



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

August 10, 2022

The Honorable Mark Holodick
Secretary of Education
Delaware Department of Education
401 Federal Street, Suite 2
Dover, DE 19901-3639

Dear Secretary Holodick:

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 Delaware Department of Education (DDOE) to prepare for the review, which occurred in March 2022.

State assessment systems provide essential information that States, districts, schools, 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 DDOE's most recent submission and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that these components of your assessment system met most, but not all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of the ESEA. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and our own analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

- Alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards (AA-AAAS) in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for grades 3-8 and high school (DeSSA-Alt, also known as the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM)): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- General assessments in science for grades 5, 8, and high school Biology (DeSSA science assessment): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**

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

The specific list of items required for DDOE to submit is enclosed with this letter. I also want to note that, in the evidence submitted by DDOE and DLM for this peer review, DDOE indicated a plan to adopt new achievement standards (cut scores) for the DLM science assessment in the future. The peer reviewers raised several questions about these future plans, which are detailed in the peer review notes and to which I want to draw your attention. When the revised achievement standards are adopted, please be sure that the evidence submitted for peer review addresses these concerns as well as all other relevant critical elements.

Because additional evidence has been requested for these assessments, the Department is continuing the condition on the State's Title I grant award related to those components of the assessment system. To satisfy this condition, DDOE must submit satisfactory evidence to address the items identified in the enclosed list. The

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.

condition will remain until all of the evidence has been resubmitted and peer reviewed. 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.

I request that DDOE submit a plan within 30 days outlining when it will submit all required additional documentation for peer review. Upon submission of the plan, the Department will reach out to DDOE to determine a mutually agreeable schedule. Resubmission of the State's documentation for peer review should occur once all necessary evidence is complete (rather than in multiple submissions).

I also want to take this opportunity to review the peer review status of the other ESEA required assessments administered by the State, based upon our current records:

- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (Smarter Balanced): Meets all requirements of the ESEA.
- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in high school (SAT): Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.¹
- English language proficiency (ELP) general assessments (ACCESS): Partially meets requirements of the ESEA.²
- ELP alternate assessments (Alternate ACCESS): Partially meets requirements of the ESEA.³

We currently are planning assessment peer reviews for winter 2023 (submission of documentation by January 6, 2023) and summer 2023 (submission of documentation by June 30, 2023). We look forward to a mutually agreeable time to schedule peer reviews for any of the assessments listed above where additional evidence is needed. Also, please remember that if DDOE makes significant changes to any of its assessments, the State must submit information about those changes to the Department for review and approval.

Thank you for your ongoing commitment to improving educational outcomes for all students. I appreciate the work you are doing to improve your schools and provide a high-quality education for your students.

If you have any questions, please contact my staff at: ESEA.Assessment@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

James F. Lane, Ed.D.
Senior Advisor, Office of the Secretary
Delegated the Authority to Perform the
Functions and Duties of the Assistant Secretary
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Theresa Bennett, Director of Assessment

¹ See <https://oese.ed.gov/files/2020/04/Delaware-6.pdf>

² See <https://oese.ed.gov/files/2021/11/de-9.pdf>

³ Also see <https://oese.ed.gov/files/2021/11/de-9.pdf>

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

Critical Element	Evidence Needed
2.1 – Test Design and Development	<p>For the DeSSA-Alt Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of an overall test design and test blueprints that measure the full breadth of the State’s grade-level academic content standards in science (e.g., evidence that the test design adequately samples the Essential Elements in science).
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum	<p>For the DeSSA Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum (e.g., analyses which show that the assessment produces adequately precise estimates of student performance across the full performance continuum despite the U-shaped distributions showing larger standard errors in the tails of the observed score scale (or ability level scale) and smaller standard errors in the center of the distributions).
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	<p>For the DeSSA-Alt Reading/Language Arts, Mathematics, and Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State does not preclude a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who takes the alternate assessment from being able to attempt to complete the requirements for a regular high school diploma.
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	<p>For the DeSSA Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State’s academic achievement standards for the science general assessment are challenging and aligned with the Next Generation Science 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.
6.4 – Reporting	<p>For the DeSSA Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State reports assessment results, including itemized score analysis, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results (e.g., evidence of more detailed reports such as item analysis reports). • Evidence that the State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports (e.g., reports by item, standard, or domain) after each administration of its DeSSA Science Assessment that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian. • Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the Americans with Disabilities (ADA), as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.

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

January-May 2022 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 Delaware-General Science
Assessment

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	4
Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments.....	5
Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments ..	5
Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments.....	5
SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS.....	6
Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development	6
Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development	8
Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration.....	8
Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration	11
Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security.....	12
Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy ..	14
SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY	15
Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content	15
Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes	17
Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure.....	17
Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables.....	18
SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER.....	19
Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability	19
Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility	21
Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum	21
Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring.....	22
Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms.....	23
Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	23
Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	23
SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS.....	24
Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	24
Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments.....	27
Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations	27
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.

..... 30

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING33

Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students 33
Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting 35
Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 36
Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting 38

SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS

.....**ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.**

Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic AssessmentsError! Bookmark not defined.
Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic AssessmentsError! Bookmark not defined.
Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State AssessmentsError! Bookmark not defined.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Delaware-General Science Assessment

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

Critical Element 1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students
Met in Prior Peer Review

Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content Standards

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic content standards:</u> The State’s challenging academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science are aligned with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards.</p>		<p>For the NGSS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the science standards are aligned with relevant State career and technical education standards and entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State. No evidence specified by state. Finding stands. </p>
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The state did not provide evidence for CE1.2—so the original finding remains. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Delaware-General Science Assessment

Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments

Met in prior peer review

Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments

Met in prior peer review

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)).

Met in prior 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 Delaware-General Science Assessment

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS
Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to <u>the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards</u> for the grade that is being assessed and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of <u>the State’s grade-level academic content standards</u> and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results. • Processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <u>the State’s academic content standards</u>, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills). • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design and intended uses and interpretations of results. 		<p>For the DeSSA Science Assessment: Evidence that the test blueprints are aligned to the depth and breadth of the NGSS for the grades that are being assessed, given that the test blueprints have been adjusted following the alignment study.</p> <p>State provided plan of action to address issues with blueprint and weaknesses in test design. There was no direct evidence to evaluate if the current plan is sufficient.</p> <p>State submitted some evidence showing how they have addressed weaknesses from alignment findings. Item banks for grade 8 and HS science have been updated to align with test blueprint. But no evidence of impact on test forms to demonstrate they cover the breadth and depth of NCSS. No evidence specified by state. Finding stands.</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 Delaware-General Science Assessment

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the student is enrolled and uses that determination for all reporting. • If the State administers a content assessment that includes portfolios, such assessment may be partially administered through a portfolio but may not be <i>entirely</i> administered through a portfolio. 		
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence not specified. Original finding stands. Plans for addressing alignment provided, but no evidence on whether the plans worked to address alignment concerns. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Delaware-General Science Assessment

Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development
Met in prior peer review

Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible 	<p>Evidence</p> <p>In addition to the DDOE accessibility guidelines, all special educators, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs and other specialized instructional support must complete related training. The DOE also works with Pearson to produce additional trainings for all educators to ensure that they are prepared to administer the Science Assessment. The documents listed below include the PANnext training slides for 2019 and updated 2020 and a roster of teachers who have completed those trainings online.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Document 2.3.3 2019 DeSSA SC-SS PearsonAccessNext Training Slides specific to accommodations include 9, 11-20 and 30. - Document 2.3.4 2020 DeSSA SC-SS PearsonAccessNext TA Training Slides specific to accommodations include 9-11, 13-21 and 30. - Document 2.3.5 DeSSA SC-SS Test Admin Training Registration Completion <p>Teachers who administer the assessment are directed to the Test Administration Manual</p>	<p>For the DeSSA Science Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of English learners, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to know how to administer the assessment and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during testing for all students with disabilities (e.g., attendance sheets from test administration trainings). • Evidence that the State has included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration (e.g., steps to follow when students encounter issues using the test delivery system). <p>Request 1</p> <p>Document 2.3.1a DeSSA19-Online-TAM-FORWEB (Section 1 p. 1 re: support/assistance; See also Appendix K: QuickLinks for PearsonAccessNext and TestNav8</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 Delaware-General Science Assessment

<p>technology challenges during test administration.</p>	<p>(TAM) for information to address technology challenges. When challenges persist support/assistance directories are available for quick access to human technology assistants for troubleshooting via telephone numbers and quick links.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Document 2.3.1a DeSSA19-Online-TAM-FORWEB (Section 1 p. 1 re: support/assistance; See also Appendix K: Quick Links for PearsonAccessNext and TestNav8 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 6 states - All individuals participating in or otherwise associated with DeSSA test administrations must complete the training requirements specified for each role on the Department of Education’s Office of Assessment website at https://www.doe.k12.de.us/domain/111. Prior to administering an assessment, Test Administrators must read the manuals and complete the training associated with the test to be administered. Where applicable, other participants should also read relevant materials, including user guides and manuals, before attending training. • Section 6.6 page 23-24 and several appendices also include information on the use of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities. <p>There seems to be enough evidence to meet request 1.</p> <p>Request 2</p> <p>Document 2.3.1a DeSSA19-Online-TAM-FORWEB (Section 1 p. 1 re: support/assistance; See also Appendix K: QuickLinks for PearsonAccessNext and TestNav8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 8.2 (page 44) of this document contains information on reporting test improprieties, irregularities, and breaches. However, there is no evidence that the State has included a contingency plan for other issues (e.g. internet/power goes out during testing, platform stalls, bandwidth issues)
----------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Delaware-General Science Assessment

		<p>There is insufficient evidence to meet requests 2.</p> <p>Evidence contain in the TAM is sufficient to ensure standardized test administration with adequate accommodation</p> <p>The PearsonAccessNext training includes sufficient information to address both requests. There are procedures to resume a test for individual students and for an entire class of students in the event of a technical issue. This coupled with online help should be sufficient.</p> <p>Recommendation—make explicit what happens during major interruptions (e.g., power outages, etc.).</p>
<p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Delaware-General Science Assessment

Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. Monitoring of test administration should be demonstrated for all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS.		Department staff found that the evidence provided by the State was sufficient to demonstrate that adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.
Section 2.4 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Delaware-General Science Assessment

Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. • Application of test security procedures to all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS. 	<p>Evidence</p> <p>Educational staff is trained to follow protocols for responding to potential and confirmed test security violations. DDOE has created training and a flowchart for Test Security Incidents so educators can follow it to make correct decisions. Districts are responsible for enforcing test security at educator and student levels. Delaware has an internal Secure Help Desk Ticket System. Districts and schools use this system to report incidents and irregularities on state assessments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Document 2.5.3a Test Security Incident Flow Chart Final Document 2.5.3b Incident Report Form 2015-16_District Sample Document 2.5.3c Protocol Verification Sheet 2014_District Sample Document 2.5.3d DeSSA Testing Checklist 2015_District Sample Document 2.5.4 DOE Help Desk Quick Reference Guide <p>Evidence of implemented test security policies as requested in 1a-1c are outlined in the following: Document 2.5.1 DeSSA Test Security Manual Au2ust 2020.</p>	<p>For the DeSSA Science Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Detection of test irregularities (e.g., number of times that information about the assessment was found on social media sites following a State-led inquiry). o Remediation following any test security incidents involving the assessment (e.g., types of remediation imposed based on the findings of a State-led social media inquiry). o Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. <p>Document 2.5.3a Test Security Incident Flow Chart Final and Document 2.5.1 DeSSA Test Security Manual Au2ust 2020.</p> <p>Provides evidence to meet the requests 1a -1c. Page numbers that highlight the evidence requested are listed at the beginning of the document. The flowchart also contains evidence of procedures for test irregularities.</p> <p>Sufficient evidence and documentation on policies and procedures to prevent, monitor and report test irregularities.</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 Delaware-General Science Assessment

		<p>Test security manual, incident flowchart, and incident report form are sufficient evidence that the state addresses test security and testing irregularities. While I do not find evidence of the number of times information was found on social media, that seems like a request beyond the CE requirements (an example of a type of evidence rather than a specifically required component). .</p>
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Delaware-General Science Assessment

Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy

Met in prior 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 Delaware-General Science Assessment

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. The State’s validity evidence includes evidence that:</p> <p><u>The State’s academic assessments</u> measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards; • If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards and administers alternate assessments aligned with those standards, the assessments show adequate alignment to the State’s academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content 	<p>(2)Evidence requested for critical element 2.1 will also apply to this critical element.</p> <p>Evidence In response to Peer Review notes (page 13-<i>see notes</i>) we have decided NOT TO CHANGE blueprints. We have included a response to the Alignment Study and its rationale.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Document 2.1.1a Response to Alignment Study_2020.12.14 (pp.4-6) <p>Document 2.1.1b Blueprint DecisionMemo.doc</p>	<p>For the DeSSA Science Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of adequate alignment between the assessment and the NGSS the assessment is designed to measure in terms of balance of content, given that the test blueprints have been adjusted to improve the alignment ratings. • Evidence requested for critical element 2.1 will also apply to this critical element. <p>Refer to section 2.1 for information.</p> <p>Section 2.1 information was not available for the review, however as the US DOE did not request additional information it is assumed that requirement as been met.</p> <p>Reviewer’s question related to item 1 of the US DOE request.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Document 2.1.1b Blueprint DecisionMemo only references HS Biology. Is this the only domain tested? If so, how are the other domains (physical science and Earth and space science evaluated at the HS as they seem to be assessed in grades 5 and 8. If they are not assessed how does the States assessment meet the breadth and depths of the standards as indicated in the critical element? 2. Document 2.1.1b Blueprint DecisionMemo indicates that there is a New HS Biology assessment in development. The new assessment does indicate the incorporation of

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Delaware-General Science Assessment

<p>and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>		<p>other science domains. Will this still be considered a biology assessment, if so that seems to be misleading.</p> <p>Adoption of the biology test for HS deliberately limits the depth and breadth of the standards tested to a single subject.</p> <p>Note—Current test structure emphasizes physical and earth/space science in grades 5 and 8, and then life science in high school. It is challenging to see how the depth and breadth of the NGSS is assessed at each level.</p>
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of adequate alignment between assessment (current version) and content standards (NGSS). • Evidence for CE 2.1 will also apply to this critical element. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Delaware-General Science Assessment

Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes
Met in prior peer review

Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s <u>academic content standards</u>.</p>	<p>The validity evidence on the internal structure for the Integrative Transfer Science Assessments is provided in Chapter 7 of the technical report based on additional analyses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Document 3.3.1 2018-2019 DE Technical Report for Science - Document 3.3.2 2018-2019 DE Technical Report for Science - Appendices. <p>I. Additional evidence of Differential Item Functioning is provided, including minimum sample size (o. 44),</p>	<p>For the DeSSA Science Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validity evidence based on the internal structure of the assessment that shows levels of validity generally consistent with expectations of current professional standards (e.g., differential item functioning analyses for English learners and non-English learners, as well as, students with disabilities and students without disabilities). <p>Document 3.3.1 2018-2019 DE Technical Report for Science</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P 46 and 47 offer 2019 DIF results, it would not seem as this meets the request from the state. As there is limited information on the DIF analysis for comparing the diverse groups. <p>DIF analyses presented in the technical report shows sufficient evidence items are reviewed for DIF particular for EL and SWD subgroups.</p> <p>Page 47 includes DIF analyses for EL and SWD that shows similar rates of DIF to other comparisons based on gender and race/ethnicity. This meets the request. DIF indices in the appendices were clear and expansive.</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 Delaware-General Science Assessment

		Evidence is adequate for a test of a single domain. No evidence of sub-domain structure since sub-domain is not reported.
Section 3.3 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables
Met in prior 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 Delaware-General Science Assessment

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. If the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, measures of reliability for the assessment overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a <u>student’s academic achievement</u>. 	<p>Evidence</p> <p>Extra evidence of adequate reliability on the Integrative Transfer Science Assessments is provided in:</p> <p>Document 3.3.1 2018-2019 DE Technical Report for Science, Chapter 10, pp. 56-60) with interpretations of the results, as well as in Appendix D and E based on additional analyses</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The results of reliability coefficients and standard error of measures are summarized in Table 10.1 by grade (p. 56) and in Tables 10.2-10.4 by grade and subgroup, such as for ELs and SWD (p. 58). 2. Classical item statistics (p-value, pbis, and proportion of choice or scoring point) by grade and item type. (Appendix A, A1- A4) 3. Item statistics by Rasch model (b-parameter, SE, fit-statistics, and step values) by grade and item type (Appendix C, A1 1- A14). 4. The conditional standard error of measurements (CSEM) by the scale score (SS) are presented by grade (Appendix D, A1 5-A1 7). <p>The corresponding plots of CSEM and SS visualize larger CSEMs at Test Theory (Document 3.3.1 p. 58).</p>	<p>For the DeSSA Science Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of adequate reliability on the assessment for each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards (e.g., additional analyses to explain the relatively low reliabilities for English learners (grades 5 and 8) and students with disabilities (grade 8); and guidance on how to interpret the classification accuracy and consistency results). <p>This is not my area of expertise, however it would seem that the data requested by the US DOE has been addressed in the State’s evidence.</p> <p>The tables and explanation in the technical manual describe the reliabilities and explain in clear terms why the EL reliabilities are lower than for other groups—homogeneity of scores for the EL group lead to lower estimates of reliability. This is common and can happen for student subgroups and is especially troublesome with relatively small sample sizes as we see here.</p> <p>We would like to see additional information on how the state is dealing with lower-than-acceptable reliabilities. . Are these scores for subgroups with reliabilities around .6 reported and interpreted differently?</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 Delaware-General Science Assessment

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>2. Table D1 shows the conditional standard error of measurement (CSEM) by scale score (SS) for each grade based on the Item Response Theory (Appendix D, A15-A17).</p> <p>3. Figures D1-D3 present the plots of CSEM by SS that visualize a larger CSEM at the lower and higher ends of the scale; though the magnitude of the CSEM remains in a reasonable range around the three cut scores (e.g., in grade 8, the CSEMs are 12, 11, and 13, respectively, at the three cuts for Level 2, Level 3, and Level 4) (Appendix D, A18-A20).</p> <p>4. The frequency distributions of scale scores in Appendix E (A21-24) suggest a positively skewed distributions for all three grades.</p> <p>The Technical Report provides some meaningful interpretations of the lower reliability and smaller SEM particularly for ELs and SWD, the CSEM, and the classification accuracy and consistency (Document 3.3.1, pp. 58-60).</p>	<p>EL sample size is not too small. We wonder if there is a construct issue (maybe irrelevant variance caused by reading load?) that may be causing the lower reliabilities.</p>
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that lower reliabilities for subgroups is adequately addressed—especially for EL and SWD students in Grades 5 and 8. Documentation of reliability is sufficient, but low reliability for these subgroups is not addressed. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Delaware-General Science Assessment

Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility

Met in prior peer review

Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for academic assessments, including performance for high- and low-achieving students.</p>		<p>For the DeSSA Science Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum (e.g., analyses which show that the assessment produces adequately precise estimates of student performance across the full performance continuum despite the U-shaped distributions showing larger standard errors in the tails of the observed score scale (or ability level scale) and smaller standard errors in the center of the distributions). <p>The appendices for the technical report are listed in the response, but were not provided. If we go to the website listing, we can find error curves with cut scores marked and distribution plots of scale scores indicating that the test differentiates well within the specified range, which should be include most high and low performing students. Not indicated as evidence by the state—so we are not sure that this evidence is intended and did not judge its sufficiency.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State should specify evidence for CE4.3. No evidence indicated. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Delaware-General Science Assessment

Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s <u>academic achievement standards</u>.</p>	<p>Evidence of standardized scoring procedure and the inter-rater reliability is provided in Chapter 6 of the technical report (Document 3.3.1, pp.35-41) Detailed information and evidence support DDOE has a website where all the Technical Reports for each State assessment are accessible. Document 4. 7 .1 DOE State Assessments Technical Reports Website</p>	<p>For the DeSSA Science Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the State’s documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for the assessment produce reliable and meaningful results, and facilitate valid score interpretations (e.g., exact agreement, adjacent agreement, and inter-rater reliability for the 10 percent second scoring that was done for operational items). <p>Document 3.3.1, pp.35-41, Chapter 6 provides evidence that the State in collaboration with Pearson has a documented standardize scoring procedure and protocols for hand-scored items as listed under the ‘Benchmarking’ heading on page 35. Table 6.1 on page 38 offers data on qualification, inter-rater reliability and validity standards.</p> <p>Agreement and inter-rater reliability are reported in a table on page 41 of the technical report. The information therein meets this request.</p>
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Delaware-General Science Assessment

Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms

Met in prior peer review

Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment

Met in prior peer review

Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments), and Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website. 	<p>Evidence</p> <p>DDOE has a website where all the Technical Reports for each State assessment are accessible.</p> <p>- Document 4.7.I DOE State Assessments Technical Reports Website</p>	<p>US DOE request</p> <p>Evidence of adequate technical quality, which is made public, including on the State's website.</p> <p>This Reviewer could not find the specific page pictured on Document 4.7.I DOE State Assessments Technical Reports Website as the website stated it was being updated.</p> <p>While the website does provide the technical documentation, it is not very intuitive getting to them.</p>
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> 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 Delaware-General Science Assessment

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system. Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, the placement team under Section 504, or the individual or team designated by a district to make that decision under Title II of the ADA, as applicable, based on each student’s individual abilities and needs.</p> <p>If a State adopts alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and administers an alternate assessment aligned with those standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(1)(E) and (b)(2)(D), respectively, the State must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish guidelines for determining whether to assess a student with an AA-AAAS, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A State definition of “students with the most significant cognitive disabilities” that addresses factors related to cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior; • Provide information for IEP Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that: 	<p>Evidence</p> <p>DDOE offers documents (e.g. Accessibility Guidelines, What Parents Need to Know; Accessibility Supports, & Parent Guide for Alternate Assessment) and trainings for LEAs about the requirements for students with disability to participate in the statewide assessments The documents provide procedures and information to help LEA and family decision-making about the type of assessments (Regular vs Alternate) that students should take. The DDOE Accessibility Guidelines is a detailed resource for educators in making decisions about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The inclusion of students with disabilities (SwD), English Learners (EL), students who are classified as both (SwD/EL); <p>The identification of "General included in alternate assessment with handouts provided by schools and providedonline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Document 5.1.3a What parents need to know about accessibility supports <p>Document 5.1.3b Parent Guide for the Alternate Assessment</p>	<p>For the DeSSA Science Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the assessment (e.g., State-created evidence that can be made available to districts and parents rather than evidence gathered from other state department of education offices). <p>Document 5.1.3a is not in the evidence presented. Document 5.1.3b is general information for parents, however it does not meet the request form the US DOE.</p> <p>It is unclear how students with disabilities including students with IEP and 504 plans are included in the State’s assessment. The document included only state’s information on how a student might qualify for the alternate assessment.</p> <p>Sufficient evidence provided to support accessibility for all students. Accessibility guidelines is very comprehensive.</p> <p>Guidance for accessibility is very comprehensive and clear. Document 5.1.3a was not included but can be found on the state’s website at Appendix A-1 DeSSA Assessments Accessibility Form.pdf (doe.k12.de.us).</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 Delaware-General Science Assessment

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Delaware-General Science Assessment

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>for the grade in which the student is enrolled; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop, disseminate information on, and promote the use of appropriate accommodations to ensure that a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who does not take an AA-AAAS participates in academic instruction and assessments for the grade in which the student is enrolled. • The State has in place and monitors implementation of guidelines for IEP teams to apply in determining, on a case-by-case basis, which students with the most significant cognitive disabilities will be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, if applicable. Such guidelines must be developed in accordance with 34 CFR § 200.6(d).¹ 		
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required		

¹ See the full regulation at 34 CFR § 200.6(d) (online at https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=07e168e9e7a6c5931b4549cc15547ee9&mc=true&node=se34.1.200_16&rgn=div8)

