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AGENDA

- Significant new peer review requirements under ESSA
- Navigating the Revised Guide
  - When do assessments need to be peer reviewed?
  - Critical Elements
- 2018 peer review update
- What’s coming up?
CONTEXT FOR THE SEMINAR

UPDATED GUIDE

• New Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) requirements for State Assessments
  • Guide Reflects New Requirements

• English Language Proficiency (ELP) and alternate ELP assessments (AELPA) are now part of assessment peer review
  • Guide includes specific references to requirements for ELP assessments and ALEPA

• Since peer review began again in 2016, States have asked for opportunities to develop better understanding for expectations of peer reviewers
ABOUT THIS SEMINAR
A FEW THINGS YOU NEED TO KNOW

1. All sessions, including breakouts, will be videotaped and posted online. Also, summary notes of all sessions will be recorded, edited and posted.

2. Many breakout sessions will be repeated. We chose to repeat the topics attendees said were most interesting. Repeated sessions* will sometimes have different speakers, so while the content will be similar, it won’t be identical. Each speaker brings their own perspective.

3. Some breakout rooms may get too crowded, and you may be asked to choose a different breakout. But thanks to 1 and 2, above, you will have access to all the content!

*Breakout sessions D and E are all repeated from among A, B and C session topics
A DISCLAIMER

ABOUT THE PEER REVIEW SEMINAR

The purpose of this peer review seminar is to provide an opportunity for State assessment staff to interact and engage with some of the peer reviewers and other relevant experts about the State assessment peer review process, ELP assessment peer review, and other new ESSA requirements. The observations and opinions of the expert panelists are their own.
UPDATED PEER REVIEW GUIDE
HARD COPY AVAILABLE AT SEMINAR CHECK-IN

Peer Review Guide

https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa/assessmentpeerreview.pdf
PURPOSE AND ROLE OF PEER REVIEW

- Support States in meeting statutory requirements under Title I
- Support States in developing and implementing valid and reliable coherent State assessment systems
- Document technical quality
- Apply assessment results in a manner consistent with professional standards
The updated guide reflects changes made to the ESEA standards and assessment requirements by the ESSA.

For the most part, the academic assessment provisions under the ESEA as amended by the ESSA remain similar to the prior assessment provisions under the ESEA as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.

ELP assessments now required under Title I. ELP requirements will be integrated throughout the document because most academic assessment peer review criteria apply to ELP as well.

This guide will be in effect for assessments administered in 2017-18 and thereafter.

Reviews in 2017 and 2018 have incorporated new ESSA requirements for academic assessments in feedback to States.
WHAT WILL BE THE SAME?

THE PEER REVIEW PROCESS

- Similar Critical Elements and Structure
- Evidence Based
- Use of Independent Experts
- Submission Process and Index/Evidence Documentation
- Feedback from Experts and Outcome Letter from ED
- Similar Requirements for Changing Your Assessment System: When You Need to Resubmit Evidence
WHAT NEEDS TO BE PEER REVIEWED?

- General mathematics and reading/language arts for grades 3-8 and at least once in grades 9-12
- General science administered at least once in each of these grade spans: 3-5, 6-9, and 10-12
- AA-AAAS in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities for the grades described above
- (NEW) English language proficiency (ELP) assessments for all English leaners (ELs) grades K-12
- (NEW) Alternate ELP assessments (AELPA) for ELs with the most significant cognitive disabilities in grades K-12
WHAT NEEDS TO BE PEER REVIEWED?

(CONT.)

NEW ESSA FLEXIBILITIES

- If applicable, locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessments
- If applicable, the more advanced high school assessments used by students who take the State’s high school math test in 8th grade
- If applicable, content assessments in a student’s native language for ELs
- If applicable, content assessments in a Native American language
NEW ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS UNDER ESSA

- Meaningful consultation in standards development
- Universal design for learning (UDL) in assessment design
- Equal benefits for students taking assessments with accommodations
- Alternate Academic Achievement Standards (AAAS) aligned with post-secondary education or employment
- Assessments may be partially delivered in the form of portfolios, projects, or extended performance tasks
  - May not be completely delivered in these forms
ELP ASSESSMENTS
NOW MUST BE PEER REVIEWED

- ELP assessments now part of Title I requirements for State assessments.
  - Includes evidence suggestions specific to ELP assessments.
  - Still six primary sections of critical elements.
- ELP standards and assessments are subject to peer review by the Department and must meet all applicable requirements.
- Each State must submit evidence for peer review that its ELP assessment provides valid and reliable results, is aligned with the State’s ELP standards, and is consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards.
ELP ASSESSMENT

EL STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

 ELs with disabilities must be provided accommodations on the ELP assessment (e.g., accessible formatting) so that these students are afforded the opportunity to demonstrate what they know and can do.

