State’s academic content standards regarding the language domain, or presents an explanation as to why this domain was not included.</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>SAT:</p> <p>The evidence NHDE provided in 2.1.a, b, f do not include a plan and a timeline to address the alignment issues identified in the existing alignment studies, particularly in mathematics.</p> <p><b>Evidence 2.1a – User Group Geometry Review</b> – appears to minimize the importance of the alignment issues that were identified with the SAT in relation to Grade 10 Geometry. Essentially, the document argues that no plan and timeline to address alignment issues is necessary, since the test is already well-aligned. No evidence addressing the alignment issue in the area of Functions (2.1.b Connecticut Alignment Study, p 33) was located.</p> <p>NH-101 SAT Math Test – Alignment with State Geometry Standards does not address the full scope of the High School Geometry Standards in the CCSS, which include proofs and constructions, among other aspects of geometry not covered in the SAT sample items.</p> <p>The SAT Peer Review notes indicate “The available evidence does <b>not</b> justify the alignment of the SAT to the breadth and depth of the mathematics state standards or the depth of the state standards in ELA. Several of the cited reports advise states to incorporate additional assessments to complement the SAT to ensure the breadth and depth of the standards are assessed. Evidence should be provided as requested.”</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <b><u>the State’s academic content standards</u></b>, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills).</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design and intended uses and interpretations of results.</li> <li>• If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the student is enrolled and uses that determination for all reporting.</li> <li>• If the State administers a content assessment that includes</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;">Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NH-103 SAT Alignment Final Report Chapters 2&amp;3 pages 2 through 32. Two panels, one for reading, writing, and one for math, were recruited for the alignment study. The panels consisted of (a) educators from Delaware and Maine who are familiar with the CCSS and (b) national content experts. The panelists provided the alignment data during a 2-day workshop in Wilmington, Delaware August 3 – 4, 2016. Panelists’ training began with a whole group training that focused on the roles of all workshop participants and provided an overview of the alignment study and tasks. Panelists then went to their content group where they received a content-specific presentation by the College Board on their respective tests (math; reading and writing).</li> <li>• NH-104 SAT Assessment Reporting Educator Question Analysis Report showing items (content available by clicking question number), responses, difficulty,</li> </ul>	<p>NH-102 Connecticut SAT School Day Alignment Study explicitly sets aside the critical alignment question: “Because the data collection procedures were designed to model the College Board alignment study, the panelists were only asked to identify which Connecticut SAT School Day content dimension(s) were associated with each Connecticut Core Standard. Panelists were not asked to comment on the degree of match or the nature of the match. This procedure is in accordance with the College Board study. <b><u>In this study, we did not examine the extent to which the Connecticut Core Standards are covered on the Connecticut SAT School Day.</u></b>” (p.5, emphasis added)</p> <p>Beyond that, the data provided in the report furnish evidence that the SAT is NOT adequately aligned to the breadth and depth of the State’s academic content standards.</p> <p>“The English language arts panelists felt that the Connecticut Core Standards were specific and deep, while the Connecticut SAT School Day specifications were broad and could be taught at a more surface level. The panelists also raised specific concerns with the Language standards. The mathematics panel recommended additional alignment studies. The panelists commented that the SAT specifications were broad and questioned whether the individual items on the SAT were aligned to the specifications. [...] They questioned the alignment between the depth of knowledge required on the Connecticut Core Standards and the SAT specifications. Many of the Connecticut Core Standards begin with verbs such as ‘prove’ and ‘construct’ that cannot be assessed with a multiple-choice question. The panelists felt that the Smarter Balanced assessment was more complex, required deeper thinking, and was a better reflection of their classroom activities. Panelists in both groups were concerned that given the Connecticut SAT School Day may not be as deep or as broad as the Connecticut Core Standards, that Connecticut educators may begin to limit their instruction to only those topics addressed on the Connecticut SAT School Day.” (p.31)</p> <p>NH-103 SAT Alignment Final Report (2.1.d SAT Final Report-Revised) could not be located.</p>
---	---	--

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

<p>portfolios, such assessment may be partially administered through a portfolio but may not be <i>entirely</i> administered through a portfolio.</p>	<p>and related standards from the state specific mapping.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NH-146 DLM Alignment of Dynamic Learning Maps Operational Items to Grade-Level Content Standards The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships between the content structures in the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) year-end assessment system and the pools of assessment items. Findings from this study inform the degree to which assessment results support claims about what students know and can do in relation to grade-level CCR standards.p.9 <a href="https://secure.dynamiclearningmaps.org/sites/default/files/documents/resources/TAC_Resources/External_Alignment_Study_YE.pdf">https://secure.dynamiclearningmaps.org/sites/default/files/documents/resources/TAC_Resources/External_Alignment_Study_YE.pdf</a></li> <li>NH-147 2015 Year-End Model Standard Setting: English Language Arts and Mathematics A standard setting approach was implemented to classify student performance into four different levels: emerging, approaching the target, at target, and advanced.p.7 <a href="https://secure.dynamiclearningmaps.org/sites/default/files/documents/resources/ye/Standard_Setting_Tech_Report_YE.pdf">https://secure.dynamiclearningmaps.org/sites/default/files/documents/resources/ye/Standard_Setting_Tech_Report_YE.pdf</a></li> </ul>	<p>NH-104 SAT Assessment Reporting shows a list of related state academic standards, for each area on the assessment. This does not constitute evidence of alignment.</p> <p>DLM:</p> <p>NH-146 DLM identifies several relevant dimensions of alignment, an alignment study methodology, and a model for quantifying rating error. The executive summary reports that on several dimensions of alignment, the confidence intervals are at or very near 100%. However, on some dimensions, alignment is lower, particularly for content centrality. The reasons for this mismatch are not clear, nor what the DLM system will do (or has done) to address them.</p> <p>Science content standards are not addressed for AA-AAAS.</p> <p>NH-146, p. 32, Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Since this study used a sample of items from the pools and the results are intended to provide evidence of alignment for the overall system, it is recommended that a future study examine the content alignment at the student-level.</li> <li>DLM can review the comments that panelists made to develop strategies for future content and item development (in Appendix A).</li> <li>While this study focused on the Target Level Node and vertical articulation of nodes in the linkage levels, future studies might consider examining the direct relationship between associated learning map nodes and CCR standards.</li> </ul> <p>DLM should provide a plan and timeline to address these recommendations.</p> <p>The DLM Peer Review notes from June 2016 indicate the following:</p> <p>“DLM should explain why some CCSS ELA domains are not directly addressed (Language) or are not addressed at all (Speaking/Listening).”</p> <p>Peers could not locate any evidence supplied by New Hampshire that directly references this deficiency. As such, NH has still not met the requirement for DLM that was requested in the NH7 letter from US ED.</p>
---	--	---

