



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Carey M. Wright  
State Superintendent of Education  
Mississippi Department of Education  
P.O. Box 771  
Jackson, MS 39205-0771

June 15, 2020

Dear Superintendent Wright:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education's (the Department) assessment peer review process under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). I appreciate the efforts of the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in March 2020.

State assessment systems provide essential information that States, districts, principals and teachers can use to identify the academic needs of students, target resources and supports toward students who need them most, evaluate school and program effectiveness and close achievement gaps among students. A high-quality assessment system also provides useful information to parents about their children's advancement against and achievement of grade-level standards. The Department's peer review of State assessment systems is designed to provide feedback to States to support the development and administration of high-quality assessments.

External peer reviewers and Department staff carefully evaluated MDE's submission and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that this component of your assessment system met some, but not all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of the ESEA. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and our own analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

- General assessments in mathematics and reading/language assessment (R/LA) for grades 3-8 (MAAP): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- General assessments in high school mathematics (MAAP EOC algebra I) and R/LA (MAAP EOC English I): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**

The assessments that substantially meet requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act, means that these assessments meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. The Department expects that MDE may be able to provide this additional information within one year.

MDE must submit a plan within 30 days outlining when it will submit all required additional documentation for peer review. I recognize the unprecedented situation affecting you and your schools due to widespread and extended school closures caused by the novel coronavirus disease 2019, COVID-19. As a result, if you need more than 30 days to submit your plan, please let my staff know at

400 MARYLAND AVE., SW, WASHINGTON, DC 20202  
<http://www.ed.gov/>

*The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.*

[ESEA.Assessment@ed.gov](mailto:ESEA.Assessment@ed.gov). Upon submission of the plan, the Department will reach out to the State educational agency to determine a mutually agreeable schedule. Resubmission should occur once all necessary evidence is complete (rather than in multiple submissions).

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.

The Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE) placed a condition on MDE's Title I, Part A grant award beginning July 1, 2018. The condition stated that until MDE provided all of the requested information from assessment peer reviews held in 2018, the condition would remain on the grant. The condition also stipulated that the Department may take further action if the condition was not resolved in a timely manner. This condition was continued on MDE's Title I, Part A grant award in 2019. The condition should remain until all of the evidence has been resubmitted and peer reviewed. If the outcome of the re-review by peers indicates full approval, then the condition should be removed. If adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action.

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

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

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank T. Brogan  
Assistant Secretary  
for Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Jackie Sampsell, State Assessment Director

## Critical Elements Where Additional Evidence is Needed for Mississippi’s Assessment System

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b>	For the MAAP for grades 3-8 and the MAAP end-of-course (EOC) high school assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the assessments are aligned to the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards for the grade that is being assessed (e.g., a plan and timeline to address alignment issues raised in the alignment study).</li> </ul>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b>	For the MAAP for grades 3-8 and high school assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that addresses critical element 2.1 will address this critical element.</li> </ul>
<b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b>	For the MAAP for grades 3-8 and high school assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that assessments measure the intended cognitive processes.</li> </ul>
<b>4.1 – Reliability</b>	For the MAAP for grades 3-8 and high school assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the reliability for each subscore or strand.</li> </ul>
<b>4.4 – Scoring</b>	For the MAAP for grades 3-8 and the English II assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the hand scoring rubrics, criteria, and overall processes are generating valid and reliable scores for the reading/language arts writing component (e.g., improved rates of hand scoring inter-rater agreement).</li> </ul>
<b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b>	For the MAAP for grades 3-8 and high school assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a plan and timeline for analyzing whether assessments delivered by different types of devices yield results that are comparable in meaning and interpretation.</li> </ul>
<b>5.3 – Accommodations</b>	For the MAAP for grades 3-8 and high school assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence to show that accommodations are appropriate and effective, do not alter the construct, and allow meaningful interpretation of results and comparisons.</li> </ul>

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## March 2020 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSISSIPPI

Contents

**SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS .....ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.**

**Critical Element 1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students.....Error! Bookmark not defined.**

**Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content StandardsError! Bookmark not defined.**

**Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments.....Error! Bookmark not defined.**

**Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in AssessmentsError! Bookmark not defined.**

**Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments.....Error! Bookmark not defined.**

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS.....4**

**Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development ..... 4**

**Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development .....Error! Bookmark not defined.**

**Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration.....Error! Bookmark not defined.**

**Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test AdministrationError! Bookmark not defined.**

**Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security.....Error! Bookmark not defined.**

**Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy .... 6**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY ..... 7**

**Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content 7**

**Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes ..... 9**

**Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal StructureError! Bookmark not defined.**

**Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables..... 10**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER..... 11**

**Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability ..... 11**

**Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility ..... 13**

**Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance ContinuumError! Bookmark not defined.**

**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring..... 14**

**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment FormsError! Bookmark not defined.**

**Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment..... 15**

**Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance ..... 16**

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS..... 17**

**Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with DisabilitiesError! 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 MISSISSIPPI

**Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments**.....Error! Bookmark not defined.  
**Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations** ..... 17  
**Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations** ..... 19

**SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING**.....20

**Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students**.....Error! Bookmark not defined.  
**Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting**Error! Bookmark not defined.  
**Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards** ..... 20  
**Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting** ..... 22

**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 Assessments**Error! Bookmark not defined.  
**Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments**Error! Bookmark not defined.  
**Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State Assessments**Error! 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 MISSISSIPPI**

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State’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</li> </ul>	<p>2.1.1 Agenda for MAAP Align Jan 2019                  2.1.2 Mississippi Alignment Study Report for MAAP – It seems noteworthy that only one ‘expectation’ at each grade level was a DOK 4.                  Page 32 of the report indicates that grades 6-10th need slight to major adjustments to ensure alignment. There are tables starting on page 33 that detail the grade level alignment by criteria. It is unclear how the data in the detailed tables aggregates to the summary tables. It is also unclear how the criteria was established. For example Gr6 ELA needs 6-8 items to be replaced or changed (rated at ‘needs slight adjustment’) (p. 32). This represents 14% of the test needing to be changed or replaced.</p> <p>Page 40-42 shows the DOK rating of the math standards. Across the grades, there were no DOK 4 standards and only 2 DOK 3 standards. Page 44-48 shows the math alignment results. It is concerning that the DOK criteria is not met for at least one standard in most grade levels. Final 5.6.19 pp. 6-12; 15-28; Findings: pp. 28-39 (ELA), pp. 40-50 (Math); Conclusions: pp. 51-52</p> <p>2.1.3 MS Alignment Study – Appendices ELA                  2.1.4 MS Alignment Study – Appendices Mathematics  <b>Questar (Vendor) Response to Study</b>                  2.1.5 Response to the Alignment Study-Questar pp. 1-4; especially p.4</p>	<p>The state conducted an alignment study that met the requirements of what was requested by the Department.</p> <p>The findings indicated that more development still needs to be done in order to create tests that are fully aligned with respect to content standards and depth of knowledge targets. It seems noteworthy that only one ‘expectation’ at each grade level was a DOK 4.                  Page 32 of the report indicates that grades 6-10<sup>th</sup> need slight to major adjustments to ensure alignment. There are tables starting on page 33 that detail the grade level alignment by criteria. It is unclear how the data in the detailed tables aggregates to the summary tables. It is also unclear how the criteria was established. For example Gr6 ELA needs 6-8 items to be replaced or changed (rated at ‘needs slight adjustment’) (p. 32). This represents 14% of the test needing to be changed or replaced.</p> <p>Page 40-42 shows the DOK rating of the math standards. Across the grades, there were no DOK 4 standards and only 2 DOK 3 standards. Page 44-48 shows the math alignment results. DOK criteria is not met for at least one standard in most grade levels.</p> <p>Peers suggest that the state develop a more detailed timeline for fully addressing alignment concerns including content standards and DOK alignment issues.</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 MISSISSIPPI

