



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

February 17, 2023

The Honorable Khalid Mumin  
Acting Secretary of Education  
Pennsylvania Department of Education  
333 Market Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17126

Dear Acting Secretary Mumin:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education's (Department's) assessment peer review process under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). I appreciate the efforts of the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) to prepare for the peer review which occurred in August 2022.

State assessment systems provide essential information that States, districts, schools, and educators 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, including students with disabilities and English learners. 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 PDE's submission and the Department found, based on evidence received, that these components of Pennsylvania's assessment system meet all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of the ESEA. As a result, I have determined the following:

- Alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) in reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics in grades 3-8 and high school (PASA, also known as the DLM): **Meets all requirements of the ESEA.**

Congratulations on this significant accomplishment. Assessments that produce valid and reliable results are fundamental to a State's accountability system. Please be aware that approval of PDE's assessments is not a determination that the system complies with Federal civil rights requirements, including Title VI of the Civil Rights Acts of 1964, Title IX of the Americans with Disabilities Act, and requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. The full peer review notes are enclosed. We encourage you to read the full peer review notes for additional suggestions and recommendations for improving your assessment system.

Regarding the other assessments reviewed, the Department found, based on evidence received, that the PASA science component of Pennsylvania's assessment system meets most, but not all, of the statutory

400 MARYLAND AVE., SW, WASHINGTON, DC 20202  
[www.ed.gov](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.*

and regulatory requirements of the ESEA. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and our own internal analysis of the State’s submission, I have determined the following:

- AA-AAAS in science in grades 4, 8, and high school in science (PASA, also known as the DLM science): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**

**Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA** means that this component of the State’s assessment system meets most of the requirements of the statute and regulations, but some additional information is required. The list of items required for PDE to meet all statutory and regulatory requirements of the ESEA is enclosed with this letter. The Department expects that PDE will likely be able to provide this additional information within one year.

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

I request that PDE submit a plan within 30 days, outlining when it will submit all additional required documentation for peer review. Upon submission of the plan, the Department will reach out to PDE to schedule the next peer review. Resubmission of the State’s documentation for peer review should occur once the State has all remaining evidence for a particular assessment component.

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:

- General assessments in R/LA and mathematics in grades 3-8 (Pennsylvania System of State Assessment (PSSA)): Meets requirements of the ESEA.
- General assessments in R/LA, mathematics, and science in high school (Keystone Assessment): Meets requirements of the ESEA.
- General assessments in science in grades 4-8. We understand that the State will be adopting new content standards in science and anticipate that the State will submit evidence of a new assessment in science for this assessment following the first operational administration in the 2024-2025 school year.
- General English language proficiency (ELP) assessment (ACCESS): Partially meets requirements of the ESEA.<sup>1</sup>
- Alternate ELP assessment (Alternate ACCESS): We understand that a revised Alternate ACCESS ELP assessment is being implemented in the spring of 2023. We look forward to working with you to schedule the peer review for this new assessment.

We are currently planning assessment peer reviews for summer 2023 (submission of documentation by June 31, 2023) and winter 2024 (submission of documentation by January 10, 2024). We look forward to a mutually agreeable time to schedule peer reviews for any of the State’s assessment components where additional evidence is needed. Also, please remember that if PDE makes significant changes to any of its assessments, the State must submit information about those changes to the Department for review and approval.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://oese.ed.gov/files/2020/06/Pennsylvania-9.pdf>

Page 2 – The Honorable Khalid Mumin

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](mailto: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: Brian Truesdale, PDE Chief of Assessment and Accountability

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence Needed</b>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b>	<b>For DLM Science:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence that the State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, and aligns the assessments to the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards for the grade that is being assessed (e.g., provide evidence that the test design adequately samples the Essential Elements in science).</li></ul>

400 MARYLAND AVE., SW, WASHINGTON, DC 20202  
[www.ed.gov](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.*

# 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.

Contents

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

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

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

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

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

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

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS..... 13**

**Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development ..... 13**

**Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development ..... 15**

**Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration..... 16**

**Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration ..... 18**

**Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security..... 20**

**Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy .. 22**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY .....24**

**Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content24**

**Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes ..... 26**

**Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure..... 27**

**Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables..... 28**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER.....29**

**Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability ..... 29**

**Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility ..... 31**

**Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum ..... 32**

**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring..... 33**

**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms..... 34**

**Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment ..... 35**

**Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance ..... 36**

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS.....37**

**Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 37**

**Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments..... 40**

**Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations ..... 43**

**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.

..... 46

**SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING.....48**

**Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students..... 48**

**Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting ..... 50**

**Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards ..... 51**

**Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting ..... 53**

**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 Pennsylvania

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b><u>For academic content standards:</u></b></p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public schools and public school students in the State.</p>	<p>1.1 (1) March 14, 2013 minutes at <a href="#">2013 Meeting Minutes State Board</a></p> <p>1.1 (2) 1.1 (2) PA Core Standards <b>ELA and Mathematics</b> documents in March <a href="#">Board Actions 2013</a> contains links to the documents approved in 1.1 (1); The links include:</p> <p>1.1 (3) Chapter 4 Final Form (PA School Code Title 22. Education Part I. State Board Chapter 4. Academic Standards and Assessment), which defines the nature of the Academic Content Standards;</p> <p>1.1 (4) Resources Related to State Academic Standards at bottom of <a href="#">State Board of Education State Academic Standards</a>. The Academic Content Standards for ELA (Appendix A-1), Math (Appendix A-1), Science, Technology, Ecology, and Environment (Appendix B), and Civics and Government (Appendix C)</p> <p>1.1 (5) Assessment Anchors and Eligible Content – Grades 3-8</p> <p>1.1 (6) Assessment Anchors and Eligible Content – High School</p> <p>1.1 (7) adoption in November 19, 2015 minutes at <a href="#">2015 Meeting Minutes State Board</a></p> <p>1.1 (8) adoption of PASA AEC <b>Reading and Mathematics</b> document in November <a href="#">Board Actions 2015</a></p>	<p>State provides evidence showing State Board approval for ELA and Math Common Core standards and what those standards are in the March 2013 meeting minutes archived on the web (1.1 (1)).</p> <p>State provides Chapter 4 evidence showing the adoption of CC standards for ELA and Math for all students on July 1, 2013 (1.1 (2)).</p> <p>State’s Science standards are documented on the website. The actual Board meeting notes are not available, but are referenced in the evidence in the 9/11/2019 Board discussion regarding NGSS updates to these standards. Currently, State is updating these standards.</p> <p>State provides a link to the PA website with more information regarding the AEC (1.1 (4)).</p> <p>State provides additional evidence of the relationship established between curriculum, assessment, and the Standards (1.1 (5) and 1.1 (6)).</p> <p>State shows vote approving the AEC Reading and Math AEC (1.1 (7)).</p> <p>State provides links to a webpage with a link to the ELA and Math AEC (1.1 (8)).</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 Pennsylvania**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p>1.1(9) <u>PA DLM webpage</u> Resources to Essential Element blueprints (Blueprint English Language Arts for YE Model States; Blueprint Science Phase 1 – General)</p> <p>1.1 (10) adoption in the May 11, 2017 minutes at <u>2017 Meeting Minutes State Board</u></p> <p>1.1 (11) adoption of PASA AEC <b>Science and Writing</b> document in May <u>Board Actions 2017</u></p>	<p>State provides a link to the PA website with all relevant information related to the administration of DLM in PA. This includes the essential elements of DLM and the alignment to the learning maps, along with the essential elements currently being tested by the DLM assessments (1.1(9)).</p> <p>State provides evidence of approval of Writing and Science AEC (1.1(10)).</p> <p>State provides links to a webpage containing the AEC for Writing and Science (1.1 (11)).</p>
<b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: [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 Pennsylvania**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b><u>For academic content standards:</u></b>                      The State’s challenging academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science are aligned with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards.</p>	<p>Refer to C.E. 1.1</p> <p>1.1 (12) and 1.1 (12a-12i) PA External Alignment Study and Appendices (A-I)                      1.1 (13a-c) DLM Crosswalks in ELA, Mathematics, and Science                      1.1 (14) Pennsylvania’s Response to PA External Alignment Study and Crosswalks</p> <p>1.1 (13a-13c) DLM Crosswalks in ELA (a), Mathematics (b), and Science (c)</p>	<p>State’s documented evidence substantiates challenging academic content standards for their alternate assessment as this assessment’s Alternate Eligible Content is derived from the Common Core. The standards have been officially approved by the State Board of Education.</p> <p>State provides evidence of an external alignment study that was conducted to determine the degree of alignment of the AEC to the EEs <u>and</u> EEs to the PA Core Standards in ELA and Mathematics and PA Academic Standards in Science. The external alignment studies were completed in ELA, Mathematics, and Science* (1.1 (12) and 1.1 (12a-12i), 1.1 (13a-c), and 1.1 (14)). *Alignment study for Science was based on former science academic standards.</p> <p>State is missing critical analyses regarding the “no” and “weak” alignments between the AECs to EEs by grade level for the ELA, math, and Science tests (1.1 (12) and 1.1 (12a-12i), pp. 37-63). For example:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The impact of these low or no alignments on the interpretation and reporting of test scores by claim?</li> <li>2. The impact of “no match” and high percent mismatches between AECs and EEs for the category labeled “None,” meaning no match between the sets of standards, on the interpretation and reporting of test scores by claim, grade, and content? 1.1 (13a-13c)</li> </ol> <p>State may consider including a broader set of stakeholders (educators, parents, industry partners, etc.) in the process of matching AECs and EEs. State’s evidence of mismatch percentages of standards that were mismatched for ELA, math, and science – 18%, 29%, and 13%, respectively (1.1 (13a) and 1.1 (13b)).</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 Pennsylvania**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	1.1 (12f) Detailed Agreement Results	State is recommended to adjust its methodology in future alignment studies to reduce the influence of “experts” on panelists. The influence of expert judgments on the panelists’ agreement decisions. This concern is further supported when examining the percent of agreement in alignment strength between AEC and EE. The Agreement Results mode of agreement is 100% (1.1 (12f)).
<b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<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: [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale.]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide documentation that shows the reconciliation of no or weak alignments between AEC and EE to ensure consistency of academic standards.</li> <li>• Provide documentation on a broader set of stakeholders (educators, parents, industry partners) in the matching of AEC and EE.</li> <li>• Provide documentation to ensure the alignment of AEC to the new science standards.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Pennsylvania**

**Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments aligned with <b><u>grade-level academic achievement standards</u></b> or alternate academic achievement standards in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 9-12);</li> <li>• Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12).</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <p>The State’s <b><u>academic content assessments</u></b> must be the same assessments administered to all students in the tested grades, with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may take an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards.</li> <li>• A State may permit an LEA to administer a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in lieu of the State high school assessment if certain conditions are met.</li> <li>• A State that administers an end-of-course high school mathematics assessment may exempt an 8<sup>th</sup> grade student from the mathematics assessment typically administered in</li> </ul>	<p>The State Board of Education adopted the PASA DLM Performance Levels and Descriptors for ELA, Mathematics and Science</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Evidence 1.3 (1) of the State Board of Education Agenda May 4, 2022</li> <li>• See Evidence 1.3 (2) State Board of Education Presentation May 4, 2022</li> <li>• See Evidence 1.3 (3) PASA Performance Levels and Descriptors in May Board Actions 2022</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <p>Further Evidence that PA’s academic content assessments are the same assessments administered to all students in the tested grades, with the following exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may take an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Evidence 1.3 (4) PA Department of Education, PSSA Testing Calendar (grades 3-8)</li> <li>• See Evidence 1.3 (5) PA Department of Education, Keystone Exams Testing Calendar (High School, End of Course Exams)</li> <li>• See Evidence 1.3 (6) PA Department of Education, Bureau of Special Education PASA webpage, PASA Testing Calendar</li> <li>• See Evidence 1.3 (7) PA DLM webpage, 2021-2022 PASA DLM Instruction and Assessment Calendar</li> </ul>	<p>Department staff reviewed evidence for this critical element. Staff determined that PDE demonstrated that it administers all required assessments. 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 Pennsylvania**

<p>             eighth grade and allow the student to take the State end-of-course mathematics test instead.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Department may have approved the State, under the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority, to permit students in some LEAs to participate in a demonstration assessment system in lieu of participating in the State assessment.</li> </ul> </p>		
<p><b>Section 1.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p> <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"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul> </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 Pennsylvania

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For students with disabilities, policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including those children with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system;</li> <li>• For ELs:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Policies state that all ELs must be included in all aspects of the content assessment system, unless the State has chosen the statutory option for recently arrived ELs under which such ELs are exempt from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment.</li> <li>○ If a State has developed native language assessments for ELs in R/LA, ELs must be assessed in R/LA in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except, if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Pennsylvania requires all public elementary and secondary students to participate in the assessment system and communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Evidence 1.1 (3) Chapter 4 Final Form (PA School Code Title 22. Education Part I. State Board Chapter 4. Academic Standards and Assessment) in March Board Actions 2013</li> <li>• See Evidence 1.4 (1) Annotated Individualized Education Program (IEP) template, Part IV “Participation in State and Local Assessments,” on page 21.</li> <li>• See Evidence 1.4 (2) 2022 Attribution Map</li> <li>• See Evidence 1.4 (3) PASA DLM Assessment Coordinator Email Communications on the PaTTAN PASA webpage sent from the State to alternate assessment coordinators</li> <li>• See Evidence 1.4 (4) PASA Annual Getting Ready Training on the PA Department of Education, Bureau of Special Education PASA webpage that outlines participation requirements and alternate assessment eligibility</li> <li>• See Evidence 1.4 (5), PA Department of Education Testing Information webpage for access to the Accommodations Handbooks – 2022 Accommodations Guidelines and 2022 Accommodation Guidelines for ELs demonstrating the commitment to include all students in statewide assessments</li> </ul>	<p>Department staff reviewed evidence for this critical element. Staff believe that the evidence provided demonstrates that the State has policies that require the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary students in the State’s assessments. 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 Pennsylvania**

