



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

July 10, 2020

The Honorable Jeffrey C. Riley
Commissioner of Education
Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
75 Pleasant Street
Malden, MA 02148-4906

Dear Commissioner Riley:

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 Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (Massachusetts DESE) to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in March 2020. Specifically, Massachusetts DESE submitted evidence regarding the grade 10 Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) general assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics. The Department also reviewed part of the State's MCAS general assessment in grades 3-8 reading/language arts and mathematics.

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 Massachusetts DESE's submission and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that the components of your assessment system meet many, but not all, of the statutory and regulatory requirements of sections 1111(b)(1) and (2) 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:

- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (MCAS):
Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.
- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in grade 10 (MCAS):
Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.

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

The specific list of items required for Massachusetts DESE to submit is enclosed with this letter. I request that Massachusetts DESE submit a plan within 30 days outlining when it will submit all required additional documentation for peer review. I recognize the unprecedented situation affecting

400 MARYLAND AVE., SW, WASHINGTON, DC 20202
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.

you and your schools due to widespread and extended school closures caused by the novel coronavirus, COVID-19. As a result, if you need more than 30 days to submit your plan, please let my staff know at ESEA.Assessment@ed.gov. Upon submission of the plan, the Department will reach out to the SEA 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.

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.

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank T. Brogan
Assistant Secretary
for Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Michol Stapel, Associate Commissioner, Student Assessment

Critical Elements Where Additional Evidence is Needed to Meet the Requirements for Massachusetts DESE’s Use of the MCAS in grade 10

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
2.1 – Test Design and Development	<p>For the grade 10 MCAS R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State’s test design and test development process aligns the assessments to the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards for grade 10 and includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Test blueprints that describe the structure of the assessments in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of the State’s grade-level academic content standards. ○ Processes to ensure the assessments are tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills like higher-order thinking skills (e.g., plan to address the alignment criteria that were not met in R/LA and mathematics, plan to include Depth of Knowledge (DOK) Level 3 items on the mathematics assessment).
2.2 – Item Development	<p>For the grade 10 MCAS R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills. (e.g., plan to address the alignment criteria that were not met in R/LA and mathematics, plan to include DOK Level 3 items on the mathematics assessment).
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	<p>For the grade 10 MCAS R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content like knowledge and process, balance of content, and cognitive complexity (e.g., plan to address the alignment criteria that were not met in R/LA and mathematics, plan to include DOK Level 3 items on the mathematics assessment). ○ Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards. • Evidence requested for critical element 2.1 will also apply to this critical element.
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum	<p>For the grade 10 MCAS R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State’s assessments provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including performance for high-achieving students (e.g., plan to address the alignment criteria that were not met in R/LA and mathematics, plan to include DOK Level 3 items on the mathematics assessment).

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	<p>For the grade 10 MCAS Mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the English and Spanish versions of the assessment (e.g., procedures for translation or trans-adaptation of the assessment). • Evidence that the State documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results (e.g., report showing that English and Spanish versions elicit comparable response processes and produces adequately aligned assessments).
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	<p>For the grade 10 MCAS R/LA and Mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website (e.g., post a completed 2019 technical manual on the State’s website).
6.4 – Reporting	<p>For the grade 10 MCAS R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration (e.g., complete the 2019 Assessment & Accountability Reporting Schedule and make it available to schools and districts; complete the parent reports and make them available to parents).

Critical Elements Reviewed MCAS R/LA and Mathematics in Grades 3-8

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	This critical element has been met; no additional evidence is required.

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.

400 MARYLAND AVE., SW, WASHINGTON, DC 20202
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.

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 7
Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments..... 9
Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments 11

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS.....12
Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 12
Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development..... 15
Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration..... 17
Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration 24
Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security..... 25
Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy 27

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY29
Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content..... 29
Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 31
Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure..... 32
Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables 33

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER.....34
Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability 34
Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility 36
Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... 38
Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring..... 39
Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 41
Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment..... 42
Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance 43

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS.....44
Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 44
Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments47
Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations..... 48
Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations 50

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING52
Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students 52
Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting..... 54
Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards..... 55
Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting..... 57

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.