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

--	--	--

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



## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission

### Section 2.1 Summary Statement

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- For SAT: A plan and a timeline to address the alignment issues identified in the existing alignment studies, particularly in mathematics.
- For High School and Alternate, ELA and MA: A plan and a timeline to address the alignment issues identified in alignment studies conducted to date.
- For High School and Alternate, ELA and MA: Alignment results at the student level – that is, at the level of the test form that a student receives.
- For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), NHDE must provide: Evidence that the assessment design measures the State’s academic content standards regarding the language domain, or presents an explanation as to why this domain was not included.

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

**Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess student achievement based on the <b>State’s academic content standards</b> in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</li> </ul>		<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</li> <li>Evidence of guidelines for item writers with respect to fairness in the development and review process.</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>The SAT Peer Review team noted deficiencies in the evidence provided to address this critical element.</p> <p>No Evidence Submitted in State Submission.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For the SAT: Evidence of reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State's academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</li> <li>For the SAT: Evidence of guidelines for item writers with respect to fairness in the development and review process.</li> <li>See SAT Peer Review summary statement.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission

**Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>Has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NH-105 SAT School Day Coordinator Manual <a href="https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/accountability/documents/digital_sat_coordinator_manual.pdf">https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/accountability/documents/digital_sat_coordinator_manual.pdf</a> <a href="https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/accountability/documents/sat_coordinator_manual.pdf">https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/accountability/documents/sat_coordinator_manual.pdf</a></li> <li>NH-106 SAT School Day Accommodated Testing Manual <a href="https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/accountability/documents/digital_sat_accommodated_manual.pdf">https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/accountability/documents/digital_sat_accommodated_manual.pdf</a> <a href="https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/accountability/documents/sat_accommodated_testing_manual.pdf">https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/accountability/documents/sat_accommodated_testing_manual.pdf</a></li> <li>NH-107 Online Test Day Training Script</li> <li>NH-148 Assessment Coordinator Manual for Dynamic Learning Maps YE This document supports the Assessment Coordinator in preparing schools for the Dynamic Learning Maps(DLM) assessment. P.5 <a href="https://secure.dynamiclearningmaps.org/sites/default/files/documents/Peer_Review/acm_ye_2014-15.pdf">https://secure.dynamiclearningmaps.org/sites/default/files/documents/Peer_Review/acm_ye_2014-15.pdf</a></li> <li>NH-149 Test Administrator Manual for DLM YE model The Test Administrator Manual serves as a comprehensive resource in planning for preparing for and administering the DLM assessments. It</li> </ul>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the SEA has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, specifically administration with the read-aloud and scribing accommodations.</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>For R/LA and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (Smarter Balanced), and for R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of a comprehensive contingency plan to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>SAT:</p> <p>NHDE did not submit verification that training was implemented as described in SAT documents.</p> <p>Other documents submitted contain standardized procedures and directions for administering these accommodations. However no verification of NHDE training.</p> <p><b>NH-106 (also apparently identified as 2.3a SAT-School Day Accommodated Testing Manual State-Provided)</b> provides evidence of standardized procedures regarding read-aloud and scribing accommodations.</p> <p>The SAT Peer Review notes indicate that states must submit verification that training was implemented as described in SAT documents, although this requirement did not seem to be enumerated in the NH Letter.</p> <p>Guidelines for transcribing answers begin on p.16 of the Accommodated SAT TAM.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>	<p>covers key responsibilities, policies, practices and procedures for Educator Portal and Kite. P.5  <a href="https://secure.dynamiclearningmaps.org/sites/default/files/documents/Peer_Review/tam_ye_2014-15.pdf">https://secure.dynamiclearningmaps.org/sites/default/files/documents/Peer_Review/tam_ye_2014-15.pdf</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NH-150 Technical Liaison Manual for DLM YE model  <a href="https://secure.dynamiclearningmaps.org/sites/default/files/documents/Peer_Review/technical_liaison_manual_2014-15.pdf">https://secure.dynamiclearningmaps.org/sites/default/files/documents/Peer_Review/technical_liaison_manual_2014-15.pdf</a></li> </ul>	<p>Guidelines for read-aloud are covered under “script 6” of the same TAM.</p> <p>For DLM:</p> <p>NH-149 Test Administrator Manual for DLM YE          NH-150 Technical Liaison Manual for DLM YE model          Neither of these documents address outage contingency plans.</p> <p>DLM TCM, TAM, and TLM cover the rest of this CE for DLM.</p>
---	---	---

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission

### Section 2.3 Summary Statement

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- For the SAT: State must submit verification that it has communicated to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, specifically administration with the read-aloud and scribing accommodations.
- For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), NHDE must provide: Evidence of a comprehensive contingency plan to address possible technology challenges during test administration

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

**Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. Monitoring of test administration should be demonstrated for all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS.	See NH SAS Peer Review notes.	See NH SAS Peer Review notes.
<b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement</b>		
See NH SAS Peer Review notes.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission