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

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



**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Pennsylvania**

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>If the State has developed or amended challenging <b>academic</b> standards and assessments, the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education).</li> <li>• Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas).</li> <li>• Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State.</li> <li>• Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents.</li> </ul>	<p>The general assessment is aligned to the PA Core Standards in ELA and Mathematics and the PA Academic Standards in Science. Demonstration of meaningful and timely consultation with stakeholders was met in the general assessment peer reviews for grades 3-8 and high school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Evidence 1.5 (1) USDE Peer Review Letter – meets requirements</li> </ul> <p>The alternate assessment is aligned to the PA Core Standards in ELA and Mathematics and the PA Academic Standards in Science through the AEC. Demonstration of meaningful and timely consultation with stakeholders regarding AEC development is found in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Evidence 1.5 (2) the PA Alternate Assessment and AEC Statewide Survey with Comments and Demographics_2017</li> <li>• See Evidence 1.5 (3) May 1 and 2 Agenda AEC Development</li> <li>• See Evidence 1.5 (4) May 1 and 2 AEC Development PASA Teacher Participants</li> <li>• See Evidence 1.5 (5) PASA Science Activity Feedback Report Grade 4/8</li> <li>• See Evidence 1.5 (6) PASA Science Activity Feedback Report Grade11</li> <li>• See Evidence 1.5 (7) PA External Alignment Study Participant List</li> </ul>	<p>Staff reviewed the evidence for this critical element. Staff found that the evidence provided demonstrates that the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation in the development of the challenging science standards.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Pennsylvania

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to <b><u>the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards</u></b> for the grade that is being assessed and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of <b><u>the State’s grade-level academic content standards</u></b> and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results.</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <b><u>the State’s academic content standards</u></b>, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills).</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design and intended uses and interpretations of results.</li> </ul>	<p><b>PA relies on the consortium-level evidence for this critical element.</b></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 Pennsylvania**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the student is enrolled and uses that determination for all reporting.</li> <li>• If the State administers a content assessment that includes portfolios, such assessment may be partially administered through a portfolio but may not be <i>entirely</i> administered through a portfolio.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><b>PA relies on the consortium-level evidence for this critical element.</b></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 Pennsylvania**

**Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess student achievement based on the <b>State’s academic content standards</b> in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</li> </ul>	<b>PA relies on the consortium-level evidence for this critical element.</b>	
<b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<b>PA relies on the consortium-level evidence for this critical element.</b>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Pennsylvania**

**Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>• Has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities;</li> <li>• If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>	<p><b>See the consortium-level evidence for Standardized Procedures, Communication, Administration with Accommodations, Training, Technology Requirements, and Contingency Plans for Technology-based Assessment Administration Topics.</b></p> <p>2.3 (1) Bureau of Special Education webpage                  2.3 (2) PA Training and Technical Assistance Network webpage                  2.3 (3) Email to PASA Assessment Coordinators                  2.3 (4) PA specific test administration training                  2.3 (5) PA specific training for assessment coordinators.                  1.3 (7) PA DLM webpage, 2021-2022 <a href="#">PASA DLM Instruction and Assessment Calendar</a></p> <p>2.3 (6) <a href="#">Technology Specifications Manual 2021–2022 (dynamiclearningmaps.org)</a></p>	<p><b>State relies on its (DLM) consortium-level and state-specific evidence to meet the requirements of this critical element.</b></p> <p>State has well-developed test administration procedures, training opportunities and requirements (modules, programs), and related information to ensure proper test administration of the PASA DLM in ELA, Math, and Science. Procedures for standardized test administration specific to the PASA (ELA, Math, and Science) are well described. Important information and communications regarding test administration training, notifications, test administration of technology-based assessment, training for assessment coordinators, guides, and FAQs are provided. Of note is a link (2.3 (2)) to the PA DLM website, which contains documentation on test administrator training, coordinator manuals, guides on accessing and using the training and portal, materials return guides, and a link to the accessibility manual. Supplement compiles key information for ease of use and access by test administrators 2.3 (4).</p> <p>State provides specific technology/technical test administration information and training. Technology coordinators are provided with information to manage the computer-based assessments, including network and device setup and troubleshooting on the DLM website.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>X_ No additional evidence is required or</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Pennsylvania

\_\_\_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Pennsylvania**

**Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. Monitoring of test administration should be demonstrated for all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS.</p>	<p>Pennsylvania relies on the consortium-level evidence for some of the evidence required for this critical element. See the consortium-level evidence for Appropriate Test Administration Monitoring Procedures and Test Administration Monitoring.</p> <p>PA implements a monitoring system for the general assessments. In addition to the monitoring process in place for the general assessments in PA, the Bureau of Special Education (BSE) implements a PASA Accommodations Monitoring.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Evidence 2.4 (1) PASA Accommodations Monitoring</li> <li>• See Evidence 2.4 (2) Letter to district after completion of PASA Accommodations Monitoring</li> </ul> <p>The BSE continually monitors test enrollment and completion of the PASA. Data is extracted and analyzed on a regular basis, and schools are notified by the BSE of the status of their enrollment and testing completion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Evidence 2.4 (3) PASA AC Email No. 12 – April 21, 2022 (pattan.net)</li> </ul> <p>A team from BSE meets weekly with DLM staff to review important information and data regarding enrollment and testing status.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Evidence 2.4 (4) example of weekly meeting agenda between PA Team and DLM to outline test completion status.</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the test administration training and materials provided by DLM, PA created a supplemental resource entitled, ‘Enhanced Checklist for PASA DLM Test Administrators’. The checklist includes key steps</p>	<p>Department staff determined the documentation submitted provided evidence demonstrating training for individuals involved in testing clearly communicating protocols and of requirements for standardized test administration and the implementation of compliance monitoring protocols. Department staff believe that the documentation submitted provides sufficient evidence for this critical element.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Pennsylvania**