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic content standards:</u></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 Minutes of the December 2010 meeting of the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education</p> <p>1.1.2 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Framework for Mathematics</p> <p>1.1.2 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Framework for Mathematics</p> <p>1.1.4 Minutes of the March 28 2017 Meeting of the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education</p> <p>1.1.5 2017 English Language Arts and Literacy Framework</p> <p>1.1.6 2017 Mathematics Curriculum Framework</p> <p>1.1.7 PRESS RELEASE Massachusetts Adopts New ELA and Math Learning Standards</p> <p>1.1.8 Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 69, Sections 1D, 1E, and 1I</p> <p>(1.1.5) 2017 English Language Arts and Literacy Framework: Commissioner’s letter of preface and Appendix A</p> <p>(1.1.6) 2017 Mathematics Curriculum Framework: Commissioner’s letter of preface and Appendix I</p>	<p>The evidence submitted is sufficient to meet this CE.</p>
<p>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</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>		

Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content Standards

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic content standards:</u> The State’s challenging academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science are aligned with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards.</p>	<p>(1.1.5) 2017 English Language Arts and Literacy Framework , pp. 6-7, pp. 9-18</p> <p>(1.1.6) 2017 Mathematics Framework, pp. 5-6; pp. 8-13; p. 74</p> <p>1.2.1 Strong Standards A Review of Changes to State Standards Since the Common Core</p>	<p>The evidence submitted is sufficient to meet this CE.</p> <p>The reviewers noted that the standards contain clear linkages to post-secondary and an external study (of multiple States) found MA to have very challenging standards.</p>
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</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>		

Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments aligned with <u>grade-level academic achievement standards</u> or alternate academic achievement standards in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 9-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). <p>AND</p> <p>The State’s <u>academic content assessments</u> must be the same assessments administered to all students in the tested grades, with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may take an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards. • A State may permit an LEA to administer a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in lieu of the State high school assessment if certain conditions are met. • A State that administers an end-of-course high school mathematics assessment may exempt an 8th grade student from the mathematics assessment typically administered in eighth grade and allow the student to 	<p>Department staff determined that the State’s evidence is sufficient for this critical element.</p>	<p>No evidence required.</p>

<p>take the State end-of-course mathematics test instead.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Department may have approved the State, under the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority, to permit students in some LEAs to participate in a demonstration assessment system in lieu of participating in the State assessment. 		
<p>Section 1.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For students with disabilities, policies State that all students with disabilities in the State, including those children with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system; • For ELs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policies State that all ELs must be included in all aspects of the content assessment system, unless the State has chosen the statutory option for recently arrived ELs under which such ELs are exempt from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment. ○ If a State has developed native language assessments for ELs in R/LA, ELs must be assessed in R/LA in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except, if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a 	<p>Department staff determined that the State’s evidence is sufficient for this critical element.</p>	<p>No evidence required.</p>