**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
------------------	--	--

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

<p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> <li>• Application of test security procedures to all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NH-123 NH Statewide Assessment Monitoring Guide <a href="https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/assessment/documents/nh_statewide_assessment_monitoring_guide_final_032019.pdf">https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/assessment/documents/nh_statewide_assessment_monitoring_guide_final_032019.pdf</a></li> <li>• NH-124 NH Statewide Assessment Test Security Assurances signed by test administrators and building principals <a href="https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/assessment/documents/test_security_assurances_2019.pdf">https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/assessment/documents/test_security_assurances_2019.pdf</a></li> <li>• NH-105 SAT School Day Coordinator Manual <a href="https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/accountability/documents/digital_sat_coordinator_manual.pdf">https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/accountability/documents/digital_sat_coordinator_manual.pdf</a>  <a href="https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/accountability/documents/sat_coordinator_manual.pdf">https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/accountability/documents/sat_coordinator_manual.pdf</a></li> <li>• NH-148 Assessment Coordinator Manual for Dynamic Learning Maps YE This document supports the Assessment Coordinator in preparing schools for the Dynamic Learning Maps(DLM) assessment. P.5  <a href="https://secure.dynamiclearningmaps.org/sites/default/files/documents/Peer_Review/acm_ye_2014-15.pdf">https://secure.dynamiclearningmaps.org/sites/default/files/documents/Peer_Review/acm_ye_2014-15.pdf</a></li> <li>• NH-149 Test Administrator Manual for DLM YE model The Test Administrator Manual serves as a</li> </ul>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of NHDE policies and procedures for remediation following test security incidents involving the SAT assessments; and</li> <li>• Evidence of NHDE policies and procedures for prevention of assessment irregularities, specifically annual training requirements for test security policies and procedures, including how NHDE ensures that all test coordinators receive training.</li> </ul> <hr/> <p><b>NH 123</b> details policies related to remediation following test security incidents and for prevention of assessment irregularities. <b>Page 9:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. After Testing Window:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyze data to detect and analyze test administration irregularities.</li> <li>• Respond to and investigate possible test administration irregularities.</li> <li>• Strengthen prevention and handling of test administration irregularities, including formal processes for:                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ timely reporting by local districts</li> <li>○ timely resolution by NH DOE</li> <li>○ Provide documentation of corrective action recommendations and resolution.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p>However, it is not specifically stated that the SAT is included in these assessment policies. The one exception is the “Assessment Security Notice” on p.20.</p> <p><b>NH 123 Page 10</b> NH DOE Training The NH DOE will provide an annual test security and administration webinar.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The webinar will be available on demand.</li> <li>• All local school district principals and/or test site coordinators must participate in the webinar.</li> <li>• Attendance will be recorded by the NH DOE.</li> <li>• The webinar will include targeted methods to prevent, detect, investigate and follow through on reports of cheating, breaches of security or other improper behavior; in turn, local school principals or</li> </ul>
---	--	---

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



STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission

	<p>comprehensive resource in planning for preparing for and administering the DLM assessments. It covers key responsibilities, policies, practices and procedures for Educator Portal and Kite. P.5</p> <p><a href="https://secure.dynamiclearningmaps.org/sites/default/files/documents/Peer_Review/tam_ye_2014-15.pdf">https://secure.dynamiclearningmaps.org/sites/default/files/documents/Peer_Review/tam_ye_2014-15.pdf</a></p>	<p>test site coordinators will train test administrators and monitor at the local level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The webinar will provide specific examples of allowed and prohibited behavior by test monitors and students.</li> <li>• It will describe and illustrate active monitoring.</li> </ul> <p>However, it is not explicitly for the SAT.</p> <p><b>No evidence noted</b> of NHDE policies and procedures for remediation following test security incidents involving the SAT assessments.</p> <p>Could not locate: For the SAT administrations, evidence of NHDE policies and procedures for prevention of assessment irregularities, specifically annual training requirements for test security policies and procedures, including how NHDE ensures that all test coordinators receive training.</p> <hr/>
--	--	---

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission

### Section 2.5 Summary Statement

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- For the SAT: Evidence of NHDE policies and procedures for remediation following test security incidents involving the SAT assessments.
- For the SAT: Evidence of NHDE policies and procedures for prevention of assessment irregularities, specifically annual training requirements for test security policies and procedures, including how NHDE ensures that all test coordinators receive training

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

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

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

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

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. The State’s validity evidence includes evidence that:</p> <p><b><u>The State’s academic assessments</u></b> measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), , balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> <li>• Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards;</li> <li>• If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards and administers alternate assessments aligned with those standards, the assessments show adequate alignment to the State’s academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content</li> </ul>	<p>Critical Element 3.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NH-101 SAT Math Test – Alignment with State Geometry Standards Currently, 10 states utilize the SAT Math Test as part of their compliance with the <i>Every Student Succeeds Act</i>1 (ESSA). Many of these states submitted SAT Math Test documentation for the federal peer review process in 2018, including alignment reports between state’s standards and the SAT conducted by independent and external organizations. In the cases submitted to date, the peer review results indicated only a partial alignment in math and required additional evidence regarding alignment of the state standards to the SAT Math Test in section 2.1 and 3.1.</li> <li>• NH-102 Connecticut SAT School Day Alignment Study The purpose of this study was to conduct an independent evaluation of the alignment between the Connecticut SAT School Day and the Connecticut Core Standards for English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics.</li> <li>• NH-103 SAT Alignment Final Report Chapters 2&amp;3 pages 2 through 32. Two panels, one for reading, writing, and one for math, were recruited for the alignment study. The panels consisted of (a) educators from Delaware and Maine who are familiar with the CCSS and (b) national content experts.</li> </ul>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence requested in critical element 2.1 will satisfy this critical element.</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>The evidence NHDE provided in 2.1.a, b, f do not include a plan and a timeline to address the alignment issues identified in the existing alignment studies, particularly in mathematics.</p> <p>SAT Peer Review notes refer to comments for section 2.1.</p> <p>See notes and summary statements from CE 2.1.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