<p>and intended uses and interpretations of results.</p> <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>		
<b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a more detailed timeline for fully addressing alignment concerns, including content standard and DOK alignment issues</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 MISSISSIPPI**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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><b>Training Evidence</b></p> <p>2.6.1 Test Security Presentation-Fall 2019 pp. 19, 20, 44, 45</p> <p><b>MDE Website and Policy</b></p> <p>2.6.2 MS Data Governance Guidelines – May 2017, pp. 8, [10] 11, 12, 13 2.6.3 MDE OTSS-public website</p> <p><b>Reminder Message to DTCs</b></p> <p>2.6.4 DTC_Listserv_Accommodations_10.4.19</p> <p><b>Guidance from Vendors</b></p> <p>2.6.5 Nextera Standard Admin Requirements and File Layouts, pp. 9- 24. 2.6.6 Executed Questar MOU</p> <p><b>Compliance Forms</b></p> <p>2.6.7 DTC-STC Test Security Form-New 2019</p>	<p>Overall, the evidence demonstrated that district or school staff are offered specific training or instruction on security of student-level assessment data and protection of student privacy and confidentiality.</p> <p>However, there is no evidence of training completion (sign in sheets, electronic completion rates, etc) to ensure that LEA staff received training.</p> <p>While there appear to be numerous internal security controls, external controls appear to be lacking. The MOU signed between the state and the vendor is broad and generic, and does not require the types of Breach Insurance or remediation required in most data sharing agreements. It is unclear how the state would be able to have confidence in external data security. What are the vendor’s policies, procedures, protections, etc, in case of a breach?</p>
<p><b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of training completion (sign in sheets, electronic completion rates, etc) to ensure that LEA staff received training</li> <li>Evidence that the MOU signed between the vendor and state ensures external data security</li> <li>Evidence of the state and vendor policies, procedures, protections, etc, in the event of a data breach</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 MISSISSIPPI**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY**

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

<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 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><b>Alignment Study Evidence</b></p> <p>2.1.2 Mississippi Alignment Study Report for MAAP ELA and Math – Final_5.6.19                      Panelists: p.2; Procedures: pp. 17-20; Findings: pp. 28-49</p> <p>2.1.3 MS Alignment Study – Appendices ELA</p> <p>2.1.4 MS Alignment Study – Appendices Mathematics</p> <p><b>Questar (Vendor) Response to Study</b></p> <p>2.1.5 Response to the Alignment Study - Questar pp. 1-4; especially p.3</p>	<p>The state conducted an alignment study that met the requirements of what was requested by the Department.</p> <p>The findings indicated that development still needs to be done in order to create tests that are fully aligned with respect to content standards and depth of knowledge targets. It seems noteworthy that only one ‘expectation’ at each grade level was a DOK 4.</p> <p>Page 32 of the report indicates that grades 6-10<sup>th</sup> need slight to major adjustments to ensure alignment. There are tables starting on page 33 that detail the grade level alignment by criteria. It is unclear how the data in the detailed tables aggregates to the summary tables. It is also unclear how the criteria was established. For example Gr6 ELA needs 6-8 items to be replaced or changed (rated at ‘needs slight adjustment’) (p. 32). This represents 14% of the test needing to be changed or replaced.</p> <p>Page 40-42 shows the DOK rating of the math standards. Across the grades, there were no DOK 4 standards and only 2 DOK 3 standards. Page 44-48 shows the math alignment results. DOK criteria is not met for at least one standard in most grade levels.</p> <p>It is difficult to understand how changes during the 2017-2018 assessment can provide evidence about improved alignment in support of a study that was conducted in 2019. In addition, page 3 discusses that DOK 4 were not expected to be included on the test because of the test length (200+ minutes). However, there are DOK 4 standards on the assessment (p. 29-30).</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 MISSISSIPPI