 A State must develop an AELPA for ELs with the most significant cognitive disabilities who cannot participate in the regular State ELP assessment, even with appropriate accommodations.

 A State may choose to implement an AELPA aligned with the grade-level/grade-band achievement standards, or it may choose to implement an AELPA aligned with alternate ELP achievement standards that the State has the option to develop.
States must provide appropriate accommodations for ELs with disabilities.

If an EL has a disability that precludes assessment in one or more domains of the ELP assessment such that there are no appropriate accommodations for the affected domain, States must assess the student’s ELP based on the remaining domains in which it is possible to assess the student.
ELP ASSESSMENT

CONSORTIUM CONSIDERATIONS

- Process used for academic assessment consortium will be applied to ELP assessment consortium
- “Common” evidence items for consortium
  - Reviewed by one panel of peers
- “State specific” items for each State
  - Reviewed by other peers, using notes from common evidence review
- Map to Critical Elements
  - Outlines which are most likely consortium specific
    - Note: this is a guide, may differ between consortia
NEW REQUIREMENTS FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

- If a State administers an AA-AAAS in an academic content area for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the AA-AAAS must be aligned with the State’s academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled and yield results relative to the State’s alternate academic achievement standards.

- A State’s alternate academic achievement standards must reflect professional judgment as to the highest possible standards achievable by such students, and be designed to ensure that a student who meets those standards is on track to pursue postsecondary education or competitive integrated employment.
NEW REQUIREMENTS FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

- A State must ensure that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.

- A State must, to the extent practicable, incorporate principles of universal design for learning (UDL) for all required assessments.

- ESSA prohibits a State from precluding students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who take an AA-AAAS in an academic content area from attempting to complete requirements for a regular high school diploma.
NEW REQUIREMENTS FOR ASSESSING ENGLISH LEARNERS

- Appropriate accommodations for ELs may not deny them the opportunity to participate in the assessments or any of the benefits afforded to any other students who are not ELs.

- To the extent practicable, academic content assessments (mathematics, reading/language arts, and science) must be administered in the language and form most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what ELs know and can do in order to determine the students’ mastery of skills in academic content areas until the students have achieved English proficiency.
LOCALLY SELECTED, NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED ASSESSMENT

- Memo to States -- May 2017
  - [https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa/locallyselected72117.pdf](https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa/locallyselected72117.pdf)

- State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments before an LEA can use the flexibility
  - Establish technical criteria
  - Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State Assessments
  - Submit for assessment peer review-get “substantially met” or “meets”

- State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments
  - Parent notification
  - All schools administer same test within LEA
ADDITIONAL NEW REQUIREMENTS

- A State must demonstrate that its challenging academic standards are aligned with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards.

- A State must conduct meaningful and timely consultation with stakeholders when developing the challenging academic standards and assessment systems and the English language proficiency (ELP) standards and assessment systems.
  - Only applies to standards and assessments adopted after the passage of ESSA (December 2015).
NAVIGATING THE REVISED GUIDE

FRONT MATTER:
- Overview of ESSA Changes
- The Peer Review Process
- Preparing the Submission
- When assessments must be peer reviewed
- Terminology

CRITICAL ELEMENTS
- Map of the Critical Elements
- Critical Element Requirements and Examples
- Critical Elements Sections 1-7
WHEN TO PEER REVIEW