<p>and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p>The panelists provided the alignment data during a 2-day workshop in Wilmington, Delaware August 3 – 4, 2016. Panelists’ training began with a whole group training that focused on the roles of all workshop participants and provided an overview of the alignment study and tasks. Panelists then went to their content group where they received a content-specific presentation by the College Board on their respective tests (math; reading and writing).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NH-104 SAT Assessment Reporting Educator Question Analysis Report showing items (content available by clicking question number), responses, difficulty, and related standards from the state specific mapping.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For SAT: Evidence requested in critical element 2.1 will satisfy this critical element.</li> <li>• Refer to SAT Peer Review summary statement.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap: <b><u>the intended cognitive processes</u></b> appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>Critical Element 3.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NH-108 Summary of SAT Cognitive Lab Report</li> </ul> <p>The College Board has partnered with HumRRO to conduct a Cognitive Lab Study of the SAT. The purpose of this research study is to learn more about how test takers solve questions (i.e., test items) on the Evidence-based Reading and Writing (ERW) and Math sections of the SAT test. p.2</p>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for high school as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>Please refer to notes from SAT Peer Review and the HumRRO study.</p> <p>NH-108 Summary of SAT Cognitive Lab Report NH-108 is a Device Comparability Report</p> <p>NH 107 is a Cognitive Lab conducted by AIR</p> <p>SAT Peer Review notes indicate that the evidence is insufficient to determine whether the SAT evokes the intended cognitive processes. A final report should be submitted when it is complete</p> <p>“Summary of SAT Cognitive Lab Report” cited in Index but not among evidence documents.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For the SAT: Validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for high school as represented in the State's academic content standards.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s <b><u>academic content standards</u></b>.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NH-113 Student Score Report Example Report with annotation on how to interpret the student score</li> <li>• NH-114 Skills Insight for SAT Suite Skills Insight for the SAT Suite demonstrates how the SAT Suite of Assessments is linked to the knowledge and skills taught in the classroom. Educators can use Skills Insight to see the academic skills typically mastered at each score band and develop strategies for improvement. It also provides actionable suggestions for improving skills that help students gain additional practice.</li> </ul>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>NH 113 - 115 are letters from USED.</p> <p>(Peers realize there was a crosswalk of document identifiers and found the documents the State was referring to.)</p> <p>SAT Peer Review notes indicate that the evidence submitted provides evidence of the SAT predictiveness of college readiness, but it does not provide any information on how well students have mastered the state Standards. There is limited evidence that “State Standards” are being measured by the assessment but the overall notion of college and career readiness is. This is a critical point because this assessment can measure college and career readiness but it is not measuring and providing information on how well students mastered the state standards. As the evidence in this peer review has indicated, these are indeed two separate but equally important measurable aspects that have not been integrated into the assessment.</p> <p>The evidence submitted (Sample Student Score Report, SAT Skill Insight Guide) does not constitute validity evidence “that the scoring and reporting structures of [the State’s] assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.”</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission

### Section 3.3 Summary Statement

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- For the SAT: Scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State's academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.

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



**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.	N/A	N/A
<b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. If the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, measures of reliability for the assessment overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of <b><u>a student’s academic achievement.</u></b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NH-115 SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report This report summarizes the performance of 395 Delaware test takers who took the Spring 2018 SAT School Day administration with accommodations.</li> <li>• NH-125 SAT Score Reliability Estimates by Subgroup-Michigan The reliability estimates are based on 122,998 test takers who took the SAT with Essay. For the multiple-choice sections, raw score internal consistency reliabilities were calculated using Kuder-Richardson 20 (KR20) and stratified coefficient alpha. For the essay dimension scores and their sum, reliabilities were computed by updating test-retest reliabilities obtained from a special study. Race/ethnicity and gender designations are self-reported by the test taker. Those students classified as ELL were designated as Limited English Proficient in their school districts at the time of testing. Students classified as accommodated received some accommodation in reading, mathematics, or writing on the SAT. p. 2</li> <li>• NH-127 SAT Score Reliability Estimates by Subgroup-Connecticut The tables report on the four master forms administered to at least 100 test takers in the state of Connecticut. For the SAT Suite of Assessments, the compound binomial model is used to calculate reliability for scale scores.p.2</li> </ul>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate reliability evidence for students with disabilities, English learners, and students who received accommodations.</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of monitoring and refinement of the diagnostic classification models from subsequent test administrations.</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>For SAT:</p> <p>See SAT Peer Review Notes</p> <p>SAT Peer Review notes indicate that evidence provided is state-specific, and therefore data from other states cannot be evaluated for NH.</p> <p>The Delaware SAT Admin report does not appear to contain the requested information.</p> <p>The SAT Score Reliability Estimates by Subgroup – Michigan report shows systematically lower ELA and Math reliabilities for English Learners and those receiving accommodated forms. The reliabilities in the low to mid .7s for ELs is especially concerning, especially the large difference in Math test reliability for the total population (.92) versus ELs only (.73).</p> <p>The SAT Score Reliability Estimates by Subgroup – Connecticut report raises serious questions about the precision of the SAT for SWDs, with reliability estimates as low as 0.59 (SAT Math, Form 4).</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p><b><u>DLM</u></b></p> <p>NH-146 DLM Alignment of Dynamic Learning Maps Operational Items to Grade-Level Content Standards</p> <p>NH-147 2015 Year-End Model Standard Setting:</p> <p>NH-151 Accessibility Manual for DLM YE</p> <p>The documents submitted do not provide evidence for this critical element.</p>
<b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the SAT: Evidence of adequate reliability for students with disabilities, English learners, and students who received accommodations, for the State of New Hampshire.</li> <li>• See SAT Peer Review Notes summary statement.</li> <li>• For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), NHDE must provide: Evidence of monitoring and refinement of the diagnostic classification models from subsequent test administrations</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

**Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><i>For all State academic assessments</i>, assessments should be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (see definition<sup>4</sup>).</p> <p><b>For academic content assessments</b>, the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in their design, development and analysis.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NH-128 SAT Suite Universal Design Principles All content area tests are developed to elicit from students work worth doing through questions that resemble the best classroom practices. This is accomplished by working with a multitude of K–12 teachers and postsecondary instructors of entry-level courses across the United States.p.3</li> <li>NH-146 DLM Alignment of Dynamic Learning Maps Operational Items to Grade-Level Content Standards The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships between the content structures in the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) year-end assessment system and the pools of assessment items. Findings from this study inform the degree to which assessment results support claims about what students know and can do in relation to grade-level CCR standards.p.9 <a href="https://secure.dynamiclearningmaps.org/sites/default/files/documents/resources/TAC_Resources/External_Alignment_Study_YE.pdf">https://secure.dynamiclearningmaps.org/sites/default/files/documents/resources/TAC_Resources/External_Alignment_Study_YE.pdf</a></li> <li>NH-147 2015 Year-End Model Standard Setting: English Language Arts and Mathematics A standard setting approach was implemented to classify student performance into four different levels: emerging, approaching the target, at target, and advanced.p.7 <a href="https://secure.dynamiclearningmaps.org/sites/default/files/documents/resources/ye/Standard_Setting_Tech_Report_YE.pdf">https://secure.dynamiclearningmaps.org/sites/default/files/documents/resources/ye/Standard_Setting_Tech_Report_YE.pdf</a></li> </ul>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the assessment is accessible and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments, including data related to students with disabilities and English learners.</li> <li>Evidence that the State supports and enhances the accessibility of the assessments through appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities and, to the extent practicable, by incorporating principles of universal design for learning.</li> </ul> <p>For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of the development and selection of reading passages that includes information about steps that test developers have taken to ensure reading passages are accessible to students with significant cognitive disabilities.</li> <li>Evidence of the development and selection and/or creation of graphic components in the assessment (e.g., drawn or photographed images) that includes information about steps that test developers have taken to ensure passages from general grade-level texts are made accessible to students with significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul> <p>For SAT:</p> <p>See SAT Peer Review Notes</p> <p>EL and SWD DIF analysis needed, given low reliability indices for these groups.</p> <p>Could not locate, for SAT: Evidence of NHDE policies and procedures for prevention of assessment irregularities, specifically annual training requirements</p>