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

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State has developed or amended challenging academic standards and assessments, the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education). • Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas). • Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State. • Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents. 	<p>Department staff determined that the State’s evidence is sufficient for this critical element.</p>	<p>No evidence required.</p>
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to <u>the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards</u> for the grade that is being assessed and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of <u>the State’s grade-level academic content standards</u> and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results • Processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <u>the State’s academic content standards</u>, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills). • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design and intended uses and interpretations of results. 	<p>Purposes and intended interpretations (1.3.4) 2019 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report (Draft), pp. 10-12; 15 (1.3.1) MCAS Request for Responses, pp. 4-7 2.1.1 Memo to the Board: Recommendation on Student Assessment for Spring 2016 and Beyond</p> <p>Test Designs and Blueprints 2.1.2 Grade 10 ELA Test Design 2.1.3 Grade 10 ELA MCAS Blueprint 2.1.4 Grade 10 Mathematics MCAS Test Design 2.1.5 Grade 10 Mathematics MCAS Blueprint (1.3.4) 2019 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report (Draft) – ELA Test Design (including grade 10), pp. 23-24 – Grade 10 ELA MCAS Reporting Categories, pp. 24 – Mathematics Test Design (including grade 10), pp. 26-28 – Grade 10 MCAS Mathematics Reporting Categories, pp. 29 – Grade 10 ELA MCAS Blueprint, pp. 23-24 – Grade 10 Mathematics MCAS Blueprint, pp. 26-29 – Item Types for ELA and Mathematics, pp. 18-20 2.1.6 Grade 10 ELA and Mathematics Test Design Presentation 2.1.7 Waiver for ELA, Speaking and Listening</p> <p>Connection to Massachusetts Curriculum Standards (1.1.5) 2017 MA ELA Curriculum Framework, pp. 21 (1.3.4) 2019 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report (Draft), pp. 14, 19-20, 25, 29 2.1.8 Grade 10 ELA MCAS Item Alignment and Standards Coding 2.1.9 Grade 10 ELA MCAS Cognitive Skills and Percentages</p>	<p>The reviewers noted that the evidence is an excellent demonstration of communication to stakeholders regarding the changes to the assessment, alignment, expectations in terms of academic achievement standards, etc. (particularly 2.1.6)</p> <p>The alignment study (by Boston College) did not adhere to the reporting structure for the MCAS. It therefore underestimates the alignment evidence (validity evidence) because the link to scores is indirect. The actual alignment statistics, especially for ELA, would be considerably better if they had.</p> <p>The reviewers are concerned that the alignment study found no items at level 3 for the math test, despite about 30% of the standards being at level 3.</p> <p>The reviewers noted that the conclusions of the alignment study, which say excellent for the ELA test and solid alignment for the math test, seem overly positive given the results. Numbers and operations did not meet any but the Balance of Representation criterion. 7 of the 20 alignment criteria were not met for math. 4 of 16 not met for ELA.</p> <p>The reviewers require that a supplement to the alignment report should include information on how MA will address the findings through item development or other means. The State needs to submit a plan on how the State will address the alignment criteria that were not met.</p> <p>The reviewers commend the State for the redesign which seems to be a clear improvement. Revisions to take advantage of computer based testing and clearer links to skills. There appears to be improved accessibility and accommodations.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the student is enrolled and uses that determination for all reporting. • If the State administers a content assessment that includes portfolios, such assessment may be partially administered through a portfolio but may not be <i>entirely</i> administered through a portfolio. 	<p>(1.1.6) 2017 MA Mathematics Curriculum Framework, pp. 25-2</p> <p>2.1.10 Grade 10 Mathematics MCAS Cognitive Skills Categories</p> <p>2.1.11 Standards Assessed on Grade 10 Mathematics MCAS tests</p> <p>2.1.12 Mathematics MCAS Test Construction Checklist</p> <p>2.1.13 Grade 10 Mathematics MCAS Calculator Policy</p> <p>2.1.14 Grade 10 Mathematics MCAS Reference Sheet</p> <p>Achievement Level Descriptors</p> <p>(1.3.4) 2019 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report (Draft), p. 17</p> <p>2.1.15 Appendix A, 2019 Technical Report – Grade-Specific ALDs</p> <p>2.1.16 General ELA MCAS Achievement Level Descriptors</p> <p>2.1.17 General Mathematics MCAS Achievement Level Descriptors</p> <p>2.1.18 Grade 10 ELA MCAS Achievement Level Descriptors</p> <p>2.1.19 Grade 10 Mathematics MCAS Achievement Level Descriptors</p> <p>Item Descriptions for ELA and Mathematics</p> <p>2.1.20 MCAS Item Descriptions - General Guidelines</p> <p>(1.3.4) 2019 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report (Draft), pp. 11, 34</p> <p>2.1.21 ELA MCAS Explanation of Item Descriptions</p> <p>2.1.22 Grade 10 ELA MCAS Item Descriptions</p> <p>2.1.23 Grade 10 Mathematics Item Descriptions</p> <p>Educator and Student Resources</p> <p>2.1.24 Student Tutorial</p> <p>2.1.25 Practice Tests</p> <p>Item Reporting Categories</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>(1.3.4) 2019 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report (Draft), pp. 24, 29</p> <p>2.1.26 Grade 10 ELA MCAS Item Reporting Categories</p> <p>2.1.27 Grade 10 Mathematics MCAS Item Reporting Categories</p> <p>Alignment Study</p> <p>2.1.28 2019 MCAS Content Alignment Study, Grade 10 ELA and Mathematics and Grades 5 and 8 STE (Draft)</p>	
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State needs to submit a plan on how the State will address the alignment criteria that were not met. 		

Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills. 	<p>(1.3.4) 2019 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report (Draft)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Assessment Development Committees, pp. 33-35 – ELA Passage Review Process, pp. 22, 34-35 – Item and Test Development, pp. 34-35 <p>Assessment Development Committees</p> <p>2.2.1 MCAS ADC and Bias and Sensitivity 2018 Recruitment Memo</p> <p>2.2.2 Appendix B of Technical Report – Committee Membership</p> <p>2.2.3 ELA MCAS ADC Passage Review Criteria</p> <p>2.2.4 ELA MCAS ADC Item Review Criteria</p> <p>2.2.5 ELA MCAS Passage and Item Review Presentation</p> <p>2.2.6 Mathematics MCAS ADC Item Review Criteria</p> <p>Item Development</p> <p>(1.3.4) 2019 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report (Draft), pp. 25, 29, 35</p> <p>2.2.7 MCAS Item Review Process</p> <p>2.2.8 ELA MCAS Life Cycle of an Item</p> <p>2.2.9 Grade 10 ELA MCAS Cognitive Skills Categories</p> <p>2.2.10 Mathematics MCAS Life Cycle of an Item</p> <p>2.2.11 Grade 10 Mathematics Cognitive Skills Categories</p> <p>Test Development</p> <p>(1.3.4) 2019 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report (Draft), pp. 33-35</p> <p>2.2.12 MCAS Test Development Process</p> <p>2.2.13 ELA MCAS Test Construction Checklist</p> <p>2.2.14 Mathematics MCAS Test Construction Checklist</p>	<p>The evidence submitted is sufficient to meet this CE.</p> <p>The State provided clear evidence regarding its content panels, language used in item development, level of cognition for items, and content/sensitivity panel.</p> <p>The reviewers noted that math is missing DOK3 level questions and has many more DOK3 standards than DOK3 items. The State should publish a rotation that shows how they cover the 88 standards and a plan to begin including items that tap into higher cognitive levels like DOK3.</p>

	(2.1.28) 2019 MCAS Content Alignment Study, Grade 10 ELA and Mathematics and Grades 5 and 8 STE (Draft)	
Section 2.2 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or <input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:		

Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>Standardized Test Administration Procedures, Including Accommodations</p> <p>(1.3.5) Principal’s Administration Manual (Spring 2019)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – standardized protocols for administration, pp. 22–45 – step-by-step tasks to complete for the spring test administration for computer based testing (CBT), pp. 48–63 – step-by-step tasks to complete after testing for CBT, pp. 63–66 – additional standardized protocols for administration for paper-based testing (PBT), pp. 79–86 – step-by-step tasks to complete for the spring test administration for PBT, pp. 86–89 – step-by-step tasks to complete after testing for PBT, pp. 90–100 – standardized protocols for accessibility features for all students and accommodations for students with disabilities and EL students, pp. 102– 129 <p>2.3.1 MCAS Test Administrator’s Manual for Computer-Based Testing (CBT TAM), Spring 2019</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – standardized protocols for administration, pp. 12–21 – standardized protocols for administering accommodations, pp. 21 – step-by-step tasks to complete before testing, pp. 24–27 – scripts and step-by-step tasks for administering ELA and Mathematics tests, pp. 34–82 – scripts and step-by-step tasks for administering the English/Spanish edition of the grade 10 Mathematics test, pp. 98–114 – standardized protocols for reading the test aloud to students with certain accommodations, pp. 132–134 – standardized protocols for signing the test to students who are deaf or hard of hearing, pp. 136–138 – standardized protocols for approving bilingual word-to- 	<p>The evidence submitted is sufficient to meet this CE.</p> <p>The State has provided educators extensive training materials that are consistent for all assessment elements. These materials are based on the specific type of assessment being administered (paper or computer). There are standard protocols for accessibility/accommodation supports.</p> <p>The reviewers commend the State for have specific training for New vs. Returning Staff and for the depth of documentation for CE 2.3.</p>