DEPENDS ON CONTEXT AND EXTENT OF CHANGE

- New Assessments (whether or not new content standards)
- Development of a Technology-Based Version of an Assessment
- Development of a Native Language Version of an Assessment
- Changes to an Existing Test Design
- Changes to Test Administration
- Assessments Based on New Academic Achievement Standards or New ELP Achievement Standards
- Assessments Based on New or Revised Academic Content Standards or ELP Standards
- Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments Used in Place of State High School Assessments
CRITICAL ELEMENTS
SAME BASIC STRUCTURE FOR PEER REVIEW

II – CRITICAL ELEMENTS FOR STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW

1. Statewide system of standards & assessments
   - 1.1 State adoption of academic content standards/ELP Standards
   - 1.2 Challenging academic content/ELP standards
   - 1.3 Required assessments
   - 1.4 Policies for including all students in assessments
   - 1.5 Meaningful Consultation

2. Assessment system operations
   - 2.1 Test design & development
   - 2.2 Item development
   - 2.3 Test administration
   - 2.4 Monitoring test admin.
   - 2.5 Test security
   - 2.6 Systems for protecting data integrity & privacy

3. Technical quality — validity
   - 3.1 Overall Validity, including validity based on content
   - 3.2 Validity based on cognitive processes
   - 3.3 Validity based on internal structure
   - 3.4 Validity based on relations to other variables

4. Technical quality — other
   - 4.1 Reliability
   - 4.2 Fairness & accessibility
   - 4.3 Full performance continuum
   - 4.4 Scoring
   - 4.5 Multiple assessment forms
   - 4.6 Multiple versions of an assessment
   - 4.7 Technical analyses & ongoing maintenance

5. Inclusion of all students
   - 5.1 Procedures for including SWDs
   - 5.2 Procedures for including ELs
   - 5.3 Accommodations
   - 5.4 Monitoring test admin. for special populations

6. Achievement standards & reporting
   - 6.1 Procedures for including SWDs
   - 6.2 Achievement standards setting
   - 6.3 Challenging & aligned achievement standards
   - 6.4 Reporting

7. Locally selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments (if applicable)
   - 7.1 State procedures
   - 7.2 LEA procedures
   - 7.3 Comparability of selected assessment with State assessment

Key

Critical elements primarily checked by Department staff (e.g., Critical Element 1.3)

Critical elements likely addressed by coordinated evidence for all States administering the same assessments (e.g., Critical Element 2.1).

Critical elements likely addressed with State-specific evidence (e.g., Critical Element 5.1).

Critical elements likely addressed by both State-specific evidence and new section (if applicable).
CRITICAL ELEMENTS

A NOTE ABOUT THE SUGGESTED “SOURCES” FOR SUBMISSION FOR CONSORTIA AND STATES USING COMMON ASSESSMENTS

Exhibit 3: Evidence for Critical Elements that Likely Will Be Addressed by Submissions of Evidence that are State-Specific, Coordinated for States Administering the Same Assessments, or a Hybrid[

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Critical Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State-specific evidence</td>
<td>1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.4, 5.1, 5.2, 6.1, 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated evidence for States administering the same assessments</td>
<td>2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 6.2 and 6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid evidence</td>
<td>2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 5.3, 5.4 and 6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are suggestions, based on past experience in reviewing consortium assessments; other consortium or ‘common assessments’ may have different patterns of ‘who submits what’.
### CRITICAL ELEMENTS

**LEFT HAND TEXT UPDATED TO INTEGRATE ELP AND AELPA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development</th>
<th>Examples of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to (1) the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards, for the grade that is being assessed; or (2) the full range of the State’s ELP standards, and includes:</td>
<td>Evidence to support this critical element for the State’s assessments includes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</td>
<td>• Relevant portions of State code or regulations, language from contract(s) for the State’s academic and ELP assessments, test coordinator or test administrator manuals, or other relevant documents and purposes of these assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of (1) the State’s grade-level academic content standards, or (2) the State’s ELP standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results.</td>
<td>• Test blueprints that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations of knowledge and skills</td>
<td>o Describe the structure of each academic content and ELP assessment in support of the development of a technically sound assessment, for example, in terms of the proportion of item types, response formats, range of item difficulties, test time, applicable time limits;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Align to either: (1) the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, in terms of content (i.e., knowledge, cognitive process, cognitive processes, academic language complexity, academic language proficiency), or (2) the State’s ELP standards, in terms of content (i.e., speaking, listening, reading, and writing skills and tasks found in the standards);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Documentation of the test design that is tailored to the specific knowledge and skills in: (1) the State’s academic content standards, (2) the State’s grade-level academic content standards, (3) includes extended response items that require demonstration of writing skills (if the State's reading/literacy arts academic content standards include writing) or (2) the State’s ELP standards (thus, includes speaking, listening, reading, and writing skills and tasks found in the standards);</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | • Documentation of the approaches the State uses to include challenging content and complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., items that assess higher-order thinking skills, such as item types appropriate to the content that require synthesizing and evaluating information and analytical text-based reading or multiple steps and student explanations of their work); for example, this could include test specifications or test blueprints that require a certain portion of the total score be based on item types that require complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills and the rationale for that design.
CRITICAL ELEMENTS