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NH-151 Accessibility Manual for DLM YE Informed decision making regarding accessibility is critical to ensure successful and effective participation in the assessment.p.5.  <a href="https://secure.dynamiclearningmaps.org/sites/default/files/documents/Peer_Review/accessiblity_manual_2014-15.pdf">https://secure.dynamiclearningmaps.org/sites/default/files/documents/Peer_Review/accessiblity_manual_2014-15.pdf</a></li> </ul>	<p>for test security policies and procedures, including how NHDE ensures that all test coordinators receive training</p> <p><b><u>For DLM:</u></b></p> <p>NH-151 Accessibility Manual for DLM YE p. 6 Describes various processes used to support accessibility, including item specifications, use of UDL principles, and completion of technology Access Profile (PNP) so that students can access the test items online using various accessibility features.</p> <p>NH-146 DLM and NH-147 DLM do not provide any evidence that address this CE. Although NH-151 provides some generic statements about item specifications and UDL principles, nothing in that document provides evidence that specifically addresses the ask from US ED in the nh7 letter. NH has not met this CE for DLM.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For SAT: Evidence that the assessment is accessible and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments, including data related to students with disabilities and English learners.</li> <li>For SAT: Evidence that the State supports and enhances the accessibility of the assessments through appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities and, to the extent practicable, by incorporating principles of universal design for learning.</li> <li>See SAT Peer Review Notes summary statement.</li> <li>For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), NHDE must provide:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of the development and selection of reading passages that includes information about steps that test developers have taken to ensure reading passages are accessible to students with significant cognitive disabilities.</li> <li>Evidence of the development and selection and/or creation of graphic components in the assessment (e.g., drawn or photographed images) that includes information about steps that test developers have taken to ensure passages from general grade-level texts are made accessible to students with significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

**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 <b>academic assessments</b> , including performance for high- and low-achieving students.	N/A	N/A
<b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s <b><u>academic achievement standards</u></b>.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NH-152 Dynamic Learning Maps Preliminary Report on Standard Setting <a href="https://secure.dynamiclearningmaps.org/sites/default/files/documents/resources/ye/ss_initial_results_YEbrief.pdf">https://secure.dynamiclearningmaps.org/sites/default/files/documents/resources/ye/ss_initial_results_YEbrief.pdf</a></li> <li>NH-147 2015 Year-End Model Standard Setting: English Language Arts and Mathematics A standard setting approach was implemented to classify student performance into four different levels: emerging, approaching the target, at target, and advanced.p.7 <a href="https://secure.dynamiclearningmaps.org/sites/default/files/documents/resources/ye/Standard_Setting_Tech_Report_YE.pdf">https://secure.dynamiclearningmaps.org/sites/default/files/documents/resources/ye/Standard_Setting_Tech_Report_YE.pdf</a></li> </ul>	<p>For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of monitoring procedures used for scoring DLM-YE writing items, including measures of inter-rater reliability.</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>These documents relate to standard setting, not monitoring procedures used for scoring DLM YE writing items.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), NHDE must provide: Evidence of monitoring procedures used for scoring DLM-YE writing items, including measures of inter-rater reliability. See letter from US ED (“nh7” with the attached 2016 Peer Review notes from the DLM peer review) for more details.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms**