and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.		Peers suggest that the state develop a more detailed timeline for fully addressing alignment concerns including content standard and DOK alignment issues.
<b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a more detailed timeline for fully addressing alignment concerns, including content standard and DOK alignment issues</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 MISSISSIPPI**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap: <b><u>the intended cognitive processes</u></b> appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p><b>Alignment Study Evidence</b>                  2.1.2 Mississippi Alignment Study Report for MAAP – Final_5.6.19, Findings: pp. 28-49                  2.1.3 MS Alignment Study – Appendices ELA                  2.1.4 MS Alignment Study – Appendices Mathematics</p> <p><b>Questar (Vendor) Response to Study</b>                  2.1.5 Response to the Alignment Study-Questar, pp. 1-4; especially p.3</p> <p><b>Vendor Item Writing and Form Building Documents</b>                  3.2.5 Cognitive Rigor Matrix – Math and Science                  3.2.6 Cognitive Rigor Matrix – Reading and Writing                  3.2.7. SOP for Item Development, pp. 8, 10, 13                  3.2.8 Client Review Guidelines – SOP, pp. 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14</p>	<p>Peers could not find evidence regarding expert judgment that the items appropriately demonstrate cognitive processing intended to be measured. This could be shown by conducting cognitive labs, or including specific evidence of such expert judgment in the checklists used during client reviews of individual test items (3.2.8).</p> <p>On p. 100 of the Technical Report (4.1.1), we have this statement: “Some sources of evidence have not been explored extensively to date. These include evidence of response processes...” On p. 103, there is additional discussion about this, and readers are referred to Appendix F, which is in 4.1.2., however, there is no indication that cognitive processing demands of each item are reviewed.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that assessments measure the intended cognitive processes, such as evidence obtained through cognitive labs, or specific evidence of expert judgment</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 MISSISSIPPI**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p><b>NAEP Effect Size &amp; State Scale Score Proficiency Mapping</b>                      3.4.1 MAAP_NAEP Effect Size Comparison and Mapping Summary                      3.4.2 NAEP Mapping State Proficiency Standards Report                      3.4.3 Mapping State Proficiency Standards Technical Notes  <b>MAAP ELA to Math Correlation</b>                      3.4.4 2016-2017 MAAP_ELA-Math Scale Score Correlation  <b>ELPT Correlation</b>                      3.4.5 ELPT Validity Correlation to MAAP</p>	<p><b>NAEP</b>                      3.4.1, 3.4.2, and 3.4.3 show the relationships between NAEP standards relative to MS and other states.</p> <p><b>MAAP</b>                      3.4.4 shows correlational data between math and ELA (Note: the correlations seem low between the assessments (approximately .5) but it might be due to the range restrictions. It is also unclear why bivariate regressions were used, or what hypothesis was being tested. The evidence does not provide actionable data that could be used to create a plan for moving forward. The data are from 2017 instead of a more current year’s results. Peers could not find subgroup data showing evidence for all student groups.</p> <p><b>ELPT</b>                      3.4.5 shows correlational results for the EL test and MAAP. It is difficult to tell how the EL levels in the box and whisker plots relate to scale scores.</p> <p>The state should consider another assessment, such as the ACT for corollary evidence.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Validity evidence that shows the State’s more recent assessment scores are related as expected with criterion and other variables for all student groups</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 MISSISSIPPI

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER

**Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. If the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, measures of reliability for the assessment overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a <b>student’s academic achievement</b>.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Vendor Reports for MDE</b></p> <p>4.1.1 MAAP 2018-2019 Technical Report; Chapter 7: Data Analysis, pp. 65-78; Chapter 11: Reliability, pp. 91-99; Chapter 12 Validity: pp. 100-110</p> <p>4.1.2 MAAP 2018-2019 Technical Report- Appendices; Appendix P: Descriptive Statistics, pp. 362-481.</p> <p>4.1.3 MAAP-CSEM Explanation paper-Questar</p>	<p>4.1.1 (p. 65- 72) shows item flagging criteria and discussion for point biserial, DIF, difficulty, and omit rates. Pages 73-77 showed total test score statistics and subscore correlations. Pages 93-95 provide <u>total test reliability</u>. Appendix R had reliability evidence to by demographic group.</p> <p>Peers could find no evidence with regard to subscore strand reliability.</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 MISSISSIPPI**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the reliability for each subscore (strand)</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 MISSISSIPPI**

**Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><i>For all State academic assessments,</i> assessments should be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (see definition<sup>1</sup>).</p> <p><b>For academic content assessments,</b> the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in their design, development and analysis.</p>	<p><b>Item Design and Development</b>            4.2.1 Item Writing Workshop Agenda            4.2.2 Item Writing Workshop Presentation            4.2.3 Universal Design IWW Training Module</p> <p><b>Administration Procedures</b>            4.2.4 MAAP Fall 2019 Test Coordinator Manual, pp. 30-41.</p> <p><b>MDE Universal Design Documents</b>            4.2.5 2019 Access for All Guide, pp. 11-15</p> <p><b>Analysis of all Student Subgroup Results</b>            4.2.6 2018 Achievement GAP Report</p> <p><b>Accommodated Material Information</b>            4.2.7 2018 MAAP Accommodation Instructions</p> <p><b>Test Design for TE items – Paper vs Online</b>            4.2.8 Mississippi TE Item Conversions_v4</p>	<p>The state provides adequate evidence that UDL principles are incorporated into training and design documents.</p> <p>However, peers could not find evidence of who received training on Universal Design. A list of participants (or a sign-in sheet) would provide this evidence.</p> <p>For 4.2.7, adjustments for braille are similar to what is done for other states. As with any adjustments, there is always the risk of mis-administration or mis-transcription. In the examples given, it seems that the complexity of the changes may pose a threat to validity for these forms.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that test developers received training on Universal Design, such as a list of participants and sign-in sheets that show the training was delivered</li> </ul>		

<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 MISSISSIPPI**

**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s <b><u>academic achievement standards</u></b>.</p>	<p><b>Technical Report Evidence</b>                      4.4.1 2017-2018 MAAP Technical Report, pp. 45-55                      4.4.2 2017-2018 MAAP Technical Report – Appendices, Appendix D, pp. 215-216; Appendix K, pp. 346-355.</p> <p><b>Hand Scoring Guidelines</b>                      4.4.3 Mississippi Scoring Process 2017-2018                      4.4.4 Scoring Guide – MAAP Grade 4 Spring 2018                      4.4.5 Scoring Guide – MAAP Eng. II Spring 2018</p>	<p>The percentage of non-adjacent scores appears to be high, especially in Grades 3-5, and especially for components worth 2 points each.</p> <p>The process might be informed by generating Kappa values. The scoring process might also include the monitoring of drift over time (introducing papers from previous years to ensure the rubrics are functioning consistently over test cycles).</p> <p>Appendix D, 4.4.2 provides the writing rubric and range finding training is provided on pages 346-355. The state should collect evidence such as sign in sheets for this training to demonstrate who was trained and when.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a process to inform the maintenance and improvement of the handscoring processes, for example, using data provided by non-adjacent scores to improve the rubrics and scoring process.</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 MISSISSIPPI**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State administers any of its assessments in multiple versions within a subject area (e.g., online versus paper-based delivery; <b>or a native language version of the academic content assessment</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><b>Questar Operating System Report</b> 4.6.1 Spring 2019 Login by OS District.School</p> <p><b>Questar Technology Training</b> 4.6.2 Fall 2019 Setup and Installation Guide, pp. 10-28 4.6.3 Fall 2019 Technology Coordinator Training, OS system requirements – pp. 11-13; secure browser installation, pp. 35-36.</p> <p><b>Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meetings</b> 4.6.4 TAC Report-MAAP Prompt Scores Paper vs. Computer 4.6.5 MS TAC Meeting Notes October 2017 4.6.6 MS TAC August 2018 Agenda</p>	<p>The evidence proposed to be collected could be sufficient for the state to conduct an analysis of device comparability, but no evidence of a plan and timeline was given other than a statement in the Submission Index that 2020 results would be analyzed. There is no detail on what that analysis would entail.</p> <p>The state’s TAC had a concern regarding the comparability in the scoring of the writing prompt from the paper version to the computer version of the tests (from 2017 to current). The state should document how this concern was addressed.</p> <p>The state should provide actual or theoretical evidence that the accommodation provided in various delivery modes does not change the construct being measured.</p> <p>For students who take a paper-accommodated version of a computer-based test, peers could find no evidence of training materials for how the transcriber enters the students’ responses into the system.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a plan and timeline for conduct an analysis of device comparability</li> <li>• Evidence that the accommodations provided in various delivery modes does not change the construct being measured</li> <li>• For students who take a paper-accommodated version of a computer-based test, evidence of training materials for the transcriber to enter the students’ responses into the computer-based system.</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 MISSISSIPPI**