	<p>relevant to the year-end model utilized by PA, as well as specific information for PA teachers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Evidence 2.4 (5) Enhanced Checklist for PASA DLM (pattan.net)</li> </ul> <p>The PA Supplement to the DLM Technical Manual for 2020-21 outlines general test administration and monitoring procedures. There is a technical manual supplement for ELA and Math, and one for Science to describe procedures and data collected in 2020–2021 for the state of Pennsylvania, including the DLM policy on virtual test administration, a summary of administration time, adaptive routing, Personal Needs and Preferences Profile selections, and teacher survey responses regarding user experience, remote assessment administration, and accessibility:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Evidence 2.4 (6) 2020–2021 Technical Manual ELA and Math PA Supplement Update (dynamiclearningmaps.org) – see Chapter 4</li> <li>• See Evidence 2.4 (7) 2020–2021 Technical Manual Update - Science Supplement (dynamiclearningmaps.org)- see Chapter 4</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required or</p>		

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



**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Pennsylvania**

**Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> <li>• Application of test security procedures to all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS.</li> </ul>	<p>Pennsylvania relies on the consortium-level evidence for some of the evidence required for this critical element. See the consortium-level evidence for <b>Evidence of Prevention of Irregularities, Evidence of Detection of Irregularities, and Evidence of Investigation and Remediation Following Incidents.</b></p> <p>5.2 (2) - Test Administration Manual (TAM) 2021–2022</p> <p>2.5 (1) - Test security affidavit for school Support Staff and Related Service Personnel based on</p> <p>2.5 (1) – 2.5 (3) and 2.6 (1) - PASA_Test_Security_Affidavit.pdf (dynamiclearningmaps.org), Test Irregularity Letter, Copy of email to school that violated test security procedure, and PA State Breach Response Communication Plan</p> <p>5.2 (1) State Assessment (general and alternate) annual training</p> <p>5.3 (2) Supporting Students with Blindness and Visual Impairments During the PASA DLM</p>	<p><b>State relies on its (DLM) consortium-level and state-specific evidence to meet the requirements of this critical element.</b></p> <p>State requires test security agreements to ensure that assessments are administered with fidelity. State requires test security agreements for test administrators and test security affidavit for school support staff/service personnel.</p> <p>State provides post-test test security violations procedures.</p> <p>State provides general and specific training to supplement DLM accessibility training.</p> <p><b>State is missing test security policies and procedures to ensure the standardization of test conditions. Details are provided below:</b></p> <p>1. No comprehensive test security manual or policies to address various test security issues or detailed processes for test irregularities arising from general academic assessments and the alternate assessments.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Pennsylvania**

	<p align="center">2.4 (1) PASA Accommodations Monitoring process</p>	<p>2. No quality assurance checks to ensure test administration procedures and requirements are followed and appropriate use of accommodation supports for state testing. State provides statistics on the number of students using accessibility/accommodation supports without including purpose of the information (2.6 (2) - Statewide Assessment Performance by Students with IEPs (pa.gov)).</p> <p>3. Explicit and consistent policies, guidance, and procedures should be developed to safeguard, monitor, and report assessment irregularities in districts rather than rely on district assessment coordinators to do so (5.2 (2), TAM, p. 32).</p> <p>4. Explicit and consistent policies, guidance, and procedures are needed for the approval of supports allowed in state testing in districts rather than rely on district assessment coordinators to do so (5.3 (1) Accessibility Manual 2021–2022).</p> <p>5. State is recommended to incorporate test monitoring and security in test session observations, including test sessions in which accommodations are being provided, in the accommodations monitoring plan (2.4 (1)) to ensure standardized test administration conditions.</p>
--	--	--

**Section 2.5 Summary Statement**

No additional evidence is required or

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]

- Provide documentation developed by the State to ensure that potential test security issues are investigated and remediated in a consistent manner across LEAs.
- Provide documentation developed by the State to monitor test administrations across LEAs.

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Pennsylvania**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results;</li> <li>• To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> <li>• To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.</li> </ul>	<p>PA relies on the consortium-level evidence for some of the evidence required for this critical element. See the consortium-level evidence for <b>Security and Integrity of Test Materials, Security of Student Data, and PII Protection in Reporting</b></p> <p>2.6 (3) – PIMS Manual Vol 2 2021-22, pp. 38-40                  2.6 (2) <a href="#">Statewide Assessment Performance by Students with IEPs (pa.gov)</a>                  2.5 (1) PASA Test Security Affidavit</p> <p>2.6 (1) PA State Breach Response Communication Plan</p>	<p><b>State relies on its (DLM) consortium-level and state-specific evidence to meet the requirements of this critical element.</b></p> <p>State provides evidence of data organization (data codebook), including FERPA policies and procedures governing the disclosure of student education records, including reporting of PII for low n-size populations.</p> <p>State provides a communication plan in the event of a security or PII breach. This document contains some policy-level information, but no procedural documentation. (2.6 (1))</p> <p>State cites FERPA as the basis on which policies and procedures are to be followed for protecting data integrity and policy. However, State does not include explicit state policies to protect test related data and PII. For example, State provides that a “school district policy that specifies the categories of officials and parties to whom records may be released without parental consent” should be in place, but such policies are missing (2.6 (3), p. 40).</p> <p>Professional Educator Discipline Act, 24 P.S. § 2070.1a has general information about educator ethics, but not specifically about PII. (<a href="#">State Professional Standards and Practices Commission</a>)</p> <p>With respect to test security and protection of PII, the State is missing:</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 Pennsylvania**

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Test security and monitoring plan, including policies and procedures to ensure data integrity and privacy.</li> <li>2. Test security affidavit for all authorized users who have access to test data.</li> <li>3. Documentation on how PIMS Manual is used to ensure that assessment data and PII remain secure.</li> <li>4. Policies and procedures to ensure access to and transfer of PIMS/test data, including individual student score reports, is secured and protected.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide documentation of policies and procedures regarding the access to PIMS/student data (e.g., confidentiality agreements, system permissions, password protection, and technical specifications), security of PIMS data, and electronic transfer of PIMS data and individual student score reports to ensure data integrity and privacy.</li> <li>• Provide documentation of policy and procedures regarding how to deal with the divulgence of PII or other student data.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Pennsylvania

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. The State’s validity evidence includes evidence that:</p> <p><b><u>The State’s academic assessments</u></b> measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> <li>• Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards;</li> <li>• If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards and administers alternate assessments aligned with those standards, the assessments show adequate alignment to the State’s academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content</li> </ul>	<p>Met in consortia peer review.</p>	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Pennsylvania

and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.		
<b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<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 Pennsylvania**

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

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Pennsylvania**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s <b><u>academic content standards</u></b> .	Met in consortia peer review.	
<b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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



**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Pennsylvania**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.	Met in consortia peer review.	
<b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<u>X</u> 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 Pennsylvania**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER**

**Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Pennsylvania**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<u>X</u> 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 Pennsylvania**

**Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><i>For all State academic assessments,</i> assessments should be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (see definition<sup>1</sup>).</p> <p><b><u>For academic content assessments,</u></b> the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in their design, development and analysis.</p>	<p>Met in consortia peer review.</p>	
<p><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

---

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Pennsylvania**

**Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for <b>academic assessments</b> , including performance for high- and low-achieving students.	Met in consortia peer review.	
<b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Pennsylvania**

**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s <b><u>academic achievement standards</u></b> .	Met in consortia peer review.	
<b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Pennsylvania**

**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>If the State administers multiple forms of <b>academic assessments</b> within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s <b>academic content standards</b> and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p>Met in consortia peer review.</p>	
<p><b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b></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 Pennsylvania**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>If the State administers any of its assessments in multiple versions within a subject area (e.g., online versus paper-based delivery; <b><u>or a native language version of the academic content assessment</u></b>), grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>• Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<p>Met in consortia peer review.</p>	
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></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 Pennsylvania**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments), and</li> <li>• Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website.</li> </ul>	<p>Met in consortia peer review.</p>	
<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b></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 Pennsylvania

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system. Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, the placement team under Section 504, or the individual or team designated by a district to make that decision under Title II of the ADA, as applicable, based on each student’s individual abilities and needs.</p> <p>If a State adopts alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and administers an alternate assessment aligned with those standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(1)(E) and (b)(2)(D), respectively, the State must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish guidelines for determining whether to assess a student with an AA-AAAS, including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A State definition of “students with the most significant cognitive disabilities” that addresses factors related to cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Provide information for IEP Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</li> </ul>	<p>State relies on the consortium-level evidence for some of the evidence required for this critical element. For example, <b>Guidelines for Choice of Assessments, Information on Supports and Accommodations, Guidance on Selection of Accommodations, Disability Categories for Alternate Assessment, and Promote Access to the General Curriculum</b></p> <p>1.4 (2) 2022 Attribution Map            5.1 (4) <u>IDEA-B Policies and Procedures 2018 (pa.gov)</u>, pp. 43-44</p> <p>1.4 (1) <u>Annotated Individualized Education Program (IEP) template</u>, Part IV “Participation in State and Local Assessments,” pp. 34-42.            5.1 (1) <u>PASA Eligibility Criteria: Decision Making Companion Tool</u>.</p>	<p><b>State relies on its (DLM) consortium-level and state-specific evidence to meet the requirements of this critical element.</b></p> <p>State requires that essentially all students must test annually (1.4 (2)).</p> <p>State identifies all students with few exceptions to participate in State assessments annually, including school offices that are responsible for administering the state test. It also stipulates that a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities is included “in all general State and district-wide assessment programs, including assessments described under section 1111 of the ESEA, 20 U.S.C. 6311, with appropriate accommodations.”</p> <p>State provides clear guidelines for IEP teams to identifying SWSCD, which students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards. (1.4 (1) p. 34-42. State provides clear six-question checklist) on the identification of SWSCD, 1.4 (1), p. 38.</p> <p>State provides the definition of “students with the most significant cognitive disabilities” and the criteria for including students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in DLM/Pennsylvania Alternate System of Assessment (PASA).</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 Pennsylvania**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provides a clear explanation of the differences between assessments aligned with grade-level academic achievement standards and those aligned with alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student's education resulting from taking an AA-AAAS, such as how participation in such assessments may delay or otherwise affect the student from completing the requirements for a regular high school diploma;</li> <li>• Ensure that parents of students assessed with an AA-AAAS are informed that their child's achievement will be measured based on alternate academic achievement standards;</li> <li>• Not preclude a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who takes an AA-AAAS from attempting to complete the requirements for a regular high school diploma; and</li> <li>• Promote, consistent with requirements under the IDEA, the involvement and progress of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in the general education curriculum that is based on the State's academic content standards</li> </ul>	<p>1.4 (4) PASA Annual Getting Ready Training</p> <p>5.1 (2) A Parent Guide to the Pennsylvania Alternate System of Assessment (PASA): Frequently Asked Questions</p> <p>1.4 (4) PASA Annual Getting Ready Training</p> <p>5.1 (3) PA 1% Compliance Plan – December 2021 Updates</p> <p>5.4 (1) PDE webpage for Special Education cyclical monitoring documents: Cyclical Monitoring (pa.gov)</p>	<p>State provides excellent review of the guidelines for identification of SWSCD in the recorded PASA Annual Training 1.4 (4), refer to 25:00 – 28:00.</p> <p>State provides that DLM/PASA is based on alternate achievement standards. It also states that students taking DLM/PASA can still receive a regular high school diploma. (5.1 (2), p. 2).</p> <p>State provides information on AEC (p. 1), potential ramifications of AEC-aligned instruction, and PA's graduation policy (p. 3) in 5.1 (2).</p> <p>State provides documents that are helpful when communicating with parents/families, like "Talking with Parents/Guardians about Score Reports." (1.4 (4))</p> <p>State provides information to IEP teams and parents/guardians regarding how students are qualified to participate in DLM/PASA, the differences between the state content assessments and the alternate assessments, and the implications of taking the alternate assessments for the student. (1.4 (4) and 5.1 (2))</p> <p>State provides an oversight and monitoring plan to ensure compliance with the one percent cap on students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to take the PASA in a LEA (5.1 (3), refer to section #3).</p> <p>State provides LEAs a system through a Facilitated Self-Assessment (FSA) to evaluate and report on compliance</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 Pennsylvania**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>for the grade in which the student is enrolled; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop, disseminate information on, and promote the use of appropriate accommodations to ensure that a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who does not take an AA-AAAS participates in academic instruction and assessments for the grade in which the student is enrolled.</li> <li>The State has in place and monitors implementation of guidelines for IEP teams to apply in determining, on a case-by-case basis, which students with the most significant cognitive disabilities will be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, if applicable. Such guidelines must be developed in accordance with 34 CFR § 200.6(d).<sup>2</sup></li> </ul>	<p>5.4 (2) Special Education Monitoring form: SCHOOL DISTRICT SELF ASSESSMENT (pa.gov)                      5.4 (3) Special Education Monitoring form: Classroom Observation.pdf (pa.gov)                      5.4 (4) Special Education Monitoring form: Teacher Interview (General Education)                      5.4 (5) Special Education Monitoring form: -Teacher Interview (Special Education)                      5.4 (6) Special Education Monitoring form: Student Survey                      5.4 (7) Special Education Monitoring form: Administrative Interview</p>	<p>and accomplishments with respect to a variety of policies, procedures, student outcomes, file reviews and program operations, monitoring forms and surveys (Cyclical Monitoring, 5.4 (1), p. 33), on-site portion of monitoring, including the inclusion of parents, professionals, and students in required processes. (5.4 (1) – 5.4 (7))</p>
<p><b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> </ul>		