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

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



**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State administers any of its assessments in multiple versions within a subject area (e.g., online versus paper-based delivery; <b><u>or a native language version of the academic content assessment</u></b>), grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>• Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments), and</li> <li>Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NH-129 SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report This report provides an analysis of the quality of the test forms administered to at least 100 test takers in the state of Connecticut. Psychometric and statistical summaries related to the moments, intercorrelations, reliability and standard error of measurement (SEM), item completion rates, form speediness, differential item functioning, and classification accuracy and consistency are also included.p.2</li> <li>NH-130 SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report- Delaware This report summarizes the performance of 9,282 Delaware test takers who took the Spring 2018 SAT School Day administration.p.2</li> <li>NH-131 Connecticut SAT School Day 2018 Feedback Meeting – May 18, 2018</li> </ul>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of a system for monitoring and 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.</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>SAT:</p> <p>See SAT Peer Review Notes</p> <p>SAT Peer Review notes indicate that additional evidence is required.</p> <p>The documentation shows that the SAT has conducted state level analyses, but how these data are used for improving the quality of the assessment system is unclear. Are these results reviewed by the State? By its TAC? How often?</p> <p>Also, all the evidence provide pertains to other states, not NH.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For the SAT: Evidence that New Hampshire has a system for monitoring and 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.</li> <li>See SAT Peer Review Notes summary statement.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system. Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, the placement team under Section 504, or the individual or team designated by a district to make that decision under Title II of the ADA, as applicable, based on each student’s individual abilities and needs.</p> <p>If a State adopts alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and administers an alternate assessment aligned with those standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(1)(E) and (b)(2)(D), respectively, the State must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish guidelines for determining whether to assess a student with an AA-AAAS, including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A State definition of “students with the most significant cognitive disabilities” that addresses factors related to cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NH 133 SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Supplement: Test Administration Process In keeping with best practices and the AERA/APA/NCME Standards, the College Board has an established procedure that ensures the assessments in the SAT Suite are administered to all test takers in a fair, equitable, and standardized manner (AERA, APA, and NCME, 2014). p.4.</li> <li>• NH-116 Decision Making Worksheet for Participation of students with Disabilities in Statewide Assessment <a href="https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/assessment/alt_assess/documents/decision_making_worksheet_2018-2019.pdf">https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/assessment/alt_assess/documents/decision_making_worksheet_2018-2019.pdf</a></li> <li>• NH-140 NH Guide to The NH Standards for the Education of Students with Disabilities <a href="https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/special_ed/documents/pic_guide_ed1100.pdf">https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/special_ed/documents/pic_guide_ed1100.pdf</a> <b>186-C:1 Policy</b> and Purpose [adapted from IDEA]. – It is hereby declared to be the policy of the state that: I. All children in New Hampshire be provided with equal educational opportunities. It is the purpose of this chapter to ensure that all children with disabilities have available to them a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive</li> </ul>	<p>For all assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence explaining any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards.</li> <li>• Documentation that the State informs parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy.</li> <li>• Documentation of procedures to ensure that the State’s implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes students’ access to the general curriculum.</li> </ul> <p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the State’s process for ensuring that students with disabilities are included in the SAT, including clear guidelines for accommodations and the receipt of college-reportable scores.</li> <li>• Evidence that children with disabilities are not denied the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>SAT:</p> <p>NH-140, p. 2 states that all grade eleven students will take the SAT, however, there are no guidelines for accommodations and the receipt of college-reportable scores.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide information for IEP Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provides a clear explanation of the differences between assessments aligned with grade-level academic achievement standards and those aligned with alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student's education resulting from taking an AA-AAAS, such as how participation in such assessments may delay or otherwise affect the student from completing the requirements for a regular high school diploma;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Ensure that parents of students assessed with an AA-AAAS are informed that their child's achievement will be measured based on alternate academic achievement standards;</li> <li>• Not preclude a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who takes an AA-AAAS from attempting to complete the requirements for a regular high school diploma; and</li> <li>• Promote, consistent with requirements under the IDEA, the involvement and progress of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in the general education curriculum that is based on the State's academic content</li> </ul>	<p>environment that emphasizes special education and related services designed to meet their unique needs and prepare them for further education, employment, and independent living. II. The rights of children with disabilities and parents of such children are protected. III. Local school districts, the department of education, and other public agencies or approved programs provide for the education of all children with disabilities. P.10</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NH-139 Standards for the Education of Students with Disabilities <a href="http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/rules/state_agencies/ed1100.html">http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/rules/state_agencies/ed1100.html</a> Ed 1101.01 <u>Purpose</u>. The purpose of Ed 1100, adopted by the state board of education, is to ensure that all children with disabilities have available to them a free, appropriate, public education pursuant to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), 20 U.S.C 1400, et seq., as amended by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEIA) and the implementing regulations found in 34 CFR 300 et seq. and RSA 186-C.</li> <li>• NH-116 Decision Making Worksheet for Participation of students with Disabilities in Statewide Assessment <a href="https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/assessment/alt_assess/documents/decision_making_worksheet_2018-2019.pdf">https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/assessment/alt_assess/documents/decision_making_worksheet_2018-2019.pdf</a></li> </ul>	<p>SAT Peer Review notes indicate that additional evidence is required.</p> <p>The documents referenced in the State submission Index do not provide the evidence requested of peers for the SAT.</p> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <p>The documents submitted to not provide evidence for this critical element.</p> <p>NH-116 Decision Making Worksheet for Participation of students with Disabilities in Statewide Assessment; pertains to participation in AA-AAAS</p> <p>Several of the evidence documents are mislabeled, i.e., NH 141 and 142</p> <p>None of the documentation addresses “evidence explaining the effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards.”</p> <p>The DLM documentation for parents does not “inform parents of the students with the most significant cognitive disabilities that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or state policy.”</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop, disseminate information on, and promote the use of appropriate accommodations to ensure that a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who does not take an AA-AAAS participates in academic instruction and assessments for the grade in which the student is enrolled.</li> <li>The State has in place and monitors implementation of guidelines for IEP teams to apply in determining, on a case-by-case basis, which students with the most significant cognitive disabilities will be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, if applicable. Such guidelines must be developed in accordance with 34 CFR § 200.6(d).<sup>5</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/assessment/alt_assess/documents/dlm_parent_brochure.pdf">NH-141 DLM Brochure for Parents</a> <a href="https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/assessment/alt_assess/documents/dlm_parent_brochure.pdf">https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/assessment/alt_assess/documents/dlm_parent_brochure.pdf</a></li> <li>NH-142 Parent interpretation of the DLM Score Report Guide <a href="https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/assessment/alt_assess/documents/parent_interpretive_guide.pdf">https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/assessment/alt_assess/documents/parent_interpretive_guide.pdf</a></li> </ul>	

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence explaining any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards.</li> <li>• Documentation that the State informs parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy.</li> <li>• Documentation of procedures to ensure that the State’s implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes students’ access to the general curriculum.</li> <li>• For the SAT: Evidence of the State’s process for ensuring that students with disabilities are included in the SAT, including clear guidelines for accommodations and the receipt of college-reportable scores.</li> <li>• For the SAT: Evidence that children with disabilities are not denied the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.</li> <li>• See SAT Peer Review Notes summary statement.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all ELs in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s academic content assessments and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed with a linguistic accommodation(s);</li> <li>• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for ELs;</li> <li>• Assistance regarding selection of appropriate linguistic accommodations for ELs, including to the extent practicable, assessments in the language most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what those students know and can do to determine the students’ mastery of skills in academic content areas until the students have achieved English language proficiency.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NH-145 NH Assessment Calendar <a href="https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/assessment/documents/2018_19_nh_assessment_calendar.pdf">https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/assessment/documents/2018_19_nh_assessment_calendar.pdf</a></li> <li>• NH-153 NH State Guidance on English Learners Programs <a href="https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/integrated/esol/documents/esol_guidance_revised_9-8-15.pdf">https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/integrated/esol/documents/esol_guidance_revised_9-8-15.pdf</a> Students enrolled for less than one full academic year are exempt from taking the Reading/Language Arts portion of the State content assessment. However, they must Participate in the Math and Science assessments.</li> </ul>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> <li>o Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Evidence that English learners are not denied the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>NH 145 Assessment Calendar; no specific mention of ELs. The training webinar does mention EL supports, but there is no mention of any procedures or guidance related to determining if an EL should be assessed with accommodations or selection of accommodations or ensuring participation in the SAT.</p> <p>NH 153 does not provide evidence related to this ce</p> <p>See SAT Peer Review Notes for Description of Evidence.</p>
<b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  </u><u>  </u><u>  </u> <u>  </u><u>  </u><u>  </u> <u>  </u><u>  </u><u>  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the SAT: Evidence that the State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> <li>o Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• For the SAT: Evidence that English learners are not denied the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.</li> <li>• See SAT Peer Review Notes summary statement.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

**Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and ELs, including ELs with disabilities. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations, such as, interoperability with, and ability to use, assistive technology, are available to measure the <b>academic achievement</b> of students with disabilities.</li> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs;</li> <li>• Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> <li>• Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> <li>• Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NH-116 Decision Making Worksheet <a href="https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/assessment/alt_assess/documents/decision_making_worksheet_2018-2019.pdf">https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/assessment/alt_assess/documents/decision_making_worksheet_2018-2019.pdf</a></li> <li>• NH-144 NH Department of Education School and District Report Card <a href="https://ireport.education.nh.gov/">https://ireport.education.nh.gov/</a> Includes static information about individual schools and school districts that comprises the accountability data elements included in the New Hampshire federal accountability plan under the Every Student Succeeds Act. This is a great source to get a quick snapshot of a particular school or district.</li> <li>• NH-105 SAT School Day Coordinator Manual <a href="https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/accountability/documents/digital_sat_coordinator_manual.pdf">https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/accountability/documents/digital_sat_coordinator_manual.pdf</a> <a href="https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/accountability/documents/sat_coordinator_manual.pdf">https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/accountability/documents/sat_coordinator_manual.pdf</a></li> <li>• NH-106 SAT School Day Accommodated Testing Manual <a href="https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/accountability/documents/digital_sat_accommodated_manual.pdf">https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/accountability/documents/digital_sat_accommodated_manual.pdf</a> <a href="https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/accountability/documents/sat_accommodated_testing_manual.pdf">https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/accountability/documents/sat_accommodated_testing_manual.pdf</a></li> </ul>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</li> <li>• As noted above in elements 5.1 and 5.2, 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 (evidence submitted for element 5.1 will address this concern).</li> </ul> <p>For the entire assessment system in the State, NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 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.</li> </ul> <p>SAT:</p> <p>Bullet 1 No evidence submitted related to accommodations</p> <p>Bullet 2 No specific evidence submitted.</p> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <p>NH-116 Decision Making Worksheet is the process to identify students who are eligible to participate in the AA-AAAS, not requests for unique 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 NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For SAT: Evidence that the State has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student's need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</li> <li>• For SAT: As noted above in elements 5.1 and 5.2, 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 (evidence submitted for element 5.1 will address this concern).</li> <li>• See SAT Peer Review Notes summary statement.</li> <li>• For the entire assessment system in the State, NHDE must provide: Evidence that 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.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NH-143 IEP Team Facilitator Definition and Guidelines <a href="https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/special_ed/facilitation.htm">https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/special_ed/facilitation.htm</a></li> <li>• NH-123 NH Statewide Assessment Monitoring Guide p. 15 <a href="https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/assessment/documents/nh_statewide_assessment_monitoring_guide_final_032019.pdf">https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/assessment/documents/nh_statewide_assessment_monitoring_guide_final_032019.pdf</a></li> <li>• NH-134 SAT State Accountability Layout</li> <li>• NH-116 Decision Making Worksheet <a href="https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/assessment/alt_assess/documents/decision_making_worksheet_2018-2019.pdf">https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/assessment/alt_assess/documents/decision_making_worksheet_2018-2019.pdf</a></li> <li>• NH-148 Assessment Coordinator Manual for Dynamic Learning</li> </ul>	<p>For all assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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 so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>o Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>o Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>o Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s individualized education programs team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; and</li> <li>o Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <hr/> <p>For the entire assessment system in the State, NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that it monitors test administration of both general and alternate assessments, to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504 and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>o Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>o Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>o Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner;</li> <li>o Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <hr/> <p>SAT:</p> <p>No SAT evidence submitted related to this ce:  NH 143  NH 123  NH 134</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>instruction and/or practice;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL;</li> <li>Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures;</li> <li>Monitored for administrations of all required academic content assessments and AA-AAAS.</li> </ul>	<p>Maps YE This document supports the Assessment Coordinator in preparing schools for the Dynamic Learning Maps(DLM) assessment. P.5</p> <p><a href="https://secure.dynamiclearningmaps.org/sites/default/files/documents/Peer_Review/acm_ye_2014-15.pdf">https://secure.dynamiclearningmaps.org/sites/default/files/documents/Peer_Review/acm_ye_2014-15.pdf</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NH-149 Test Administrator Manual for DLM YE model The Test Administrator Manual serves as a comprehensive resource in planning for preparing for and administering the DLM assessments. It covers key responsibilities, policies, practices and procedures for Educator Portal and Kite. P.5 <a href="https://secure.dynamiclearningmaps.org/sites/default/files/documents/Peer_Review/tam_ye_2014-15.pdf">https://secure.dynamiclearningmaps.org/sites/default/files/documents/Peer_Review/tam_ye_2014-15.pdf</a></li> </ul>	<p>NH 116</p> <p>See SAT Peer Review Notes.</p> <p><b>DLM</b></p> <p>NH 149 Test Administration Manual refers to test administration monitoring extract but it is specific to the number of testlets confirmed, in progress, and completed by a student, not ensuring that the assessment and accommodations are monitored for fidelity of administration.</p> <p>NH 148 Assessment Coordinator Manual includes references to monitoring, but mostly for completing registration to various test features, test security agreements vs monitoring of test administration.</p> <p>No evidence of on-site monitoring of test administration: Are these assessments administered appropriately and are student-administrator interactions as described in the TAM?</p> <p>IEP team facilitator guidelines indicates IEP facilitators can be provided “upon request”. Whose request? The State’s? Is this part of a systematic monitoring plan?</p> <p>How does the monitor know, for every student in the class monitored,</p> <p>Any observed accommodation provided is consistent with State policy and procedures – that is, that it is an approved accommodation, and it is being provided in the way that accommodation is specified?</p> <p>Those that are receiving accommodations are receiving those and only those are in the IEP / 504 plan?</p> <p>Those that are not receiving accommodations are not scheduled to test with accommodations?</p> <p>It seems that a more detailed monitoring protocol is required, one which includes a review of IEPs for the group being monitored and a description of each approved accommodation.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (For all assessments) New Hampshire monitors test administration to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Consistent with the State's policies for accommodations;</li> <li>○ Appropriate for addressing a student's disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>○ Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>○ Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student's individualized education programs team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; and</li> <li>○ Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