**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><b>Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)</b>            4.7.1 Test Construction Meeting Invitation            4.7.2 Test Construction Targets Discussion_10.4.18            4.7.3 MS TAC Notes April 2019</p> <p><b>Questar Documents</b>            4.7.4 MAAP 2019 Spring Test Construction and Pre-equating Report Final            3.2.8 Client Review Guidelines – SOP</p> <p><b>Statewide News Release</b>            4.7.5 MAAP- ELA.Math.Sci.History News 8.15.19</p> <p><b>State Board Policy</b>            4.7.6 MS State Board Policy Chp. 28</p>	<p>The state provided evidence that test construction is an area of focus for improvement (Exhibits 4.7.1-3), but peers could not find evidence of a plan to address the TAC’s concerns. .</p> <p>The state references board policy relative to reviewing assessment against curriculum frameworks, however, curriculum frameworks are not standards.</p> <p>Peers could not find evidence of the timeline for reviews of content standards and assessments.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of a plan to address concerns related to test construction</li> <li>Evidence of a timeline for reviews of content standards and assessments</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSISSIPPI

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

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</li> </ul>	<p><b>MDE Reports</b> 4.2.6 2018 Achievement Gap Report</p> <p><b>Accommodations and Individual Educational Plans</b> 5.3.1 2017 MS Testing Accommodations Manual 5.3.2 IEP. Revised 2018-08-24, pp. 8-9 5.3.3 IEP.Guidance-2014-07-02, pp 44-54</p> <p><b>MDE Documents</b> 5.3.4 2018_English_Learner_Guidelines, pp. 19-22, pp. 26-27, pp. 93-122, pp. 213-235.</p> <p><b>DTC Training</b> 5.3.5 DTC_MAAP-ELA-Math_FALL2019, pp. 27-33.</p> <p><b>Questar Documents</b> 4.2.4 MAAP Fall 2019 Test Coordinator Manual, pp. 30-41. 5.3.6 Text-to-Speech State Choices_MDE-QAI final_1_5_2018</p>	<p>Peers could not find evidence of steps taken to ensure that accommodations do not alter the construct being measured. The state must provide this evidence, which could be descriptions of the reasonable and appropriate basis for the set of accommodations offered on the assessments, such as a literature review, empirical research, recommendations by advocacy and professional organizations, and/or consultations with the State’s TAC, as documented in a section on test design and development in the technical report for the 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 MISSISSIPPI**

<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>
routinely allowed. • Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.		
<b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b>		
_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: • Evidence of steps taken to ensure that accommodations do not alter the construct being measured, e.g., descriptions of the reasonable and appropriate basis for the set of accommodations offered on the assessments, such as a literature review, empirical research, recommendations by advocacy and professional organizations, and/or consultations with the State’s TAC, as documented in a section on test design and development in the technical report for the assessments.		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSISSIPPI**