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Pennsylvania

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all ELs in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s academic content assessments and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed with a linguistic accommodation(s);</li> <li>• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for ELs;</li> <li>• Assistance regarding selection of appropriate linguistic accommodations for ELs, including to the extent practicable, assessments in the language most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what those students know and can do to determine the students’ mastery of skills in academic content areas until the students have achieved English language proficiency.</li> </ul>	<p>PA relies on the consortium-level evidence for some of the evidence required for this critical element. See the consortium-level evidence for <b>Determining Appropriateness of Accommodation, Information on Supports and Accommodations, and Guidance on Selection of Accommodations</b></p> <p>5.2 (1) <u>Getting Ready for State Assessments (PPT)</u>, slide 42</p> <p>1.4 (1) - <u>Individualized Education Program (IEP) (Annotated) (pattan.net)</u>, pp. 40-41</p> <p>5.2 (2)- <u>Test Administration Manual 2021–2022 (dynamiclearningmaps.org)</u>, p. 71</p> <p>5.3 (1) - <u>Accessibility Manual 2021–2022 (dynamiclearningmaps.org)</u></p> <p>5.3 (2) <u>Supporting Students with Blindness and Visual Impairments During the PASA DLM - Google Drive</u></p> <p>6.1 (2) DLM ELA and Math 2014-2015 Technical Manual</p> <p>6.1 (4) DLM Science 2016 Technical Manual</p> <p>2.4 (6) <u>2020–2021 Technical Manual Update ELA and Math (dynamiclearningmaps.org)</u> –</p>	<p><b>State relies on its (DLM) consortium-level and state-specific evidence to meet the requirements of this critical element.</b></p> <p>State provides guidance on accessibility supports for students in ELA, Math, and Science tests, in addition to the DLM Technical Manuals for these contents.</p> <p>State provides procedures for including ELs in the state content assessments and provides for allowing accommodations for ELs in the state content assessments (5.2 (1)).</p> <p>State provides evidence of processes for test administrators and IEP teams to track accommodations.</p> <p>State provides evidence that PA provides guidance on how to select accommodations for ELs (5.2 (2)).</p> <p>State provides guidance and policies on selecting appropriate allowable accommodations for EL students, including EL students with significant cognitive disabilities, on the PASA (5.3 (1)). State provides special guidance for students with blindness and visual impairments (5.3 (2)).</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Pennsylvania

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>see page 14, Accessibility Supports Selected for PA Students (ELA and Math) Supplement</p> <p>2.4 (7) <u>2020–2021 Technical Manual Update - Science Supplement</u> (<a href="http://dynamiclearningmaps.org">dynamiclearningmaps.org</a>)- see page 12, Accessibility Supports Selected for PA Students (Science) Supplement</p> <p>2022 <i>Accommodations Guidelines for ELs</i> (p. 5) [evidence not provided by State]</p> <p>5.1 (2) A Parent Guide to the Pennsylvania Alternate System of Assessment (PASA): Frequently Asked Questions</p> <p>5.2 (2)- <u>Test Administration Manual 2021–2022</u> (<a href="http://dynamiclearningmaps.org">dynamiclearningmaps.org</a>)</p> <p>5.2 (1) <u>Getting Ready for State Assessments (PPT)</u></p> <p><u>2022 Accommodations Guidelines for ELs</u> (p. 5) [evidence not provided by State]</p>	<p>Although not provided with evidence key, State provides participation policy for ELs in state assessments. Refer to the <u>2022 Accommodations Guidelines for ELs</u> (p. 5). Interpreter may be allowed to present test directions to an EL for <b>any or all</b> of the PSSA assessments (Mathematics, ELA, and Science) and Keystone Exams (Algebra I, Literature, and Biology) during the first three years that a student is categorized as an EL in U.S. schools.</p> <p>State needs to clarify and ensure that consistent EL policies are communicated via multiple sources, in particular, the use of translation supports for the ELA subject tests. Variation of the EL policy on translator support from different State sources is provided below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>2022 Accommodations Guidelines for EL</u> - states that “<b>an interpreter may be used to present the PASA” to ELs for their first three years of EL identification (p. 5).</b></li> <li>• Parent Guide - does not mention a different policy for the ELA content area (5.1 (2), p. 2).</li> <li>• DLM TAM - states a policy that is very similar to the Parent Guide (5.2 (2), p. 71)</li> <li>• <u>Getting Ready for State Assessments (PPT)</u> – allows for the use of linguistic supports such as translations, interpreters, and Spanish/English versions of <b>PSSA Mathematics, Keystone Algebra I, PSSA Science, and Keystone Biology only, but not for any part of the PSSA ELA and Keystone Literature Exam</b> (5.2 (1), slide 43).</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Pennsylvania**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<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: [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide documentation clarifying policies on linguistic supports, specifically translation supports, for EL students during state testing (e.g., whether the PASA allows the use of the translation support for the ELA content area, if the use of the translation support is limited to the first three years of EL program assignment). [For more information, refer to the section under notes (above) with the four bullets.]</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Pennsylvania