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Delaware-General Science Assessment

Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments
Met in prior peer review

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and ELs, including ELs with disabilities. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures that appropriate accommodations, such as, interoperability with, and ability to use, assistive technology, are available to measure the academic achievement of students with disabilities. • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs; • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require 	<p>Delaware's vendor WestEd applies the principles and concepts of Universal Design for item development. Core documents for consideration in training and facilitation of item writing include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Document 5.3.la Universal Design_LSA - Document 5.3.lb Universal Design for Computer Based Testing <p>WestEd's internal item writer training slides, including UDL principles are included here:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Document 5.3.lc DE Item Writer Training Y4 - ITA March 2020 DDOE Approved see slide 45 specifically <p>Delaware requires ALL students to be Individualized Education Program (IEP), but have not completed the high school graduation course credit requirements established by the State, or the district, if district credit requirements are higher than those of the State. While an IEP team will determine the type of summative assessment a student will take, the type of assessment does not automatically determine the type of diploma a</p>	<p>For the DeSSA Science Assessment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evidence that the State has determined that the accommodations that it provides: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not alter the construct being measured (e.g., impact of accommodations on the construct being measured). • Allow for 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. 2. Evidence that the State ensures that accommodations for the assessment does not deny students with disabilities or English learners the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment (e.g., awarding students who use accommodations with an alternate high school diploma rather than a traditional high school diploma). <p>Document 5.3.la UniversalDesign_LSA as well as</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 Delaware-General Science Assessment

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>child can or will achieve.</p> <p>Document 5.3.2 Diploma vs. Alternate Diploma chart also available here Delaware's High School Diploma versus Diploma of Alternate Achievement Standards</p>	<p>Document 3.3.1 2018-2019 Technical Report provides evidence that universal accommodations are provided to students that may require them. The technical report also addresses other accommodations that are specific for students with disabilities. Accommodations that are computer based would allow for meaningful interpretations of assessment results as these accommodations only provide access to the assessment.</p> <p>Where accommodation could alter the construct being measured is when the accommodation requires a human component (e.g., scribe, human reader). As it cannot be assumed that the person(s) providing these types of accommodation have participated in any trainings around testing protocols and security procedures.</p> <p>We should document training procedures for humans providing accommodations.</p> <p>There is also evidence provided in Document 5.1.2.DE Accessibility Guidelines 2018-2019.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 2 page 13 provides guidance for additional accommodations for students with disabilities. Section 3 page 18 provides guidance for additional accommodation for multi-language learners. <p>State provided two papers on the concept of universal design in standardized assessment. However, the state did not submit any direct evidence showing how principles of</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 Delaware-General Science Assessment

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>universal design were implemented in the NGSS science assessments to ensure equitable access for all students and without altering the constructs being assessed. State needs to provide direct evidence of universal design practices in development and administration of assessments. They also need to provide evidence to show scores are comparable across all accommodations.</p> <p>Evidence 5.3.2 submitted by state is not relevant for critical element 5.3</p> <p>The evidence presented relates to universal design and is strong as far as it goes. Evidence that the accommodations do not represent a change in construct (e.g., but allowing the accommodation for students who do not need it to demonstrate that they score similarly) has not been evidenced. Such evidence could be referenced if DE uses only traditional accommodations and standardized item writing processes.</p> <p>CCSSO has references for common accommodations (and there were recent studies by PARCC and Smarter Balanced) related to construct comparability.</p> <p>It does seem as if accommodations would not preclude students from earning a diploma, but that taking the AA would—based on the law referenced for AA.</p>
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify evidence related to receiving a regular diploma—documents in evidence contradict the statement above. AA students are ineligible according to submitted materials. Clarify how the accommodations allowed elicit comparable results to the unaccommodated conditions. These can be references rather than studies if the accommodations and test item types have been studied for other assessments. Provide evidence of training for humans providing accommodations (scribes and human readers). 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Delaware-General Science Assessment

Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures; • Monitored for administrations of all required academic content assessments and AA-AAAS. 	<p>DDOE schedules Site visits to monitor state Assessment administrations, including DeSSA-Science administration. During scheduled school visits DDOE discusses findings with Districts and school test coordinators (DTCs/STCs). DDOE provides a liaison to the school to help prepare for the scheduled school visit and shares a report of findings for the school.</p> <p>Document 2.4.1 a DeSSA 2019 Site Visit Protocol. Document 2.4.3 MOT Charter School DeSSA Site Visit Final 2018</p>	<p>For the DeSSA Science Assessment: US DOE Request</p> <p>Evidence that the State monitors test administration in its district and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations. • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for the assessment. • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice. • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL. • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Delaware-General Science Assessment

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"> Monitored for administrations of the assessment (e.g., site visit reports that discuss findings of monitoring accommodations during test administration). <p>Document 2.4.1a DeSSA 2019 Site Visit Protocol. Document 2.4.3 MOT Charter School DeSSA Site Visit Final 2018</p> <p>These documents provide evidence that the State monitors the testing procedures and protocols in regards to students with disabilities and monitors those students participating in the general versus the alternate assessment.</p> <p>State submitted conversation thread as evidence of test monitoring. This evidence is not sufficient to determine if the state has a formalized plan to monitor assessment for the purpose to ensure students receive adequate accommodations.</p> <p>State needs to provide system wide plan and evidence on how all assessments are monitored to ensure students get the correct accommodation and tests are administered with fidelity.</p> <p>The provided documents demonstrate how an audit or site visit work through demonstration, but they do not specify how the system of audits and site visits work (other than saying they can be requested and are scheduled). The included site monitoring survey was informative, but we don't know how it was administered, to what proportion of the population, etc. When the processes are used together, 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 Delaware-General Science Assessment

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>school that was part of the monitoring process would be well-monitored.</p> <p>Recommendation—include how the system of monitoring works—how schools are selected, how many are included, etc. in discussions of monitoring. The procedures are well-described for a monitored school, but it’s hard to see how the overall system functions.</p>
Section 5.4 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Delaware-General Science Assessment

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic content standards:</u></p> <p>The State formally adopted <u>challenging academic achievement standards</u> in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; <p>The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (1) at least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third for lower achievement; (2) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (3) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</p>	<p>Delaware Office of Assessment and Pearson Technical staff presented the standard setting process and its recommended cut scores for Science on October 24, 2019, at which date they were approved.</p> <p>Document 6.1.1 DE-SBE Approval of Science Cut Scores_Oct 24, 2019 (Section IV Part B, pp.3-4)</p> <p>Document 6.1.2 SBE Science Standard Setting Presentation-Oct 24 2019 Slides 5, 7, 9-17</p> <p>Document 6.1.3 DE Achievement Level Regulations. (see page 4 Section 5 Levels of Performance)</p> <p>Document 6.1.4 DE 2019 Standard Setting Executive Summary Pearson</p> <p>Delaware applies its achievement standards in science to all public elementary and secondary school students as outlined in Title 14</p> <p>Document 1.1.1 Title 14 DE Admin Code Reg 501 (Section 1.0 Paragraph 1.1.1.2) credits where each course includes scientific investigations aligned with adopted science standards and one course is required to be Biology.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Document 1.1.1 Title 14 DE Admin Code Reg 501 (p. I § 1.1.1.2) - Document 1.1.2 Reg 503 science requirement (p.1 § 3) 	<p>For the DeSSA Science Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State has formally adopted academic achievement standards in science for the required test grades (e.g., clear statement that the State has formally adopted the academic achievement standards that it uses). • Evidence that the State applies its academic achievement standards in science 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>•</p> <p>Evidence for request 1</p> <p>Document 1.1.1 Title 14 DE Admin Code Reg 501 (Section 1.0 Paragraph 1.1.1.2) states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Effective with the 2013-2014 school year, the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) developed in partnership with twenty-six (26) states, including Delaware, shall be adopted as the Delaware Content Standards in science. For purposes of this subsection, “adopted” shall mean to accept a set of standards as the basis for curriculum and assessment alignment across the state according to a timeline established and disseminated by the Department of Education.</i>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Delaware-General Science Assessment

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p align="center">- Document 1.1.3 Reg 505 graduation requirement (p.4 § 5.1.2)</p> <p>The NGSS standards have been endorsed by two Higher Ed. Institutions in Delaware.</p> <p align="center">- Document 1.2.1 DTCC Letter of endorsement NGSS</p> <p>Document 1.2.2 UD Letter of Endorsement NGSS</p>	<p>Evidence for request 2 Document 6.1.1 DE-SBE Approval of Science Cut Scores_Oct 24, 2019 (Section IV Part B, pp.3-4)</p> <p>Document 6.1.2 SBE Science Standard Setting Presentation-Oct 24 2019 Slides 5, 7, 9-17</p> <p>Document 6.1.3 DE Achievement Level Regulations. (see page 4 Section 5 Levels of Performance)</p> <p>Document 6.1.4 DE 2019 Standard Setting Executive Summary Pearson</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These documents provide evidence that science is assessed at each of these grade levels (5, 8, and HS) it can be assumed that since they are assessed that the appropriate grade level standards are implemented across k-12 classrooms. <p>Sufficient evidence showing the state formally adopted academic achievement standards. The state achievement standards have 4 distinct levels with well-defined policy ALD However, evidence did not include definition of competencies associated with each achievement level</p> <p>Sufficient evidence of achievement scores that differentiate among the levels.</p> <p>State provided evidence of adopting academic achievement standards in science—NGSS.</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 Delaware-General Science Assessment

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		Policy indicates that these standards are for all students (except as modified for AAS using the DLM AA science assessments).
Section 6.1 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required		

Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards.</u> 	<p>Critical Element 1.1 and 1.2 for relevant standards information relating to our DeSSA Science Assessment for ALL students <i>except those with significant cognitive disabilities. Students who qualify for alternate science assessment are given the Dynamic Learning Maps Science Assessment—The Peer Review Process for DLM is a separate submission.</i></p> <p>For the DeSSA Science General assessment WestEd and DDOE developed ALDs with the assistance of grade-level teacher teams to enable valid inferences about student content area knowledge and skill in relation to the Next Generation Science Performance Expectations as measured by large-scale assessment. The technical report and accompanying ALDs for each assessment performance level AS WELL as each NGSS Performance expectation is found in the following document: Document 4.3.2 DeSSA_ALDs Technical Report approved 2019.10.11 Additional Note from Submission:</p>	<p>For the DeSSA Science Assessment: Evidence that the State uses a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting academic achievement standards in science (e.g., description of the process for selecting panelists, documentation that panels included individuals with appropriate experience and expertise).</p> <p>State only submitted evidence on how NGSS ALDs were created. State did not submit evidence on how achievement standards were set. Looking for standard setting technical report for NGSS.</p> <p>Pearson’s executive summary provides information on the standards setting method. The method referenced is established in the standards setting literature. Information on the panelists experience and expertise was lacking—saying that panels were comprised of both teachers and non-teachers and were demographically diverse.</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 Delaware-General Science Assessment

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 6.2 Summary Statement		
<p>_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full standards-setting technical report, including information on the qualifications of panelists, should be provided as evidence for CE 6.2. 		

Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic achievement standards:</u></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards and with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards such that a student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards (1) are aligned with the State’s challenging academic content standards for the grade in which a student is enrolled; (2) promote access to the general curriculum consistent with the IDEA; (3) reflect professional judgment as to the highest</p>	<p>Not addressed by in the resubmission.</p>	<p>For the DeSSA Science Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the Next Generation Science 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 (e.g., evidence that is specific to the assessment rather than the Dynamic Learning Map – Science Assessment).

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Delaware-General Science Assessment

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
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.		
Section 6.3 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence submitted for CE 6.3. The original request stands. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Delaware-General Science Assessment

Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State reports its assessment results for all students assessed, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public.</p> <p>The State reports to the public its assessment results on <u>student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level²</u></p> <p>For <u>academic content assessments</u>, the State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the <u>specific academic needs of students</u>, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its academic content assessments that: 	<p>Not addressed in the resubmission.</p>	<p>For the DeSSA Science Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the State reports assessment results, including itemized score analysis, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results (e.g., evidence of more detailed reports such as item analysis reports). Evidence that the State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports (e.g., reports by item, standard, or domain) after each administration of its DeSSA Science Assessment that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian. Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.