RIGHT HAND TEXT UPDATED TO SPECIFY SPECIFIC ELP AND AELPA EXAMPLES

Evidence to support this critical element for all of the examples below should:

- Relevant sections of State code or regulations, laws, or court decisions. Include a description of the academic and demographic assessments, including the intended use of the assessments for promoting more effective local and State education. Include a description of the intended interpretations and uses of the results.

- The structure of each academic content and English language arts (ELA) assessment, for example, the number of items, item types, response formats, range of item difficulties, type of scoring procedures, and applicable time limits.

- The full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards or the State’s ELA standards, and the intended interpretations and uses of the results.

- Documentation of the Grade-Level Academic Content Standards, including the intended inclusion of challenging content, refers to the knowledge and skills included in the Grade-Level Academic Content Standards, reflects complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., items that assess higher-order thinking skills, such as item types appropriate to the content that require synthesizing and evaluating information and analytical test-based writing or multiple steps and student explanations of their work; for example, this could include test specifications or test blueprints that require a certain portion of the total score be based on item types that require complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills and the rationale for that design.)
PEER REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS

PEER REVIEWERS MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO ED IN PEER NOTES

“... 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.”
STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW: STATUS UPDATE

- 2016: 38 States  2017: 11 States  2018: 42 States*
- Four possible outcome categories
  - Met Requirements
  - Substantially Meets Requirements
  - Partially Meets Requirements
  - Does Not Meet Requirements
- All outcomes posted at https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/nclbfinalassess/index.html
- Several states have demonstrated that at least one assessment met requirements

*28 State outcome letters pending as of 7/30/18
WHAT’S COMING UP

- December 6-7, 2018: Combined Federal Programs Meeting
- Winter-Spring 2019: Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority Application/Award
- Spring 2019: First opportunity for ELP Assessment Peer Review (including any Alternate ELP Assessments ready to be reviewed)
- Spring-Summer 2019: Competitive Assessment Grants (awards by 9/30/2019; see section 1203 of ESSA for program description)
- Summer 2019: State Academic Assessment Peer Review
- 2020: Alternate ELP Assessment Peer Review
- Future peer reviews most likely on semi-annual cycle
Questions?
Don Peasley
Donald.Peasley@ed.gov
202-453-7982

Deborah Spitz
Deborah.Spitz@ed.gov
202-260-3793
Thank You!
Objectives

• Develop a “best practice” resource for State Assessment Directors as guidance
  • Support Peer Review submission with regard to aspects of test administration
  • Support transitioning to and planning for online state testing administration
• Topics may include:
  - Preparing for Test Administration
  - Technology Infrastructure
  - Test Security
  - Communication
  - Monitoring
  - Test Irregularities
  - Documentation
Objectives (continued)

- Provide recommendations to:
  - Guide discussions with LEAs that are preparing for administration
  - Inform discussions and decisions when developing RFPs
  - Inform discussions with existing and potential providers/vendors

- Curate research-based best practices, state examples in practice, and applicable resources
Request

- State feedback on a draft outline proposing topics for discussion
  - Are these the topics that should be addressed?
  - What common Peer Review issues need to be addressed?
  - Where is capacity most needed?
- State input via interviews (targeting September-October 2018)
- State feedback on draft resource (targeting November-December 2018)
For more information please contact:

Bryan Hemberg
csai@wested.org
www.csai-online.org