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and ELs, including ELs with disabilities. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations, such as, interoperability with, and ability to use, assistive technology, are available to measure the <b>academic achievement</b> of students with disabilities.</li> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs;</li> <li>Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> <li>Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> <li>Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny</li> </ul>	<p>PA relies on the consortium-level evidence for some of the evidence required for this critical element. See the consortium-level evidence for <b>Evidence of Appropriate Accommodation Availability, Evidence of Appropriate Accommodations of English Learners, and Appropriateness and Effectiveness of Accommodations</b></p> <p>5.3 (1) <a href="#">Accessibility Manual 2021–2022 (dynamiclearningmaps.org)</a></p> <p>5.2 (2) <a href="#">DLM Test Administrator Manual</a>, pp. 73-78</p> <p>5.3 (2) <a href="#">Supporting Students with Blindness and Visual Impairments During the PASA DLM - Google Drive</a></p> <p>2.4 (6) <a href="#">2020–2021 Technical Manual Update ELA and Math (dynamiclearningmaps.org)</a>, p. 15</p> <p>2.4 (7) <a href="#">2020–2021 Technical Manual Update - Science Supplement (dynamiclearningmaps.org)</a>, p. 13</p>	<p><b>State relies on its (DLM) consortium-level and state-specific evidence to meet the requirements of this critical element.</b></p> <p>State provides training on accommodations and assistive technologies are available in DLM/PASA.</p> <p>State provides evidence that accommodations involving assistive technologies (5.3 (1), pp. 73-78) and accommodations for ELs (5.2 (2), pp. 71-72) are available in DLM/PASA.</p> <p>State provides evidence that exceptional requests for accommodations are permitted and general procedures for these requests are available (5.2 (2), p. 79).</p> <p>State develops supplemental training on the use of accommodations for blind and visually impaired students, beyond what is provided in the DLM Accessibility Manual (5.3 (1), 5.2 (2), and 5.3 (2)).</p> <p>DLM has Data Forensics Monitoring procedures in place for test administration and implementation of PASA. Administration evidence was collected in the form of administration time data and adaptive delivery results. Implementation evidence was collected in the form of teacher survey responses regarding user experience, remote assessment administration, accessibility, and Personal Needs and Profile selections. New data forensics</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 Pennsylvania**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.</p>	<p>2.4 (6) <u>2020–2021 Technical Manual Update ELA and Math (dynamiclearningmaps.org)</u>, p. 14</p> <p>5.3 (1) <u>Accessibility Manual 2021-2022 (dynamiclearningmaps.org)</u>, pp. 30-31</p>	<p>monitoring reports are available to state education agencies in the Educator Portal. (2.4 (6) and 2.4 (7).</p> <p>State provides evidence that accommodations are made available to students with disabilities and EL students, including EL students with disabilities, by listing the accommodations used in DLM/PASA 2.4 (6) (pp. 13-14) and 2.4 (7) (pp. 11-12).</p> <p>State needs to ensure the appropriate use of accommodations through the monitoring of accommodation use during test administration. For example, the use of individualized manipulatives. With 22.9% or 1,338 of 5,831 students tested using individualized manipulatives during state testing (2.4 (6), 5.3 (1)), the State might want to examine the standardization of accommodation application across test settings to ensure the comparability of test results.</p> <p>State should consider developing additional guidelines for accommodations that have a high risk of impacting the test construct, for example, familiar materials. Recommend providing exemplar and non-exemplars of proper high-risk accommodation application during a test event, specifically, modeling familiar object substitution and stimulus script adaptation during item delivery.</p> <p>State should consider requiring additional training and/or signed acknowledgements for assessment coordinators/administrators, who will be delivering identified high-risk accommodations to students, to ensure that they have read the State-developed guidelines for the high-risk accommodation and will adhere to the guidelines during test administration.</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 Pennsylvania

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide documentation on the usage of familiar texts and percentages of these items used by all students and by blind visually-impaired students.</li> <li>• Provide access to or script of the DLM TA Certification Course to ensure that it contains information and guidance to teachers about standardized test conditions, accommodation provision, and best practices to use and avoid.</li> <li>• Provide documentation on the policies for assigning and supplying accommodations such as familiar materials (e.g., individualized manipulatives, translations) for state testing.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Pennsylvania

Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures;</li> <li>• Monitored for administrations of all required academic content assessments and AA-AAAS.</li> </ul>	<p>PA relies on the consortium-level evidence for some of the evidence required for this critical element. See the consortium-level evidence for <b>Accommodations and Participation Decisions are Consistent with State Policy, Appropriateness for Accommodations and Participation Decisions for Addressing Student Needs, Consistent with Accommodations during Instruction and/or Practice, Consistent with Accommodations Identified by Team, and Administered with Fidelity to Procedures.</b></p> <p>5.4 (2) <u>SCHOOL DISTRICT SELF ASSESSMENT (pa.gov)</u> , pp. 74- 77</p> <p>5.4 (1) <u>Cyclical Monitoring (pa.gov)</u> Facilitated Self-Assessment</p> <p>5.4 (3) <u>Classroom Observation.pdf (pa.gov)</u> Questions: CO 1-2-3</p> <p>5.4 (4) <u>Teacher Interview (General Education)</u> Questions: 70-71-82, 72-94</p> <p>5.4 (5) <u>Teacher Interview (Special Education)</u> Questions:106-107-108-112-113</p> <p>5.4 (6) <u>Student Survey-</u> First page of questions</p> <p>5.4 (7) <u>Administrative Interview-</u> Questions: A14-A18-Provision of Services in the Least Restrictive Environment</p>	<p><b>State relies on its (DLM) consortium-level and state-specific evidence to meet the requirements of this critical element.</b></p> <p>Much of the documentation under CE 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3 serves as evidence that accommodations are consistent with state policy, and appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities (C.E. 5.1), ELs (C.E. 5.2), and accommodations (C.E. 5.3).</p> <p>States collect survey data regarding participation rate in state and local assessments as described under section 1111 of the ESEA, 20 U.S.C. 6311, with appropriate accommodations and alternate assessments.</p> <p>State conducts evaluations and monitoring of <b>decisions</b> to participate in general or alternate assessment.</p> <p>Although State provides classroom tools to support classroom observation, classroom instruction, and classroom use of accommodations, teacher interviews, and administrative interviews to support the learning of special populations, <b>these tools are not designed for monitoring of state tests.</b> (5.4 (3) - 5.4 (7))</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 Pennsylvania**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
		State is missing a monitoring plan with assigned roles and procedures and other components (e.g., test session observation, procedures to ensure that provision of accommodations correspond to documentation in the student's IEP and align with classroom practice, and follow-up survey questions about state testing test support and accommodation provision, or access to tested content) to ensure appropriate provision of supports and accommodations for state testing for students with disabilities.
<b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<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: [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide documentation of a monitoring plan with policies and assigned roles to ensure the appropriate provision of supports and accommodations, as documented in the student's IEP, for state testing of students with significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Pennsylvania