² 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 Delaware-General Science Assessment

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a <u>student’s academic achievement</u>; ○ Report the <u>student’s academic achievement</u> in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards; ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific <u>academic needs of students</u>; ○ Are provided in an understandable and uniform format; ○ Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian; ○ Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent. ● The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. 		<p>• 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 (e.g., how soon after testing are the results made available).</p> <p>Sufficient evidence state reports assessments results in timely schedule. Parent report is clear and include enough guidance for parents to understand the meaning or scores. State did not submit any evidence of itemized score reports to districts and schools to help interpret results to address specific academic needs. Item specification (6.4.2) describes how items and performance task are developed.</p> <p>Parent report was clear and easy to understand. District and school reports not provided.</p> <p>Note—classroom, school, or district reports were not 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 Delaware-General Science Assessment

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
<p data-bbox="191 293 982 326">_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul data-bbox="247 326 1940 418" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="247 326 1940 418">• Evidence should be specified by the state. Submitted evidence included parent reports, but no reports for classrooms, schools or districts. Evidence should include more specific reporting that could be used to guide instruction. Currently, no evidence of sub-scores or specific test information beyond overall scale scores is provided. Scale scores are tied to performance level descriptions—but nothing more specific is in evidence to guide instruction. 		

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

January-March 2021 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 ASSESSMENTS4

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

Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content Standards 5

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

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

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

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS 11

Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development 11

Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development 14

Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration..... 15

Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration 17

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

Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy .. 20

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....21

Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content21

Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes 23

Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure..... 24

Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables..... 25

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER26

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability 26

Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility 28

Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum 30

Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring..... 31

Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms..... 32

Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment 33

Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance 34

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS35

Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 35

Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments..... 38

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations 39

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.

..... 41

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING43

Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students 43
Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting 45
Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 46
Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting 48

SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS..51

Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments 51
Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments 53
Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State Assessments 54

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

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

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content Standards

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

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

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

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to <u>the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards</u> for the grade that is being assessed and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; 	<p>Purposes and Intended Interpretations and Uses of Results</p>	<p>Purposes and Intended Interpretations and Uses of Results</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of <u>the State’s grade-level academic content standards</u> and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results. 	<p>Test Structure and Blueprints</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> SC 01 Technical Manual Science 2015-16 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter III: Item and Test Development <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Essential Element Concept Maps for Testlet Development (pp. 45-46) Chapter IX: Validity Studies <ol style="list-style-type: none"> External Alignment Study (pp. 192-198) SC 07 Science Alignment Response Memo <ol style="list-style-type: none"> ATLAS Response (pp. 3-4) SC 09 Science Alignment Follow-up Report <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Section 2. Method <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Panel Procedures (pp. 15) Section 3. Panelists (p. 18) Section 5. Results <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Table 5.9 (p. 31) Evaluations (pp. 34-37) SC 08 Interim Report on Development and Revision of Essential Elements in Science for the Dynamic Learning Maps Alternate Assessment System <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Essential Element Revision Expansion <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Purpose and Goals (p. 1) Overview of the Approach (pp. 2-3) 	<p>Test Structure and Blueprints</p> <p><u>[USED requested additional evidence of an overall test design and test blueprints that measure the full breadth of the State’s grade-level academic content standards in science (e.g., evidence that the test design adequately samples the Essential Elements in science).]</u></p> <p>Further evidence is needed that describes an overall test design and test blueprints that measure the full breadth of the State’s grade-level academic content standards in science (e.g., evidence that the test design adequately samples the Essential Elements in science). Specifically, DLM needs to provide updated 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 grade-level academic content standards and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results.</p> <p>Submitted evidence confirms alignment issues found in the original alignment study, but those issues have not yet been fixed. Therefore, the current submission does not provide sufficient evidence of an overall test design and 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 DLM SCIENCE

	<p>c) Principles for EE Development (p. 3) d) EE Development and Revision Criteria (p. 7) e) Anticipated Results (pp. 8-9) f) Methods (p. 10-18) g) Results (pp. 19-21)</p> <p><u>Note:</u> For SC 08, page numbers provided by DLM were incorrect; peer reviewers have corrected page numbers.</p>	<p>blueprints that measure the full breadth of the State’s grade-level academic content standards in science as requested.</p> <p>Submitted evidence does provide plans that the consortium intends to implement to address those issues in the next development cycle in 2022, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revising item writing procedures • Revising EECMs. • Expanding EEs <p>As noted in the submission, due to significant changes as results of this plan, the consortium will undergo a full resubmission of evidence once new data become available in Phase 2.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <u>the State’s academic content standards</u>, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills). 	<p>Representation of Knowledge and Skills in the Assessment and the Standards</p>	<p>Representation of Knowledge and Skills in the Assessment and the Standards</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design and intended uses and interpretations of results. 	<p>Item Pool and Selection Procedures</p>	<p>Item Pool and Selection Procedures</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the student is enrolled and uses that determination for all reporting. 	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the State administers a content assessment that includes portfolios, 	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

such assessment may be partially administered through a portfolio but may not be <i>entirely</i> administered through a portfolio.		
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
<input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of an overall test design and test blueprints that measure the full breadth of the State’s grade-level academic content standards in science (e.g., evidence that the test design adequately samples the Essential Elements in science). 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills. 	<p>Item Development</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) SC 01 Technical Manual Science 2015-16 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Chapter III: Item and Test Development <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) Essential Element Concept Maps for Testlet Development (pp. 45-46) 2) SC 04 Technical Manual Update - Science 2018-19 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Chapter 3: Item and Test Development <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) Accessibility and Fairness Considerations for Item Writing (pp. 6-7) 3) SC 11 Use of Evidence-Centered Design <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Incorporating ECD Via Essential Element Concept Maps (pp. 193-197) b) Evidence Collected to Evaluate the ECD Approach (pp. 197-202) <p><u>Note:</u> Link provided for SC 04 in this pdf “Evidence Submitted with Science Peer Review 2020” leads to a different document. Peer reviewers were able to locate the correct document “2015-2016 Technical Manual Update – Science” using the following link (also provided in the aforementioned pdf file) https://dynamiclearningmaps.org/about/research/publications/2018-19</p>	<p>Item Development <u>USED requested evidence that clarifies how the development and review process for Essential Element Concept Maps (EECMs) contributes to a technically sound item-development process.</u></p> <p>Submitted evidence is adequate to clarify how the development and review process for Essential Element Concept Maps (EECMs) contributes to a technically sound item-development process as requested by USED.</p> <p>Peer reviewers would have liked to have seen an example of EECMs (this is mentioned as Appendix C in SC 01, p.46; however, peer reviewers were unable to locate this appendix.)</p>
	<p>Item Selection</p>	<p>Item Selection</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.</p>
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> 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 DLM SCIENCE

Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; 	Standardized Procedures	<p>Standardized Procedures</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.</p>
	Communication	<p>Communication</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.</p>
	Administration with Accommodations	<p>Administration with Accommodations</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 	Training	<p>Training</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has 	Technology Requirements	<p>Technology Requirements</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required 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 DLM SCIENCE

<p>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>		<p>this portion of the critical element.</p>
	<p>Contingency Plans for Technology-Based Assessment Administration</p>	<p>Contingency Plans for Technology-Based Assessment Administration</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.</p>
<p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or N/A.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. Monitoring of test administration should be demonstrated for all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS.	Reviewed by Department Staff Only	Reviewed by Department Staff Only
Section 2.4 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>Prevention of Irregularities</p>	<p>Prevention of Irregularities</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detection of test irregularities; 	<p>Detection of Irregularities</p>	<p>Detection of Irregularities</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; 	<p>Remediation Following Incidents</p> <p>THIS CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</p>	<p>Remediation Following Incidents</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. 	<p>Investigation of test irregularities</p>	<p>Investigation of test irregularities</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application of test security procedures to all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS. 	<p>Application of test security procedures</p>	<p>Application of test security procedures</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

Section 2.5 Summary Statement

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results; 	<p>Security and Integrity of Test Materials</p>	<p>Security and Integrity of Test Materials</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; 	<p>Security of Student Data</p>	<p>Security of Student Data</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>PII Protection in Reporting</p>	<p>PII Protection in Reporting</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.</p>
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required or N/A.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

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.</p>	<p>Validity Framework and Overall Evaluation</p>	<p>Validity Framework and Overall Evaluation</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.</p>
<p>The State’s validity evidence includes evidence that:</p> <p><u>The State’s academic assessments</u> measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), balance of content, and cognitive complexity; 	<p>Alignment to Academic Content Standards</p>	<p>Alignment to Academic Content Standards</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards; 	<p>Address the depth and breadth of the content standards</p>	<p>Address the depth and breadth of the content standards</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<p>AA-AAAS: Alignment between assessments and content standards (Measurement of Academic Content Standards)</p> <p>1) SC 07 Science Alignment Response Memo a) ATLAS Response (pp.1-5)</p> <p>2) SC 08 Interim Report on Development and Revision of Essential Elements in Science</p>	<p>AA-AAAS: Alignment between assessments and content standards</p> <p><u>USED requested evidence of a plan and timeline to address recommendations of the external evaluation of alignment of the tests.</u></p> <p>Submitted evidence is adequate, providing a plan and timeline to address recommendations of the external</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.	a) Future External Review Panel and Process Design (pp. 22)	evaluation of alignment of the tests as requested by USDE.
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap: <u>the intended cognitive processes</u> appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.		No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.
Section 3.2 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s <u>academic content standards</u>.</p>		<p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element</p>
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or N/A.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>Score Relationship to Other Variables</p> <p>1) SC 04 Technical Manual Update - Science 2018-19 9.4. Evidence Based on Relation to Other Variables (pp. 79-84)</p> <p>2) SC 05 Technical Manual Update - Science 2019-20 9.4. Evidence Based on Relation to Other Variables (pp. 44-45)</p> <p>3) SC 11 Use of Evidence-Centered Design (p. 201).</p> <p><u>Note:</u> Page references above for SC 04 do not correspond to that document, but rather to a document on the publication list “2018-19 Science Technical Manual” and actually titled “2018-2019 Technical Manual Update – Science”.</p>	<p>Score Relationship to Other Variables</p> <p><u>USED requested additional evidence that the science tests are related as expected with similar variables (e.g., other measures of science achievement).</u></p> <p>Submitted evidence is adequate to demonstrate that the science tests are related as expected with similar variables such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher evaluation of student knowledge/skills through the First Contact Survey • Knowledge, skills, and understandings needed for pursuit of postsecondary opportunities (SC 05, not listed by DLM as evidence for this CE). • Teachers’ perceptions of student mastery of the skill measured by each EE and linkage levels (SC 11, not listed by DLM as evidence for this CE). <p>This is a challenging area in which to gather evidence and peers commend the DLM team for exploring score relationships and encourage the team to continue following up on relationships to other measures of science achievement.</p>
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> 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 DLM SCIENCE

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. If the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, measures of reliability for the assessment overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; 	<p>Reliability for Student Population</p> <p>1) SC 04 Technical Manual Update -Science 2018-19 a) Chapter 8: Reliability i. Reliability Evidence (pp. 56-65)</p> <p>See note in CE 3.4</p>	<p>Reliability for Student Population</p> <p><u>USED requested additional evidence of updated reliability, which will be satisfied by responses to critical element 2.1.</u></p> <p>Submitted evidence is adequate to demonstrate reliability of the test. DLM indicates that reliability will continue to be monitored and reported annually as it should, especially with the new development cycle in 2022.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable; 	<p>Overall and Conditional Standard Error of Measurement</p>	<p>Overall and Conditional Standard Error of Measurement</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results; 	<p>Classification Accuracy and Consistency</p>	<p>Classification Accuracy and Consistency</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s academic achievement. 	<p>CAT: Test Forms Have Adequately Precise Estimates of Student’s Achievement</p>	<p>CAT: Test Forms Have Adequately Precise Estimates of Student’s Achievement</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of 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 DLM SCIENCE