	<p>word dictionaries for EL students and former EL students, pp. 140</p> <p>2.3.2 MCAS Test Administrator’s Manual for Paper-Based Testing (PBT TAM), Spring 2019</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – standardized protocols for administration, pp. 12–19 – standardized protocols for administering accommodations, pp. 19 – step-by-step tasks to complete before testing, pp. 22–24 – scripts and step-by-step tasks for administering ELA and Mathematics tests, pp. 28–75 – scripts and step-by-step tasks for administering the English/Spanish edition of the grade 10 Mathematics test, pp. 102–119 – standardized protocols for administering the Braille edition of the test, pp. 122 – standardized protocols for administering the large-print edition of the test to students with certain accommodations, pp. 124 – standardized protocols for administering the test to students with the accommodation to type their responses, pp. 126–129 – standardized protocols for signing the test to students who are deaf or hard of hearing, pp. 132 – standardized protocols for approving bilingual word-to-word dictionaries for EL students and former EL students, pp. 134 <p>(1.4.3) Accessibility and Accommodations Manual for the 2019-2020 MCAS Tests and Retests, Including Participation Requirements for Students with Disabilities and English Learners, pp. 1-5, 11-24, 26-35</p> <p>2.3.3 Frequently Asked Questions: Spring 2019 MCAS Training Sessions</p> <p>2.3.4 Overview of the Student Registration/Personal Needs Profile (SR/PNP) Process, September 21, 2018 and January 24, 2019</p> <p>2.3.5 MCAS Accessibility and Accommodations training session, September 28, 2018 and January 15, 2019</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>2.3.6a-6d Grade 10 ELA and Mathematics Informational Meeting presentation, October 3 and 25, November 5 and 9, 2018</p> <p>2.3.7 Introduction to Computer-Based Testing: Steps to Take in Fall/Winter to Prepare for the Spring 2019 MCAS Administration, October 26, 2018</p> <p>2.3.8 MCAS Test Security and Administration Protocols: For Returning Staff, January 29, 2019</p> <p>2.3.9 MCAS Test Security and Administration Protocols: For New Staff, January 31, 2019</p> <p>2.3.10 Pre Administration Tasks for Technology Staff, February 12, 2019</p> <p>2.3.11 Overview of Infrastructure Trials: For Returning Staff, February 13, 2019</p> <p>2.3.12 Overview of Infrastructure Trials: For New Staff, February 15, 2019</p> <p>2.3.13 Office Hours Session #1: Tasks in PearsonAccess Next, March 12, 2019</p> <p>2.3.14 Office Hours Session #2: Additional Tasks in PearsonAccess Next, March 21, 2019</p> <p>2.3.15 Slide Template for Training Test Administrators</p> <p>Modules</p> <p><i>Modules to Assist with Pre-Administration Tasks</i></p> <p>2.3.16 Student Registration/Personal Needs Profile (Screenshot)</p> <p>2.3.17 Accessibility and Accommodations (Screenshot)</p> <p>2.3.18 Infrastructure Trial for Technology Coordinators (Screenshot)</p> <p>2.3.19 Infrastructure Trial for Test Coordinators and Test Administrators (Screenshot)</p> <p>2.3.20 Creating Test Sessions (Screenshot)</p> <p><i>Modules to Assist with Tasks to Complete During Testing</i></p> <p>2.3.21 Moving Students Between Sessions (Screenshot)</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>2.3.22 Resolving Incorrect Accommodations (Screenshot)</p> <p>2.3.23 Sessions Management (Screenshot)</p> <p>Student Assessment Update Newsletters</p> <p>2.3.24 September 21, 2018 Student Assessment Update: “Testing Schedule and Administration Deadlines Now Available” section</p> <p>2.3.25 October 30, 2018 Student Assessment Update: “Recommended Testing Times for Spring 2019” section</p> <p>2.3.26 November 13, 2018 Student Assessment Update: “Graphic Organizers, Checklists, and Supplemental Reference Sheets for Students with Disabilities on NextGeneration MCAS Tests” section</p> <p>2.3.27 February 6, 2019 Student Assessment Update: “Test Administration Manuals for Spring 2019” section and “New Accommodations for English Learners Participating in Next-Generation Tests and High School Retests” section</p> <p>2.3.28 February 27, 2019 Student Assessment Update: “Resources and Timeline to Prepare for Computer-Based Testing” section</p> <p>2.3.29 April 2, 2019 Student Assessment Update: “Grade 10 ELA Reminders” section</p> <p>2.3.30 May 8, 2019 Student Assessment Update: “Clarification on Test Security Protocols” section</p> <p>Sample Resources</p> <p>2.3.31 Sample Secure CBT Materials Internal Tracking Form</p> <p>2.3.32 Sample Superintendent's Assurance of Proper Test Administration</p> <p>2.3.33 MCAS Nondisclosure Acknowledgment</p> <p>2.3.34 Sample Confirmation of Training Participation and Receipt of Test Administrator's Manuals (TAMs) and Test Security Requirements</p> <p>2.3.35 "MCAS Testing — Do Not Disturb" Sample Sign</p> <p>2.3.36 Sample Seating Charts</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>2.3.37 "Examples of Prohibited Materials During MCAS Testing" Sample Sign</p> <p>2.3.38 Student Responsibilities during MCAS Testing (Grade 6 and Above) Sample Form</p> <p>2.3.39 Student Responsibilities during MCAS Testing (Grade 6 and Above) Sample Letter</p> <p>2.3.40 PBT Test Materials Internal Tracking Forms</p> <p>2.3.41 Student Accommodation Refusal Form</p> <p>School Staff Receive Training on Test Administration (Including Accommodations)</p> <p>Manuals</p> <p>(1.3.5) Principal’s Administration Manual (Spring 2019), pp. 