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b><u>For academic content standards:</u></b></p> <p>The State formally adopted <b><u>challenging academic achievement standards</u></b> in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities;</li> <li>• The State applies its academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply;</li> </ul> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (1) at least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third for lower achievement; (2) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (3) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</p>	<p>Refer to C.E. 1.1 and 1.2.</p> <p>1.3 (1) of the <u>State Board of Education Agenda May 4, 2022</u></p> <p>1.3 (2) State Board of Education Presentation May 4, 2022</p> <p>1.3 (3) PASA Performance Levels and Descriptors in May <u>Board Actions 2022</u></p> <p>6.1 (1) <u>DLM Performance Level Descriptors</u></p> <p>6.1 (2) DLM <u>ELA and Math 2014-2015 Technical Manual</u>, pp. 163-180</p> <p>6.1 (3) Year-End Model ELA and Mathematics Performance Standards <i>Adjusted 2022</i></p>	<p>Pennsylvania uses the academic achievement standards set by the DLM consortium, using the standards setting process outlined in the ELA and Mathematics 2014-2015 and Science 2016 Technical Manuals. Together with these academic standards, new, adjusted cut scores for <b>ELA and Mathematics</b> were adopted by States in Spring 2022.</p> <p>State provides evidence that PA adopted the DLM Performance Level Descriptors (PLDs), which are the academic achievement standards for PASA/DLM. 1.3 (1), 1.3 (2), and 1.3 (3)</p> <p>State defines four levels of PLDs, and contains links to documents which further specify the competencies associated with the Math, ELA, and Science PLDs. The PLDs are also linked under 1.3 (3).</p> <p>State formally adopts the DLM PLDs, which reports student’s mastery of knowledge, skills, and understanding using four performance levels for each content subject. DLM student score reports provide results related to a student’s overall performance level for the subject using the four performance levels. (6.1 (1))</p> <p>State describes the standard setting process and the resulting achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels. (6.1 (2) Chapter VI, pp. 163-180)</p> <p>State describes the process and results of standard setting for DLM Science. 6.1 (3) Chapter VI, pp. 144-159</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 Pennsylvania**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	6.1 (4) DLM <u>Science 2016 Technical Manual</u> , pp. 144-158	It is important to note that PSBOE adopted new science standards, effective July 1, 2025, to update standards and skills in science for students and to ensure consistency in science standards across state districts. These science standards include: <u>Pennsylvania Integrated Standards for Science, Environment, Ecology, Technology, and Engineering (Grades K-5),</u> <u>Pennsylvania Integrated Standards for Science, Environment, and Ecology (Grades 6-12), and</u> <u>Pennsylvania Technology and Engineering Standards (Grades 6-12).</u>
<b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or		
<input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Pennsylvania**

**Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards.</u></b></li> </ul>	Met in consortia peer review.	
<b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Pennsylvania**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b><u>For academic achievement standards:</u></b></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards and with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards such that a student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards (1) are aligned with the State’s challenging academic content standards for the grade in which a student is enrolled; (2) promote access to the general curriculum consistent with the IDEA; (3) reflect professional judgment as to the highest possible standards achievable for such students; (4) are designated in the IEP for each student for whom alternate academic achievement standards apply; and (5) are aligned to ensure that a student who meets the alternate academic achievement standards is on track to pursue</p>	<p>Met in consortia peer review.</p>	

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



**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Pennsylvania**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
postsecondary education or competitive integrated employment.		
<b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<u>X</u> 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 Pennsylvania

Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State reports its assessment results for all students assessed, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public.</p> <p>The State reports to the public its assessment results on <b><u>student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level<sup>3</sup></u></b></p> <p>For <b><u>academic content assessments</u></b>, the State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the <b><u>specific academic needs of students</u></b>, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its academic content assessments that:</li> </ul>	<p>PA relies on the consortium-level evidence for some of the evidence required for this critical element. See the consortium-level evidence for <b>Reporting Results, Assessment Results Reported to Support Appropriate Uses of Results, Interpretive Guides, Delivery of Student Reports, and Process and Timeline.</b></p> <p>6.4 (1) Future Ready PA Index State Assessment Measures</p> <p>6.4 (2) <a href="#">PA ESSA Report Card [CORRECTED LINK]</a></p> <p>6.4 (3) <a href="#">PASA Parent Score Report Letterhead.pdf (dynamiclearningmaps.org)</a></p> <p>6.4 (4) <a href="#">Parent Interpretive Guide Year-End Model (dynamiclearningmaps.org)</a></p> <p>6.4 (5) <a href="#">Parent Interpretive Guide Year-End (en Español) (dynamiclearningmaps.org)</a></p>	<p><b>State relies on its (DLM) consortium-level and state-specific evidence to meet the requirements of this critical element.</b></p> <p>State provides information about how PA reports academic achievement results for student groups and subgroups (6.4 (1)).</p> <p>State prepares and reports annual report for LEAs and each school in the LEA that meets minimum data metric requirements under ESSA. State has developed an interactive dashboard, Future Ready PA Index, that districts and all stakeholders can access online for student academic and other outcomes (6.4 (2)).</p> <p>State provides a sample cover letter with a score report to parents/guardians, including online access to the parent interpretive guide (6.4 (4) and 6.4 (5)). This helps contextualize the purpose of the assessment for the parents. These cover letters are also linked through 5.1 (3), slide 13.</p> <p>State provides reports that show scores based on the academic achievement standards (the DLM Performance Level Descriptors). The score reports include information about the proficiency level of the DLM standards (DLM</p>

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Pennsylvania**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a <b><u>student’s academic achievement</u></b>;</li> <li>○ Report the <b><u>student’s academic achievement</u></b> in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards;</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific <b><u>academic needs of students</u></b>;</li> <li>○ Are provided in an understandable and uniform format;</li> <li>○ Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian;</li> <li>○ Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.</li> <li>● The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>	<p>5.1 (3) <u>2021-22 PASA Getting Ready: Annual PASA Updates &amp; 1 % Threshold Compliance foe LEAs (pattan.net)</u></p> <p>6.4 (6) <u>Assessment Results   Dynamic Learning Maps</u></p> <p>6.4 (7) <u>Talking to Parents about Score Reports YE (dynamiclearningmaps.org)</u></p> <p>6.4 (8) <u>Accessibility Policy   PA.GOV, p. 4</u></p>	<p>essential elements) that have been mastered (6.4 (4)) and Spanish version of the parent interpretive guide (6.4 (5)).</p> <p>5.1 (3) Slides 13-14 provides links to score reports, parent cover letters, interpretive guides, and a guide to talking with parents about the score reports. Slide 14 notes that one copy of the score report is sent to parents and one is sent to schools.</p> <p>State provides score report and interpretive guide links through 5.1 (3), along with 6.4 (3), 6.4 (4), and 6.4 (5), are evidence of understandable and uniform documentation of scores. The score report and interpretive guide are produced at a high school education readability level based on the Flesch-Kincaid and Lexile measures.</p> <p>State provides additional support for parents to understand the academic achievement standards (DLM PLDs) reported in the score reports. These are only provided in English. 6.4 (6)</p> <p>State provides additional support to teachers and schools in helping parents to understand the scores and score reports (6.4 (7) and 5.1 (3)).</p> <p>State has a policy (<u>policy document itp_acc001</u>) requiring accessibility for all online PASA and other materials, digital content and services hosted by a vendor onto the state website. It requires that all electronic materials must meet accessibility criteria. It specifically states that individuals with disabilities may request agency digital content and services in an accessible, alternative format (6.4 (8)).</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 Pennsylvania**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
		State is missing guidelines and procedures to enable parents/guardians with language (translation support) or disability (cognitive, physical) to receive printed score reports in accessible format (e.g., large print or braille).
<b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<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: [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide documentation of policies and procedures to enable parents/guardians with language barrier (translation support) or disability (cognitive, physical) to receive printed score reports in accessible format (e.g., large print or braille).</li> </ul>		

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