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

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b><u>For academic content standards:</u></b></p> <p>The State formally adopted <b><u>challenging academic achievement standards</u></b> in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities;</li> <li>• The State applies its academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply;</li> </ul> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NH-117 Section 186:8 Rule Making Authority <a href="http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/rsa/html/XV/186/186-8.htm">http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/rsa/html/XV/186/186-8.htm</a> 186:8 Rulemaking Authority; Standards; Employee Qualifications The state board of education shall adopt rules, pursuant to RSA 541-A, relative to: academic standards for all grades of the public schools.</li> <li>• NH-110 June 2010 NH State Board of Education meeting minutes NH Department of Education and the NH State Board of Education formally adopted the Common Core State Standards (6/2010) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NH-111 CCSSI for ELA <a href="http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CCSSI_ELA%20Standards.pdf">http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CCSSI_ELA%20Standards.pdf</a></li> <li>• NH-112 CCSSI for Math <a href="http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CCSSI_Math%20Standards.pdf">http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CCSSI_Math%20Standards.pdf</a></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has formally adopted academic achievement standards in reading/language arts and mathematics in high school that include at least three levels of achievement, descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level, and achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>For the R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), NHDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that NHDE has formally adopted academic achievement standards (including cut scores, descriptions and levels), and that NHDE applies these standards to all public elementary and secondary school students, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities taking the AA-AAAS.</li> <li>• Evidence that NHDE has formally adopted alternate academic achievement standards (including cut scores, descriptions and levels), and that NHDE applies these standards to all public elementary and secondary school students who take an AA-AAAS.</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>The documents provided do not address academic achievement standards – they address academic content standards.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<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 NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the SAT, evidence that the State has formally adopted academic achievement standards in reading/language arts and mathematics in high school that include at least three levels of achievement, descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level, and achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</li> <li>• For R/LA AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (DLM-YE), NHDE must provide:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence that NHDE has formally adopted academic achievement standards (including cut scores, descriptions and levels), and that NHDE applies these standards to all public elementary and secondary school students, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities taking the AA-AAAS.</li> <li>○ Evidence that NHDE has formally adopted alternate academic achievement standards (including cut scores, descriptions and levels), and that NHDE applies these standards to all public elementary and secondary school students who take an AA-AAAS.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

**Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards.</u></b></li> </ul>	N/A	N/A
<b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b><u>For academic achievement standards:</u></b></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards and with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards such that a student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards (1) are aligned with the State’s challenging academic content standards for the grade in which a student is enrolled; (2) promote access to the general curriculum consistent with the IDEA; (3) reflect professional judgment as to the highest possible standards achievable for such students; (4) are designated in the IEP for each student for whom alternate academic achievement standards apply; and (5) are aligned to ensure that a student who meets the alternate academic achievement standards is on track to pursue postsecondary education or competitive integrated employment.</p>	<p>NH-135 Validity of the SAT for Predicting First-Year Grades and Retention to the Second Year This report represents the first national operational SAT® validity study since the SAT was redesigned and launched in March 2016. This is among the largest SAT validity studies ever conducted and is based on data from more than 223,000 students across 171 four-year colleges and universities. P.4</p> <p>NH-136 The Relationship between SAT Scores and Performance in CTE Programs: A Case Study The results from a case study based on 2,387 students from a large two-year institution demonstrated that SAT scores are valid predictors of student performance in career/technical programs of study. P1.</p>	<p>For the SAT: • Evidence that the State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school 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> <hr/> <p>See SAT Peer Review Notes</p> <p>From the SAT Peer Review notes: Although the evidence confirms predictive validity of the SAT as a predictor of college success, the available evidence does not make explicit how the achievement standards of the SAT align to the states’ academic content standards.</p> <p>The State has not provided evidence of having set academic achievement standards based on its academic content standards. Without such evidence, it cannot meet this CE.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the SAT: Evidence of how the academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State's academic content standards such that a high school 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.</li> <li>• See SAT Peer Review Notes summary statement.</li> </ul>		

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



**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

**Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State reports its assessment results for all students assessed, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public.</p> <p>The State reports to the public its assessment results on <b><u>student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level</u></b><sup>6</sup></p> <p>For <b><u>academic content assessments</u></b>, the State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the <b><u>specific academic needs of students</u></b>, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its academic content assessments that:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a <b><u>student’s academic achievement</u></b>;</li> <li>○ Report the <b><u>student’s academic achievement</u></b> in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards;</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific <b><u>academic needs of students</u></b>;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NH-137 Understanding SAT Scores 2018</li> <li>• NH-138 Understanding SAT Scores 2018 in Spanish</li> <li>• NH-126 NH Department of Education Link to SAT page <a href="https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/accountability/sat.htm">https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/accountability/sat.htm</a></li> <li>• NH-145 NH Department of Education Assessment Calendar <a href="https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/assessment/documents/2018_19_nh_assessment_calendar.pdf">https://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/assessment/documents/2018_19_nh_assessment_calendar.pdf</a></li> </ul>	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of reporting that facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that:                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>▪ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand; and</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ A process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <hr/> <p>NH 137 Not clear if this document is sent to parents/guardians; if online, how are parents informed this is available? All parents may not have access to online reports</p> <p>Assessment Calendar indicates scores are available to districts in May. When are these scores provided to parents?</p> <p>See SAT Peer Review Notes for missing CE components</p>

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Are provided in an understandable and uniform format;</li> <li>○ Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian;</li> <li>○ Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.</li> <li>● The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>		<p>From the evidence documents provided, it is not clear how parents would obtain or be able to request reports in alternate formats or languages. For example, there are no instructions on the State’s SAT page for requesting reports in an alternate format.</p> <p>It does not appear that the State reports on achievement standards based on the State’s academic content standards.</p>
<b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:            For the SAT, New Hampshire must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence of reporting that facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that:                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>▪ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand; and</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ A process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● See SAT Peer Review Notes summary statement.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission

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

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

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

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission

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

**Academic Assessments**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

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

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE DLM and SAT Resubmission**

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

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