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><i>For all State academic assessments,</i> assessments should be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (see definition¹).</p> <p>For academic content assessments, the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in their design, development and analysis.</p>	<p>Accessibility</p>	<p>Accessibility</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element</p>
	<p>Fairness</p>	<p>Fairness</p> <p><u>USED requested additional evidence of reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that the assessments are fair across student groups in the design, development, and analysis of its assessments. Such evidence may include the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Once sufficient data exists, additional analysis by student subgroup to analyze test fairness.</u> • <u>Once sufficient data exists, additional item analysis to examine the effects of certain stimuli (e.g., “fictionalized” science stories) and item response characteristics (response order) on test fairness.</u>
	<p>Fairness in Design</p> <p>1) SC 05 Technical Manual Update - Science 2019-20</p>	<p>Fairness in Design (addressing the 2nd bullet, above)</p> <p>Submitted evidence is adequate to support the test fairness</p>

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

	<p>a) Chapter 3: Item and Test Development i. Science Testlet Development (pp. 5-7)</p>	<p>in design via sound item and test development processes.</p> <p>In future submissions, it would be helpful to include, as a reference for reviewers (some of whom may not have reviewed previous DLM submissions), a recap of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How items were reviewed for bias during item development process. • How DLM used the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) in item and test development. • Steps taken to ensure that the test design is fair across subgroups.
	<p>Fairness in Analysis</p> <p>1) SC 05 Technical Manual Update - Science 2019-20 a) Chapter 9: Validity Studies i. Evaluation of Item-Level Bias (pp. 36-43)</p> <p>2) SC 03 Technical Manual Update - Science 2017-18 a) Chapter 9: Validity Studies i. Evaluation of Item-Level Bias (pp. 61-65)</p>	<p>Fairness in Analysis (addressing the 1st bullet on page 29, row 2, column 3)</p> <p>Submitted evidence is adequate to support the test fairness in analysis via sound item DIF and bias analyses.</p> <p>In future submissions, it would be helpful to include details, as a reference for reviewers (some of whom may not have reviewed previous DLM submissions), on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How the test development team reviewed the content of items for bias (flagging criteria, decision making processes). • Results from further DIF/bias analysis by subgroup once sufficient data exists, especially with the new development cycle in 2022.
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> 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 DLM SCIENCE

Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for academic assessments , including performance for high- and low-achieving students.	Adequately Precise Estimate Across the Continuum	Adequately Precise Estimate Across the Continuum No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.
Section 4.3 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s <u>academic achievement standards</u>.</p>	<p>Standardized Scoring Procedures</p>	<p>Standardized Scoring Procedures</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.</p>
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> 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 DLM SCIENCE

Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
If the State administers multiple forms of academic assessments within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards 	Assessment Forms Represent Academic Content Standards	Assessment Forms Represent Academic Content Standards No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years. 	Assessment Forms Yield Consistent Score Interpretations	Assessment Forms Yield Consistent Score Interpretations No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.
Section 4.5 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State administers any of its assessments in multiple versions within a subject area (e.g., online versus paper-based delivery; <u>or a native language version of the academic content assessment</u>), grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; 	<p>Design & Processes to Support Comparability</p>	<p>Design & Processes to Support Comparability</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<p>Documented Evidence of Comparability</p>	<p>Documented Evidence of Comparability</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.</p>
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> 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 DLM SCIENCE

Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<p>Monitoring, Maintaining, and Improving Quality of Assessment</p> <p>1) SC 04 Technical Manual Update - Science 2018-19 a) Acknowledgements i. DLM Technical Advisory Committee</p> <p>2) SC 06 Example TAC Meeting Minutes</p> <p>3) SC 07 Science Alignment Response Memo a) Alignment Study Response and Implications for Peer Review Critical Elements (pp. 4-5)</p> <p>See note in CE 3.4</p>	<p>Monitoring, Maintaining, and Improving Quality of Assessment</p> <p><u>USED requested additional evidence of a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria.</u></p> <p>Submitted evidence is not adequate to fulfill the USED’s request. DLM must provide a comprehensive, systematic plan for ongoing monitoring, maintaining, and improving quality of the DLM science assessment.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website. 		
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A comprehensive, systematic plan for ongoing monitoring, maintaining, and improving quality of the DLM science assessment. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provides a clear explanation of the differences between assessments aligned with grade-level academic achievement standards and those aligned with alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student's education resulting from taking an AA-AAAS, such as how participation in such assessments may delay or otherwise affect the student from completing the requirements for a regular high school diploma; 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; 	<p>THIS PORTION OF THE CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	N/A	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<p>Promote Access to the General Curriculum</p>	<p>Promote Access to the General Curriculum No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of 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 DLM SCIENCE

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"> 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. 	N/A	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State has in place and monitors implementation of guidelines for IEP teams to apply in determining, on a case-by-case basis, which students with the most significant cognitive disabilities will be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, if applicable. Such guidelines must be developed in accordance with 34 CFR § 200.6(d).² 	N/A	N/A
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required or N/A		

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

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

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and ELs, including ELs with disabilities. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that appropriate accommodations, such as, interoperability with, and ability to use, assistive technology, are available to measure the academic achievement of students with disabilities. 	<p>Appropriate Accommodations Available for Students with Disabilities</p>	<p>Appropriate Accommodations Available for Students with Disabilities</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs; 	<p>Appropriate Accommodations Available for English Learners</p>	<p>Appropriate Accommodations Available for English Learners</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>Appropriateness and Effectiveness of Accommodations</p>	<p>Appropriateness and Effectiveness of Accommodations</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 	<p>Exceptional Accommodations Requests</p> <p>THIS PORTION OF THE CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</p>	<p>Exceptional Accommodations Requests</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	N/A	N/A
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required .		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; 	<p>Accommodations and Participation Decisions are Consistent with State Policy</p>	<p>Accommodations and Participation Decisions are Consistent with State Policy</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; 	<p>Appropriateness of Accommodations and Participation Decisions for Addressing Student Needs</p>	<p>Appropriateness of Accommodations and Participation Decisions for Addressing Student Needs</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; 	<p>Consistent with Accommodations During Instruction and/or Practice</p>	<p>Consistent with Accommodations During Instruction and/or Practice</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 	<p>Consistent with Accommodations Identified by Team</p>	<p>Consistent with Accommodations Identified by Team</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures; 	<p>Administered with Fidelity to Procedures</p>	<p>Administered with Fidelity to Procedures</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitored for administrations of all required academic content 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
assessments and AA-AAAS.		
Section 5.4 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or N/A. <input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic content standards:</u> The State formally adopted <u>challenging academic achievement standards</u> in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; 	<p>THIS CRITICAL ELEMENT IS ADDRESSED IN INDIVIDUAL STATE SUBMISSIONS.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State applies its academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; 		
<p>The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (1) at least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third for lower achievement; (2) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (3) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 6.1 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or N/A.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards.</u> 	<p>Technically Sound Method</p> <p>1) SC 07 Science Alignment Response Memo</p> <p> a) Focus 1</p> <p> i) ATLAS Response (p. 2)</p> <p> b) Alignment Study Response and Implications for Peer Review Critical Elements (pp. 4-5)</p>	<p>Technically Sound Method</p> <p><u>USED requested additional evidence of a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting alternate academic achievement standards in science to ensure they are valid and reliable. Specifically, a plan and timeline to revisit the achievement standards after the incorporation of phase II development.</u></p> <p>Additional evidence is required that describes a plan and timeline for revisiting the achievement standards, after the incorporation of phase II development. Submitted evidence does not indicate this; in fact, the consortium indicated that it had not yet set a timeline for the launch of the new operational system based on the 2022 Essential Elements.</p>
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A plan and timeline to revisit the achievement standards after the incorporation of phase II development. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic achievement standards:</u></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards and with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards such that a student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards (1) are aligned with the State’s challenging academic content standards for the grade in which a student is enrolled; (2) promote access to the general curriculum consistent with the IDEA; (3) reflect professional judgment as to the highest possible standards achievable for such students; (4) are designated in the IEP for each student for whom alternate academic achievement standards apply; and (5) are aligned to ensure that a student who meets the alternate academic achievement standards is on track to pursue postsecondary education or competitive</p>	<p>Challenging Alternate Academic Achievement Standards</p> <p>1) SC 10 Postsecondary Opportunities Tech Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Chapter 1: Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Hypotheses (pp. 10-12) b) Chapter 3: Vertical Alignment Evidence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Introduction (p. 21) ii) Vertical Alignment for Science (p. 22) iii) Vertical Articulation of Achievement Standards (pp. 22-26) c) Chapter 4: Identifying Postsecondary Opportunities and Academic Skills <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Identification of Postsecondary Opportunities (pp. 31-32) ii) Responsibilities; Knowledge, Skills, and Understandings; and Academic Skills (pp. 33-34) iii) Final Versions of Academic Skill Statements & Results (pp. 36-41) iv) Final Academic Skills (p. 41) d) Chapter 5: Ratings of Academic Skills with Alternate Academic Achievement Standards <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Purpose (p. 42) ii) Participants (pp. 43-45) iii) Panel Activities (pp. 45-51) iv) Results (pp. 51-57) v) Figure 5.5 (p. 54) e) Chapter 6: Conclusion (pp. 59-60) 	<p>Challenging alternative Academic Standards: Alignment to Support Pursuit of Postsecondary Opportunities</p> <p><u>USED requested additional evidence that the DLM alternate academic achievement standards ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA.</u></p> <p>Submitted evidence is sufficient for ensuring that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as requested by USED. DLM provided details of a study that employed a unique design based on well-established methodologies (e.g., standard setting, alignment studies) to determine whether alternate academic achievement standards support readiness to pursue post-secondary opportunities (academic or employment). The study received input and support from the TAC at various phases of the work. Despite some limitations, the study is a good initial effort to address this newly added requirement (alignment to support pursuit of postsecondary opportunities). Peer reviewers expect to see in future submissions results from any activities that have been planned but put on hold due to COVID-19 once they become 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 DLM SCIENCE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
integrated employment.		
	Development of the Performance Level Descriptors	Development of the Performance Level Descriptors No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.
	Differentiated Content Across Grades	Differentiated Content Across Grades No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element
Section 6.3 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or <input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State reports its assessment results for all students assessed, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public.</p> <p>The State reports to the public its assessment results on <u>student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level³</u></p>	<p>Reporting Results</p>	<p>Reporting Results</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For <u>academic content assessments</u>, the State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the <u>specific academic needs of students</u>, and 	<p>Assessment Results Reported to Support Appropriate Uses of Results</p>	<p>Assessment Results Reported to Support Appropriate Uses of Results</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results. 	<p>Interpretive Guides</p>	<p>Interpretive Guides</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State provides for the production 	<p>Delivery of Student Reports</p>	<p>Delivery of Student Reports</p>

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its academic content assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a <u>student’s academic achievement</u>; ○ Report the <u>student’s academic achievement</u> in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards; ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific <u>academic needs of students</u>; ○ Are provided in an understandable and uniform format; ○ Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian; ○ Upon request by a parent 		<p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of 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 DLM SCIENCE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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"> 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>Process and Timeline</p>	<p>Process and Timeline</p> <p>No additional consortium-level evidence was required for this portion of the critical element</p>
<p>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or N/A. <input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

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

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

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

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

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

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

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR DLM SCIENCE

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

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

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

January-May 2022 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 Delaware-Alternate Assessment,
Science

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS4
Critical Element 1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students..... 4
Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content Standards 4
Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments..... 4
Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments.. 5
Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments..... 5

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS.....5
Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development 5
Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development 5
Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration..... 5
Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration 5
Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security..... 6
Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy 6

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY6
Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content 6
Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes 6
Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure..... 6
Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables..... 6

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER.....6
Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability 6
Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility 6
Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum 6
Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring..... 6
Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms..... 6
Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment 6
Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance 6

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS.....7
Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities.. 7
Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments..... 11
Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations 11
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.

..... 12

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING 17

Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students 17
Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting 17
Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 17
Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting 20

SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS

.....**ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.**

Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic AssessmentsError! Bookmark not defined.
Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic AssessmentsError! Bookmark not defined.
Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State AssessmentsError! Bookmark not defined.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Delaware-Alternate Assessment, Science

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

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

Previously Met Requirements

Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content Standards

See peer notes of Delaware’s general assessment in science, 2022 that parallel this review.

Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments aligned with <u>grade-level academic achievement standards</u> or alternate academic achievement standards in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 9-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). <p>AND</p> <p>The State’s <u>academic content assessments</u> must be the same assessments administered to all students in the tested grades, with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may take an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards. • A State may permit an LEA to administer a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in 	<p>DeSSA-Alt- R/LA, Mathematics and Science</p> <p>While Delaware had previously met this critical element, Department staff noted that an issue was raised in a 2016 peer review regarding the State’s use of a portfolio assessment for students with disabilities that severely limit communication. In 2018, the State transitioned to the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessments, so this issue was not reviewed again. However, Department staff noted in the 2020 review that the State’s Accessibility Guidelines continued to reference a portfolio assessment that includes a portion of the DLM assessment so that scores can be used for accountability purposes. The Department requested the State provide more information on how this test is being used for accountability purposes, whether the DLM portion is being used to generate a valid score, and whether the test is entirely portfolio (see critical element 2.1).</p> <p>Delaware provided Department staff documentation in this review that demonstrated how alternate assessment scores for accountability</p>	<p>Reviewed by Department Staff Only</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Delaware-Alternate Assessment, Science

<p>lieu of the State high school assessment if certain conditions are met.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A State that administers an end-of-course high school mathematics assessment may exempt an 8th grade student from the mathematics assessment typically administered in eighth grade and allow the student to take the State end-of-course mathematics test instead. • The Department may have approved the State, under the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority, to permit students in some LEAs to participate in a demonstration assessment system in lieu of participating in the State assessment. 	<p>determinations are based entirely on the student’s performance on the DLM assessment.</p>	
<p>Section 1.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments

Previously Met Requirements

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

Previously Met Requirements

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development

See peer review notes from DLM science review, 2021 (included with this package of peer notes)

Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development

Previously Met Requirements

Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration

Previously Met Requirements

Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration

Previously Met Requirements

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Delaware-Alternate Assessment, Science

Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security

Previously Met Requirements

Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy

Previously Met Requirements

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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

See peer review notes from DLM science review, 2021 (included with this package of peer notes)

Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes

Previously Met Requirements

Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure

Previously Met Requirements

Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables

See peer review notes from DLM science review, 2021 (included with this package of peer notes)

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability

See peer review notes from DLM science review, 2021 (included with this package of peer notes)

Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility

See peer review notes from DLM science review, 2021 (included with this package of peer notes)

Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum

Previously Met Requirements

Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring

Previously Met Requirements

Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms

Previously Met Requirements

Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment

Previously Met Requirements

Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance

See peer review notes from DLM science review, 2021 (included with this package of peer 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 Delaware-Alternate Assessment, Science

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system. Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, the placement team under Section 504, or the individual or team designated by a district to make that decision under Title II of the ADA, as applicable, based on each student’s individual abilities and needs.</p> <p>If a State adopts alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and administers an alternate assessment aligned with those standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(1)(E) and (b)(2)(D), respectively, the State must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish guidelines for determining whether to assess a student with an AA-AAAS, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A State definition of “students with the most significant cognitive disabilities” that addresses factors related to cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior; • Provide information for IEP Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that: 	<p><u>DDOE Response:</u> In Delaware, a student takes the regular General-Ed assessment unless they meet requirements for the Alternate assessment outlined in the Accessibility Guidelines and justified by IEP team and Parents. Document 5.1.1 2021-22 Accessibility Guidelines Manual The 2021-22 <u>Accessibility Guidelines Manual</u> has been updated and the Guidelines revised. Delaware now uses an Alternate Assessment Decision Making Tool on pages 98-99 which includes parent-friendly assurances parents must initial to ensure that they understand the consequences of participating in the alternate assessment. Appendix B-1 on pages 96 is the revised accommodation form available for IEP teams to select appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities. Appendix B-2 on page 97 includes the description of the accommodations. Appendix B-3 on page 98-102 includes the DeSSA-Alternate Decision-Making Tool.</p> <p><u>DDOE Response:</u> The following documents (5.4.1c-e) include information about the Monitoring schedule, and reports of the test Administration monitoring.</p>	<p><u>US DOE Request for Alternate Assessment in Science:</u> Evidence of parent-friendly and accessible guidance that provides clear explanation of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic standards, and the selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities.</p> <p><u>US DOE Request for Alternate Assessment in Science:</u> Evidence that the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) 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. b) Ensure that parents of students assessed based with an AA-AAAS are informed that their child’s achievement will be measured based on alternate academic achievement standards; and c) Does not preclude a student with the most significant disabilities who take an AA-AAAS from attempting to complete the requirements for a regular high school diploma.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Delaware-Alternate Assessment, Science

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provides a clear explanation of the differences between assessments aligned with grade-level academic achievement standards and those aligned with alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student's education resulting from taking an AA-AAAS, such as how participation in such assessments may delay or otherwise affect the student from completing the requirements for a regular high school diploma; ● Ensure that parents of students assessed with an AA-AAAS are informed that their child's achievement will be measured based on alternate academic achievement standards; ● Not preclude a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who takes an AA-AAAS from attempting to complete the requirements for a regular high school diploma; and ● Promote, consistent with requirements under the IDEA, the involvement and progress of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in the general education curriculum that is based on the State's academic content standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Document 5.4.2a Alternate Assessment Compliance Monitoring Notification Memo_2020-21 - Document 5.4.2b Alternate Assessment IE _Review Follow-Up Letter - Document 5.4.2c Monitoring Schedule 2020-21 - Document 5.4.2d Capital - 252672 - Alternate Assessment IEP Review - Document 5.4.2e Positive Outcomes -55368 - Alternate Assessment IEP Review - Document 5.1.4 Companion Guide Dec 2021 a) Office of Assessment and the Exceptional Children workgroup collaborate to develop documents to ensure that parents of students assessed based with an AA-AAAS are informed that their child's achievement will be measured based on alternate academic achievement standards - Document 5.1.5a DeSSA-Alt Parent Letter 2021-22 - Document 5.1.5b DeSSA-Alt Parent Brochure-DOE website - Document 5.1.5c Parent Guide PPT DeSSA-ALT April 28-2021. b) In Delaware, a student takes the regular General-Ed assessment unless they meet requirements for the Alternate assessment outlined in the Accessibility Guidelines and justified by IEP team and Parents. 	<p>Document 1.3.1 DE Administrative Code Title 14_Education provides evidence that the State has guidance for determining accommodations and supports for students with special needs as it pertains to testing.</p> <p>Document 5.1.1 2021-22 Accessibility Guidelines Manual and Document 5.1.1 2021-22 Accessibility Guidelines Manual also provides evidence the IEP team (including parents) determines appropriate accommodations for students that qualify for the alternate assessment for science. Guidance is also included for providing accommodations that need to be provided on a one-to-one basis.</p> <p>Based on the documentation it would seem the State has provided adequate evidence for this critical element.</p> <p>Revision to monitoring plan includes alternate assessment. Weakness is that sample is not random LEA is asked to provide list of students for state to review their IEP 5.4.2a should be random selection from all Alternate students within district. Plan could be strengthened by scheduling random visits and reviewing student IEP plans.</p> <p>Like the math and reading AA, there are procedures in place for monitoring adherence to the specifications of the IEP. No option for regular diploma.</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 Delaware-Alternate Assessment, Science

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>for the grade in which the student is enrolled; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop, disseminate information on, and promote the use of appropriate accommodations to ensure that a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who does not take an AA-AAAS participates in academic instruction and assessments for the grade in which the student is enrolled. • The State has in place and monitors implementation of guidelines for IEP teams to apply in determining, on a case-by-case basis, which students with the most significant cognitive disabilities will be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, if applicable. Such guidelines must be developed in accordance with 34 CFR § 200.6(d).¹ 	<p>Every student that graduates from High School will obtain a High School diploma based on the student’s meeting requirements for their enrollment in either the regular track or the Alternate Achievement Standards track.</p> <p>Document 1.3.1 DE Administrative Code Title 14_Education, Chapter I, Subchapter III, §152, section d, p.21.</p> <p><i>“The Department shall award a State of Delaware – Diploma of Alternate Achievement Standards to a student who has met the requirements of the student’s Individualized Education Program but will not complete the high school graduation course credit requirements established by the State, district, or charter school for a regular “State of Delaware High School Diploma” under subsection (a) of this section”</i></p> <p>Due to the lesser complexity of the content standards (Essential Elements based on the Common Core Standards) when compared to General assessments, a student cannot take the alternate Assessment, <i>Students who take the DeSSA-Alternate assessment (Reading, Math, and Science) will not be eligible to earn credit towards a regular State of Delaware Diploma</i> (Document 5.1.3 in 2nd paragraph of Diploma of AAS)</p> <p>Document 5.1.3a Diploma for Gen-Ed vs. Diploma for Alternate Achievement Standards chart</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This chart provides a comparison and detailed descriptions of Delaware’s regular diploma versus 	

¹ See the full regulation at 34 CFR § 200.6(d) (online at https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=07e168e9e7a6c5931b4549cc15547ee9&mc=true&node=se34.1.200_16&rgn=div8)

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Delaware-Alternate Assessment, Science

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>alternate achievement standards outlining requirements for each diploma. English, Spanish and Haitian Creole, the three dominant languages in Delaware are available on the DOE website.</p> <p>Document 5.1.3b Diploma vs. Alternate Diploma chart_Spanish</p> <p>5.1.3c Diploma vs. Alternate Diploma chart_Haitian Creole</p>	
<p>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Like in reading and math AA—there is no option to receive a regular diploma for students who qualify for the AA. Other components of this critical element were met. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Delaware-Alternate Assessment, Science

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

Previously Met Requirements

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations

Previously Met Requirements

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Delaware-Alternate Assessment, Science

Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures; • Monitored for administrations of all required academic content assessments and AA-AAAS. 	<p>Document 1.3.1 DE Administrative Code_Title 14_Education</p> <p>Section 151 Paragraph f (p.19); Subchapter III specifies the regulation for including Students with special needs that cannot take the regular assessment for grades 3-8 and High School. To that effect, training, communication and documentation such as the Accessibility Guidelines are shared with parents, stakeholders, and educators at different levels.</p> <p>Document 5.1.1 2021-22 Accessibility Guidelines Manual</p> <p>The guidelines mirror Title 14 state regulations and is consistent with state policies for accommodations. Appendix B-1 on pages 96 is the revised accommodation form available for IEP teams to select appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities. Appendix B-2 on page 97 includes the description of the accommodations. Appendix B-3 on page 98-102 includes the DeSSA-Alternate Decision-Making Tool</p> <p>(b) Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered.</p> <p>DDOE’s process for addressing accommodations on the DeSSA-Alternate is as follows: Students use all the accommodations they are provided in the classroom on the assessment. Test Administrators complete a First Contact Survey and Personal Needs and Preferences for</p>	<p>For DeSSA-Alt:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State ensures 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations. • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered. • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice. • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL. • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. <p>Document 1.3.1 DE Administrative Code_Title 14_Education provides evidence that the State has guidance for determining accommodations and supports for students with special needs as it pertains to testing.</p> <p>Document 5.1.1 2021-22 Accessibility Guidelines Manual and Document 5.1.1 2021-22 Accessibility</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 Delaware-Alternate Assessment, Science

