

Options and Required Evidence for Local Assessment Development

The purpose of this document is to provide a quick overview of the three options district policymakers can choose to follow for the Local Assessments and demonstrate what evidence must be submitted.

- Option A: One assessment replaces the Keystone exam
- Option B: Several assessment components together replace the Keystone exam
- Option C: An additional component is administered in conjunction with the Keystone exam

EVIDENCE THAT THE DISTRICT IS REQUIRED TO PRESENT FOR LOCAL VALIDATION FOR EACH OPTION

Evidence	A	B	C
<i>Evidence Related to Alignment</i>			
A1. Test Blueprint/Specifications	R	R	O
A2. Item specifications	R	R	R
A3. Written instructions for item writers	R	R	R
A4. Written instructions for item reviewers	R	R	R
A5a. Results from alignment study showing local items/tasks are aligned to Keystone assessment anchors ^a	R	R	R
A5b. Results from alignment study showing all Keystone Assessment Anchors are covered by the local assessment	R	R	O
A6. Explanation of how components are combined	X	R	R ^b
A7. Sample tasks of high Depth of Knowledge (DOK)	O	O	O
A8. Research studies examining the constructs tested by each item, such as think-aloud studies	O	O	O
<i>Evidence Related to Fairness</i>			
F1. Description of policies and procedures used to ensure tests are not biased against any student group	R	R	R
F2. Evidence that local accommodations policy follows PDE policy	R	R	R
F3. Evidence of a bias review committee meeting	R	R	R
F4. Sample score reports	R	R	O
F5. Documents communicating expectations to students, teachers, and parents	R	R	R
F6. Test administration and security protocols	R	R	R
F7. Test administration and security monitoring plans	O	O	O
F8. Evidence of universal design for learning procedures (UDL) in item development	O	O	O
F9. Statistical analyses of item difficulty across various student groups	O	O	O
F10. Statistical analysis of distractor choice across student groups	O	O	O
F11. User guides to score reports relating scores to graduation requirements	O	O	O
F12. Policy regarding appeals process for disputed student scores	O	O	O

<i>Evidence Related to Proficiency Levels</i>			
P1. PLDs other than for Proficient (If all Keystone PLDs were not adopted, then a description of the development process for the other levels is required) ^c	R	R	R
P2. Standard-setting technical report	R	R	R
P3. Evidence for how multiple components of the assessment will be combined to establish proficiency determination	X	R	R
P4. Description of how PLDs were adopted (e.g., board minutes)	O	O	O
P5. Evaluation forms from teachers regarding the process of setting proficiency levels	O	O	O
<i>Evidence Related to Consistency</i>			
C1. Description of scoring procedures	R	R	R
C2. Description of procedures used to ensure comparable difficulty of items/forms over time	R	R	R
C3. Data showing inter-rater agreement on scoring of open-ended items	R	R	R
C4. Calculations of internal consistency on multiple-choice items	R	R	O
C5. Additional reliability statistics	O	O	O

R=Required to receive a satisfactory evaluation

O=Optional (will potentially raise the evaluation result from satisfactory to superior)

X=Not Applicable

^a Alignment studies must be conducted either by district or school-level content experts using an approved methodology or by an external evaluator who was not involved in developing the assessment.

^b Districts must use table P3 in the handbook to combine the proficiency level on the local component with the Keystone proficiency level.

^c Districts must adopt the Keystone definition for Proficient.