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

<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 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><b>Guidelines from MDE-Questar</b>                      5.4.1 Fall 2019 Nextera Accommodations Guide                      5.4.2 MAAP Fall 2019 Accommodation 23_25                      5.4.3 MAAP Read-Aloud Guidance 2019-2020</p> <p><b>District Audit Documents</b>                      5.4.4 OSA Audit Checklist, #14                      5.4.5 Auditing Guidelines March 2019                      5.4.6 MDE 2019 Spring Audit Result Summary                      5.4.7 2019 Spring MAAP Resets for Accommodations Log</p> <p><b>State Board of Education (SBE) Documents</b>                      5.4.8 Appendix F from MS-Public School Accountability Standards, #10 and #11.                      5.4.9 SBE Rule 78.1</p>	<p>No additional evidence is needed.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b>                      X No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSISSIPPI**

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b><u>For academic achievement standards:</u></b></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards and with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards such that a student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards (1) are aligned with the State’s challenging academic content standards for the grade in which a student is enrolled; (2) promote access to the general curriculum consistent with the IDEA; (3) reflect professional judgment as to the highest possible standards achievable for such students; (4) are designated in the IEP for each student for whom alternate academic achievement standards apply; and (5) are aligned to ensure that a student who meets</p>	<p><b>Mississippi Educator Committee Meetings</b> 6.3.1 MDE Design and Expectations Meeting_Intro, pp. 4-8.</p> <p><b>State Board of Education (SBE) Backup Material</b> 6.3.2 SBE MAAP Standard Setting Backup Material_7.25.16, pp. 6, 9, 10, 23-36, 37-43. 6.3.3 Minutes from SBE Meeting 7.25.16</p> <p><b>MAAP Guidelines</b> 6.3.4 MAAP 3-8 and EOC Test Design_Blueprints_Item Specs, Section 8, pp. 27-29</p>	<p>6.3.2 lists what are claimed to be the PLDs by grade and subject, but these appear to be policy definitions. Peers did, however, find the detailed PLDs on the state’s website.</p> <p>6.3.4 and the PLDs offer sufficient evidence for this CE.</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 MISSISSIPPI**

<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 alternate academic achievement standards is on track to pursue postsecondary education or competitive integrated employment.		
<b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b>		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSISSIPPI**

**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>2</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><b>Technical Report</b> 4.4.1 MAAP 2017-2018 Technical Report, Chapter 6, pp. 56-60.</p> <p><b>Reports and Documents for Parents</b> 6.4.2 2019 Individual Student Report-ELA 6.4.3 2019 Individual Student Report – English 6.4.4 2019 ISR – Gr 3 Reading – Did Meet 6.4.5 Family Guide Student Success Grade 3 6.4.6 Family Guide to MAAP-2019</p> <p><b>Reports and Documents for Districts, Schools</b> 6.4.7 Class Roster – ELA 6.4.8 Class Standards Analysis – Algebra 6.4.9 School Pass Not Pass Roster – Reading Gr3 6.4.10 School Pass Not Pass Roster – Algebra 6.4.11 School Roster – ELA 6.4.12 School Summary – Math Gr 8 6.4.13 District Summary – Math Gr 8 6.4.14 District Demographic Summary – Algebra 6.4.15 District Standards Analysis – Algebra</p> <p><b>Proposed Mock Individual Reports – Resources for Parents</b> 6.4.16 Individual Student Report – Math_new mock 6.4.17 Individual Student Report – Reading_new mock</p> <p><b>Resources for all Reports – Districts, Schools, Parents</b> 6.4.18 Spring 2019 Report Interpretive Guide, p. 9</p>	<p>The state has met the requirement for this element.</p> <p>The focus on CSEM on p. 4 of the Family Guide (6.4.6) may be out of the range of most parent understanding. By contrast, the CSEM is given only as -4 to 4 on the ISR, with no explanation at all. Peers suggest a more user-friendly presentation of CSEM, such as error bands or scale score ranges with the CSEMs applied.</p> <p>See reviewers’ comments in CE 4.1 regarding reliability of subscores, as this relates to the reporting of subscores.</p>

<sup>2</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 MISSISSIPPI**

<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>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSISSIPPI**

<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 6.4 Summary Statement</b>		
X No additional evidence is required		

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