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>each student in the test administration system prior to testing.</p> <p>Document 5.1.1 2021-22 Accessibility Guidelines Manual The guidelines mirror Title 14 state regulations and is consistent with state policies for accommodations. Appendix B-1 on pages 96 is the revised accommodation form available for IEP teams to select appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities. Appendix B-2 on page 97 includes the description of the accommodations. Appendix B-3 on page 98-102 includes the DeSSA-Alternate Decision-Making Tool.</p> <p>c) Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice.</p> <p>Document 5.1.5d Required Trainings for DeSSA-Alternate Assessment TAs shows the trainings done by the Office of Assessment in collaboration with the Exceptional Children’s Resources workgroup to make sure Instruction and Assessments accommodations were matching and appropriate.</p> <p>Document 5.1.7 AG F2F Complete Training-2021-22 Slide 19 shows the decision tree for SWDs who take any of the State Assessments (ELA, Math, Science). Levels 2 and 3 Supports on slides 26 & 27 emphasize that the accommodations selected for testing should be provided to students during instruction.</p>	<p>Guidelines Manual also provides evidence the IEP team (including parents) determines appropriate accommodations for students that qualify for the alternate assessment for science. Guidance is also included for providing accommodations that need to be provided on a one-to-one basis.</p> <p>Based on the documentation it would seem the State has provided adequate evidence for this critical element.</p> <p>Revision to monitoring plan includes alternate assessment. Weakness is that sample is not random LEA is asked to provide list of students for state to review their IEP 5.4.2a should be random selection from all Alternate students within district. Plan could be strengthened by scheduling random visits and reviewing student IEP plans.</p> <p>Like the math and reading AA, there are procedures in place for monitoring adherence to the specifications of the IEP. There are no procedures for monitoring administration fidelity.</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 Delaware-Alternate Assessment, Science

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Document 5.4.1 DDOE_IEP Goal Writing Accommodations and Instructional Implementation 2021-22 Slide 30 directly states that the accommodations on the assessment should be based on supports provided in classroom instruction.</p> <p>d) 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</p> <p>Document 5.1.1 2021-22 Accessibility Guidelines Manual The 2021-22 <u>Accessibility Guidelines Manual</u> has been updated and the Guidelines revised. Delaware now uses an Alternate Assessment Decision Making Tool on pages 98-99 which includes parent-friendly assurances parents must initial to ensure that they understand the consequences of participating in the alternate assessment. Appendix B-1 on pages 96 is the revised accommodation form available for IEP teams to select appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities. Appendix B-2 on page 97 includes the description of the accommodations. Appendix B-3 on page 98-102 includes the DeSSA-Alternate Decision-Making Tool for IEP Teams with parents.</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 Delaware-Alternate Assessment, Science

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Document 5.1.7b DeSSA-Alt Participation Decision-Making Workshop (Training for IEP team leaders and teachers) Case studies presented using current Delaware IEPs. Teams determine eligibility using the rubric provided in the Companion Guidelines. For each of the learners, attendees determine recommended accommodations for instruction and assessment based on information provided in the IEPs.</p> <p>(e) Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</p> <p><u>DDOE Response:</u></p> <p>In 2020-21, the two DDOE groups (Office of Assessment and Exceptional Children workgroups) revised their protocols for visiting test Administration of the Alternate Assessment. The following documents (5.4.1c-e) include information about the Monitoring schedule, and reports of the test Administration monitoring.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Document 5.4.2a Alternate Assessment Compliance Monitoring Notification Memo_2020-21 This was notification sent to LEAs who would be included as part of DOE’s monitoring. DOE reviewed IEPs of students placed on the alternate assessment using a protocol developed by the state’s One Percent Cap team. - Document 5.4.2b Alternate Assessment IE Review Follow-Up Letter Feedback provided to the LEAs reviewed along with further suggestions and assistance for 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 Delaware-Alternate Assessment, Science

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>LEAs were also given an opportunity to respond to any findings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Document 5.4.2c Monitoring Schedule 2020-21 Schedule outlining all the LEAs to be reviewed as well the meeting dates to share feedback and to provide any technical assistance. - Document 5.4.2d Capital - 252672 - Alternate Assessment IEP Review An example of the alternate assessment IEP review protocol of a student placed on the alternate assessment in a district. - Document 5.4.2e Positive Outcomes -55368 - Alternate Assessment IEP Review An example of the alternate assessment IEP review protocol of a student placed on the alternate assessment in a Charter. 	
Section 5.4 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of monitoring administration fidelity was missing. Other requests had sufficient evidence provided. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Delaware-Alternate Assessment, Science

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

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

Previously Met Requirements

Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting

See peer review notes from DLM science review, 2021 (included with this package of peer notes)

Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards

See also peer review notes from DLM science review, 2021 (included with this package of peer notes)

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic achievement standards:</u></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards and with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards such that a student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards (1) are aligned with the State’s challenging academic content standards for the grade in which a student is enrolled; (2) promote access to the general curriculum consistent with the IDEA; (3) reflect</p>	<p><u>DDOE Response:</u></p> <p>- As part of the IDEA (2004) submission, Delaware has always included Children with Disabilities in all of their regulations and doesn’t exclude them from requirements for Postsecondary education or employment. Such evidence can be found in the Title 14 Delaware Administrative Code Regulation 925 (Document 6.3.1) which addresses transition services, Appropriate measurable postsecondary goals based upon age appropriate transition assessments related to training, and education employment. We include parts of the regulations here, but for more details, refer to:</p> <p>Document 6.3.1 DE Administrative Code Title 14- Education, Reg. 925, Section 7.2 p.21</p> <p>7.2 Transition services: <i>Beginning with the earlier of the first IEP to be in effect when the child turns fourteen (14) or enters the eighth (8th) grade, or younger if determined appropriate by the IEP team, and updated annually thereafter, the IEP shall include:</i></p> <p>7.2.1 <i>Appropriate measurable postsecondary goals based upon age appropriate transition assessments related to training, education, employment, and, where appropriate, independent living skills; and</i></p>	<p>See DLM Peer Review. Peers defer to the DLM Peer Review panel.</p> <p>Notes:</p> <p>Document 6.3.1 DE Administrative Code Title 14- Education, Reg. 925, Section 7.2 p.21</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The administrative code reference here is part of IDEA that includes that transition services are addresses for all students with an IEP starting at age 14. This includes looking both academic (classes, assessments, etc), basic life skills and functional performance. <p>The State also offers several other documents that include special programing and job skills/job training opportunities as part of their postsecondary/employment offerings.</p> <p>Based on the documentation it would seem the State has provided adequate evidence for this critical element.</p> <p>State submitted amended legislation of employment for person with disability. 6.3 requires evidence to show alternate standards prepares students with most significant disability are on track for gainful employment. No evidence to address 6.3.5.</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 Delaware-Alternate Assessment, Science

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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 align="center"><i>7.2.2 The transition services and activities (including courses of study) needed to assist the child in reaching those goals.</i></p> <p align="center"><i>7.2.2.1 The IEP team shall discuss employment options with children and parents consistent with Delaware's Employment First Policy articulated by 19 Del.C. §743.</i></p> <p align="center"><i>7.2.2.2 Progress made on activities and services that reasonably enable the child to reach the child's postsecondary goals in transition IEPs shall be reported with the same frequency as academic goals.</i></p> <p align="center"><i>7.2.3 The child's strengths, interests, and postsecondary preferences, and plans to make application to high school and career technical educational programs.</i></p> <p>In addition, Delaware Code Title 19 §743 - Employment First Policy has specific language regarding the offering or provision of services to persons with disabilities who are of working age.</p> <p>Document 6.3.2 DE Code Title 19 Chapter 331-Employment First Policy (78 Del. Laws, c. 331, § 1);</p> <p align="center"><i>“It is hereby declared to be the policy of this State that competitive employment in an integrated setting shall be considered its first and priority option when offering or providing services to persons with disabilities who are of working age. All state agencies that provide services and support to persons with disabilities shall follow this policy and ensure that it is effectively implemented in their programs and services. Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed to limit or disallow any disability benefits</i></p>	<p>Policies are relevant but not specific to science AA results. Links from science AA performance to post-secondary goals seems tenuous. The state provides many services, but how the assessment is directly tied to those services and post-secondary placement or readiness is vague at best.</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 Delaware-Alternate Assessment, Science

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><i>to which a person with a disability who is unable to be employed as contemplated by this subchapter would otherwise be entitled. Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed to require any employer to give preference to hiring persons with disabilities.”</i></p> <p>Furthermore, through Delaware’s Annual Performance Plan for the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), Delaware Department of Education, Exceptional Children Resources annually monitors transition planning in the IEP (Indicator 13).</p> <p><i>“Delaware Department of Education also collaborates with Delaware Technical and Community College and University of Delaware to promote postsecondary education opportunities. University of Delaware, Center for Disabilities Studies operates an USED approved Transition and Postsecondary Programs for Students with Intellectual Disability (TPSID). The Career and Life Studies Certificate (CLSC) Program offers students with intellectual disabilities academic, career and independent-living instruction that prepares them for future employment or further education. As day students or residential students living in dorms as part of UD’s mission to provide inclusive environments to a diverse student body, they participate in classes, clubs, campus events and internships and work experiences.”</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 Delaware-Alternate Assessment, Science

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 6.3 Summary Statement		
See peer review notes from DLM science review, 2021 (included with this package of peer notes)		

Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State reports its assessment results for all students assessed, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public.</p> <p>The State reports to the public its assessment results on <u>student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level²</u></p> <p>For <u>academic content assessments</u>, the State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the <u>specific academic needs of students</u>, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results.</p>		<p><u>US DOE Request for Alternate Assessment in Science: Evidence that 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.</u></p> <p><u>US DOE Request for Alternate Assessment in Science: Evidence that the State provides individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports that:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) 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 proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian. b) 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>Satisfactory evidence of timely reports with interpretive guides and translation for non-English parents.</p>

² 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 Delaware-Alternate Assessment, Science

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State 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"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a <u>student’s academic achievement</u>; ○ Report the <u>student’s academic achievement</u> in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards; ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific <u>academic needs of students</u>; ○ Are provided in an understandable and uniform format; ○ Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian; ○ Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent. 		<p>However, sample report is for ELA grade 4. No evidence of alternate format for parents with disability to access report.</p> <p>Sample student reports for science are included in DLM documentation. There is satisfactory evidence that reports are timely and translations are provided for parents who need them. Sample DLM reports and interpretive guides should be readily accessible on the state’s website.</p> <p>Recommendation. DE should make more explicit how score reports are accessible to parents with disabilities. Currently, there is a Braille request, but other accommodations for parents with disabilities are not clearly in evidence.</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 Delaware-Alternate Assessment, Science

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. 		
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

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

January-May 2022 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 Delaware-Alternate Assessments in
Reading/language arts and mathematics

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	4
Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments.....	4
Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments ..	5
Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments.....	5
SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS.....	5
Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development	5
Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development	5
Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration.....	5
Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration	5
Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security.....	6
Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy	6
SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY	6
Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content	6
Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes	6
Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure.....	6
Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables.....	6
SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER.....	6
Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability	6
Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility	6
Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum	6
Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring.....	6
Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms.....	6
Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	6
Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	6
SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS.....	7
Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities..	7
Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments.....	10
Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations	10
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.

..... 10

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING 10

Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students 10

Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting 10

Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 10

Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting 11

SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS

.....**ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.**

Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic AssessmentsError! Bookmark not defined.

Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic AssessmentsError! Bookmark not defined.

Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State AssessmentsError! Bookmark not defined.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Delaware-Alternate Assessments in Reading/language arts and mathematics

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

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

This critical element was previously met.

Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content Standards

This critical element was previously met.

Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments aligned with <u>grade-level academic achievement standards</u> or alternate academic achievement standards in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 9-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). <p>AND</p> <p>The State’s <u>academic content assessments</u> must be the same assessments administered to all students in the tested grades, with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may take an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards. • A State may permit an LEA to administer a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in 	<p>While Delaware had previously met this critical element, Department staff noted that an issue was raised in a 2016 peer review regarding the State’s use of a portfolio assessment for students with disabilities that severely limit communication. In 2018, the State transitioned to the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessments, so this issue was not reviewed again. However, Department staff noted in the 2020 review that the State’s Accessibility Guidelines continued to reference a portfolio assessment that includes a portion of the DLM assessment so that scores can be used for accountability purposes. The Department requested the State provide more information on how this test is being used for accountability purposes, whether the DLM portion is being used to generate a valid score, and whether the test is entirely portfolio (see critical element 2.1).</p>	<p>Delaware provided Department staff documentation in this review that demonstrated how alternate assessment scores for accountability determinations are based entirely on the student’s performance on the DLM 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 Delaware-Alternate Assessments in Reading/language arts and mathematics

<p>lieu of the State high school assessment if certain conditions are met.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A State that administers an end-of-course high school mathematics assessment may exempt an 8th grade student from the mathematics assessment typically administered in eighth grade and allow the student to take the State end-of-course mathematics test instead. • The Department may have approved the State, under the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority, to permit students in some LEAs to participate in a demonstration assessment system in lieu of participating in the State assessment. 		
<p>Section 1.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments

This critical element was previously met.

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)).

This critical element was previously met.

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development

This critical element was previously met.

Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development

This critical element was previously met.

Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration

This critical element was previously met.

Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration

This critical element was previously met.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Delaware-Alternate Assessments in Reading/language arts and mathematics

Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security

This critical element was previously met.

Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy

This critical element was previously met.

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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

This critical element was previously met.

Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes

Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure

This critical element was previously met.

Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables

This critical element was previously met.

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability

This critical element was previously met.

Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility

This critical element was previously met.

Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum

This critical element was previously met.

Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring

This critical element was previously met.

Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms

This critical element was previously met.

Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment

This critical element was previously met.

Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance

This critical element was previously met.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Delaware-Alternate Assessments in Reading/language arts and mathematics

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system. Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, the placement team under Section 504, or the individual or team designated by a district to make that decision under Title II of the ADA, as applicable, based on each student’s individual abilities and needs.</p> <p>If a State adopts alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and administers an alternate assessment aligned with those standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(1)(E) and (b)(2)(D), respectively, the State must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish guidelines for determining whether to assess a student with an AA-AAAS, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A State definition of “students with the most significant cognitive disabilities” that addresses factors related to cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior; 	<p><u>DDOE Response:</u> In Delaware, a student takes the regular General-Ed assessment unless they meet requirements for the Alternate assessment outlined in the Accessibility Guidelines and justified by IEP team and Parents.</p> <p>Document 5.1.1 2021-22 Accessibility Guidelines Manual The 2021-22 <u>Accessibility Guidelines Manual</u> has been updated and the Guidelines revised. Delaware now uses an Alternate Assessment Decision Making Tool on pages 98-99 which includes parent-friendly assurances parents must initial to ensure that they understand the consequences of participating in the alternate assessment.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Appendix B-1 on pages 96 is the revised accommodation form available for IEP teams to select appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities.</p> <p>Every student that graduates from High School will obtain a High School diploma based on the student’s meeting requirements for their enrollment in either the regular track or the Alternate Achievement Standards track.</p> <p>Document 1.3.1 DE Administrative Code Title 14_Education, Chapter I, Subchapter III, §152, section d, p.21 <i>“The Department shall award a State of Delaware – Diploma of Alternate Achievement Standards to a</i></p>	<p><u>US DOE Request for Alternate Assessment in Reading & Math:</u> Evidence that the State does not preclude a student with the most severe disabilities, who takes the alternate assessment, from attempting to complete the requirements for a regular high school diploma.</p> <p>Document 5.1.1 2021-22 Accessibility Guidelines Manual The 2021-22 <u>Accessibility Guidelines Manual</u>, Alternate Assessment Decision Making Tool on pages 98-99.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tool does contain a ‘Parent Assurances’ section at the end of the tool. • Statement one of this section states ‘I understand that my child’s participation in the DeSSA-Alternate Assessment may lead to a Diploma of Alternate Achievement Standards, which may not be accepted by colleges and technical/trade schools.’ <p>Document 5.1.3a Diploma for Gen-Ed vs. Diploma for Alternate Achievement Standards chart</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This document outlines the different diploma options for Delaware, however there is evidence that this document is part of the meeting process as it is not an official IEP document. • It is not known if this document is available for parents as a paper document or if it only available on-line as indicated in the evidence, ‘English, Spanish and Haitian Creole, the three dominant languages in

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Delaware-Alternate Assessments in Reading/language arts and mathematics

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide information for IEP Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provides a clear explanation of the differences between assessments aligned with grade-level academic achievement standards and those aligned with alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student's education resulting from taking an AA-AAAS, such as how participation in such assessments may delay or otherwise affect the student from completing the requirements for a regular high school diploma; • Ensure that parents of students assessed with an AA-AAAS are informed that their child's achievement will be measured based on alternate academic achievement standards; • Not preclude a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who takes an AA-AAAS from attempting to complete the requirements for a regular high school diploma; and • Promote, consistent with requirements under the IDEA, the involvement and progress of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in the general education 	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>student who has met the requirements of the student's Individualized Education Program but will not complete the high school graduation course credit requirements established by the State, district, or charter school for a regular "State of Delaware High School Diploma" under subsection (a) of this section"</i></p> <p>Due to the lesser complexity of the content standards (Essential Elements based on the Common Core Standards) when compared to General assessments, a student cannot take the alternate Assessment, <i>Students who take the DeSSA-Alternate assessment (Reading, Math, and Science) will not be eligible to earn credit towards a regular State of Delaware Diploma</i> (Document 5.1.3 in 2nd paragraph of Diploma of AAS)</p> <p>Document 5.1.3a Diploma for Gen-Ed vs. Diploma for Alternate Achievement Standards chart</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This chart provides a comparison and detailed descriptions of Delaware's regular diploma versus alternate achievement standards outlining requirements for each diploma. English, Spanish and Haitian Creole, the three dominant languages in Delaware are available on the DOE website. <p>Document 5.1.3b Diploma vs. Alternate Diploma chart_Spanish</p> <p>5.1.3c Diploma vs. Alternate Diploma chart_Haitian Creole</p>	<p>Delaware are available on the DOE website. To ensure equity, this document should be available in paper form.</p> <p>There is clear evidence that students that participate in the alt assessment may receive an alternate diploma however, this evidence did not seem to satisfy what the US DOE asked for. Based on the language in the admin code, students that participates in the alterative assessment (assuming at the HS level) would not be eligible to receive a regular diploma.</p> <p>Satisfactory state provided sufficient evidence of their procedure on how student with significant cognitive disabilities are assessed and types of accommodations provided.</p> <p>State provided sufficient evidence describing the differences between general credentials and graduation requirements with alternate diploma awarded to students following completion of alternate curriculum.</p> <p>Delaware does not have a path for students taking alternate assessment to complete requirement for regular diploma. Delaware diploma/ graduation policy is different for general and alternate students. However, upon review by IEP team alt students can transfer to general pathway.</p> <p>While procedures for including students with disabilities and making decisions regarding which students take the AA versus the regular assessment are well documented, the documentation indicates that Delaware precludes students who take an AA-AAAS from earning a regular high school</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 Delaware-Alternate Assessments in Reading/language arts and mathematics

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>curriculum that is based on the State’s academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop, disseminate information on, and promote the use of appropriate accommodations to ensure that a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who does not take an AA-AAAS participates in academic instruction and assessments for the grade in which the student is enrolled. • The State has in place and monitors implementation of guidelines for IEP teams to apply in determining, on a case-by-case basis, which students with the most significant cognitive disabilities will be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, if applicable. Such guidelines must be developed in accordance with 34 CFR § 200.6(d).¹ 		<p>diploma. In fact, if a student takes the AA, their only diploma option is the State of Delaware Diploma of Alternate Achievement Standards. This directly contradicts requirements under Critical Element 5.1. Section 152 of Delaware’s Administrative Code, which disqualifies any AA student from earning a regular diploma.</p> <p>The remainder of Critical Element 5.1 components seem to be met.</p>
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State policy precludes the earning of a regular diploma if a student takes the alternate assessment. There needs to be a path for a regular diploma for students taking the alternate assessment. • Other evidence was satisfactory for other aspects of Critical Element 5.1. 		

¹ See the full regulation at 34 CFR § 200.6(d) (online at https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=07e168e9e7a6c5931b4549cc15547ee9&mc=true&node=se34.1.200_16&rgn=div8)

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Delaware-Alternate Assessments in Reading/language arts and mathematics

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

This critical element was previously met

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations

This critical element was previously met

Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations

This critical element was previously met

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

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

This critical element was previously met

Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting

This critical element was previously met

Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards

This critical element was previously met See DLM Peer Notes from 2021 Consortium 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 Delaware-Alternate Assessments in Reading/language arts and mathematics

Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State reports its assessment results for all students assessed, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public.</p> <p>The State reports to the public its assessment results on <u>student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level²</u></p> <p>For <u>academic content assessments</u>, the State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the <u>specific academic needs of students</u>, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its academic content assessments that: 	<p><u>DDOE Response:</u> (a&b) Document 6.4.2a Sample Score Report DLM 2021 shows the student’s overall score with descriptions that parents/guardians can easily understand. Document 6.4.2b Parent Interpretive Guide YE 2020-21 6.4.2c Parent Interpretive Guide YE 2021-21 Spanish DLM provides both English and Spanish version. Delaware has a small population of students taking this Alternate assessment so most of the time the other languages or alternate format (e.g., Braille communication) are up to the LEA to interpret and translate for parents.</p> <p>Delaware now offers language services that will (i) provide translations for the top 11 languages in Delaware, ii) that is on-demand with no schedule necessary, and iii) available to all schools/districts and Charters using a unique pin. This provides flexibility and access to information for non-English-speaking parents.</p> <p>The Department of Education has created a GoogleDrive containing all the information for access and the flyers in 11 languages. It is also included in the EL DDOE Webpage and additionally, we have a Schoology group (ZC38-CTJ8-PF5B8) that contains all of the access pins for each school. The academic</p>	<p><u>US DOE Request for Alternate Assessment in Reading and Math:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Evidence that score reports are provided, upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), as amended, in an alternative format accessible to that parent. b) Evidence of or evidence of a plan to provide translation services for the parents with limited-English proficiency and non-Spanish speaking. c) Evidence of completed reports and delivery of reports to parents for the most recent and complete year of test administration. <p>a&b) Document 6.4.2a Sample Score Report DLM 2021 and Document 6.4.2b Parent Interpretive Guide YE 2020-21</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents provide evidence that score reports are accessible to parents in that the scores can be interpreted by parents/guardians. Spanish guide is included in the materials as well as several resources that could be used to translate the score report (and guide) into other languages as needed.

² 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 Delaware-Alternate Assessments in Reading/language arts and mathematics

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a <u>student’s academic achievement</u>; ○ Report the <u>student’s academic achievement</u> in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards; ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific <u>academic needs of students</u>; ○ Are provided in an understandable and uniform format; ○ Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian; ○ Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent. ● The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. 	<p>Support Team Pin also has a pin # to use the service to facilitate support with LEAs and Parents when needed.</p> <p>Document 6.4.3 Delaware Language Translations Services-DOE Website includes information and links on the availability of the Language services for Non-English-speaking parents.</p> <p>Document 6.4.4a DDOE Language Line Public-Free Translations includes slides of the presentation of the overview of the translation services for educators and parents.</p> <p>Document 6.4.4b Delaware Education Language Line—FAQ includes some questions and answers about the Language services for Non-English-speaking parents.</p> <p>c) A yearly form approving the address file for DLM to print and mail the reports to Parents whose child is taking the Alternate assessment is standard procedure.</p> <p>Document 6.4.1 2019 DLM Address file provides sample information of address file and DDOE Approval for printed score reports. This is completed yearly.</p>	<p>It is stated that parents receive a score report via mail and a same of the yearly address request for is found on Document 6.4.1 2019 DLM Address file</p> <p>State provided sufficient evidence of timely report, interpretative guide for parents to understand student score report, translation procedure to provide access to non-English parents.</p> <p>Not clear if the sample score report was for alternate assessment.</p> <p>The state did not provide evidence of how parents with disability can access score reports through alternate formats.</p> <p>The score reports seemed interpretable and were available in multiple languages. There was an interpretive guide that references relevant information regarding essential elements and how they are assessed. Evidence seems sufficient for this CE.</p> <p>Recommendation. DE should make more explicit how score reports are accessible to parents with disabilities. Currently, there is a Braille request, but other accommodations for parents with disabilities are not clearly in evidence.</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 Delaware-Alternate Assessments in Reading/language arts and mathematics

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
__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.