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 37, 38–40, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58–59, 60, 64, 66, 85, 99, 104, 115</p> <p>(2.3.1) MCAS Test Administrator’s Manual for Computer-Based Testing (CBT TAM), Spring 2019, pp. ii, 3, 4, 5, 8, 18, 24–25</p> <p>(2.3.2) MCAS Test Administrator’s Manual for Paper-Based Testing (PBT TAM), Spring 2019, pp. ii, 3, 4, 6, 8, 16, 22–23</p> <p>(1.4.1) Accessibility and Accommodations Manual for the Spring 2019 MCAS Tests, pp. 11-14, 21, 26-27</p> <p>Student Assessment Update Newsletters</p> <p>2.3.42 November 13, 2018 Student Assessment Update: “Training Sessions Announced for 2019” section</p> <p>2.3.43 December 11, 2018 Student Assessment Update: “Registration for January Training Sessions Now Available” section</p> <p>2.3.44 January 8, 2019 Student Assessment Update: “Upcoming MCAS Training Sessions” section</p> <p>2.3.45 January 22, 2019 Student Assessment Update: “Upcoming MCAS Training Sessions” section</p> <p>(2.3.27) February 6, 2019 Student Assessment Update: “MCAS Training Sessions” section.</p> <p>(2.3.28) February 27, 2019 Student Assessment Update: “Resources and Timeline to Prepare for</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Computer-Based Testing” section and “MCAS Training Sessions” section.</p> <p>Technology and Related Requirements and Contingency Plans to Address Possible Technology Challenges During Testing</p> <p>Manuals</p> <p>(1.3.5) Principal’s Administration Manual (Spring 2019), pp. 25, 33, 34, 37, 48, 51, 59, 61, 68–76</p> <p>(2.3.1) MCAS Test Administrator’s Manual for Computer-Based Testing (CBT TAM), Spring 2019, pp. 14, 20, 36, 47, 60, 74, 98, 122–130</p> <p>Training sessions</p> <p>(2.3.7) Introduction to Computer-Based Testing: Steps to Take in Fall/Winter to Prepare for the Spring 2019 MCAS Administration, October 26, 2018</p> <p>(2.3.10) Pre-Administration Tasks for Technology Staff, February 12, 2019</p> <p>(2.3.11) Overview of Infrastructure Trials: For Returning Staff, February 13, 2019</p> <p>(2.3.12) Overview of Infrastructure Trials: For New Staff, February 15, 2019</p> <p>(2.3.13) Office Hours Session #1: Tasks in PearsonAccess Next, March 12, 2019</p> <p>(2.3.14) Office Hours Session #2: Additional Tasks in PearsonAccessNext, March 21, 2019</p> <p>Student Assessment Update Newsletters</p> <p>2.3.46 March 12, 2019 Student Assessment Update: “Technology Preparations for Spring 2019 Testing” section</p> <p>2.3.47 March 20, 2019 Student Assessment Update: “Resources and Support -- Guidance for Technology Problems That May Occur During Testing” section</p> <p>2.3.48 March 26, 2019 Student Assessment Update: “Reminders from Previous Updates” section</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Additional Resources</p> <p>2.3.49 Digital Learning & Technology Resources 2.3.50 Computer-based Testing Device Planner 2.3.51 Managed Chromebooks Required for Computer-Based Testing 2.3.52 Best Practices for MCAS Computer-Based Testing Set-Up, Administration, and Troubleshooting</p> <p>Technology Requirements and Communication</p> <p>2.3.53 Hardware and Software Requirements for TestNav8 2.3.54 Hardware and Software Requirements for Proctor Caching 2.3.55 ABBI Outage Communication Plan 2.3.56 Resource Center Outage Communication Plan 2.3.57 PAN/TestNav Outage Communication Plan</p>	
<p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</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>		

Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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>Department staff determined that the State’s evidence is sufficient for this critical element.</p>	<p>No evidence required.</p>
<p>Section 2.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. • Application of test security procedures to all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS. 	<p>Prevention of assessment irregularities (1.3.5) Principal’s Administration Manual (Spring 2019), pp. 1-9, 21–45, 52–54, 58– 59, 61 (2.3.31) Secure Materials Internal Tracking Form (2.3.32) Superintendent’s Assurance of Proper Test Administration (2.4.1) Principal’s Certification of Proper Test Administration (PCPA) (2.3.33) MCAS Nondisclosure Acknowledgment (2.3.34) Confirmation of Training Participation and Receipt of Test Administrator’s Manuals (TAMs) and Test Security Requirements (2.3.39) Student Responsibility Form (2.3.40) Student Responsibility Letter 2.5.1 Materials Summary (2.3.37) Sample seating charts (2.3.36) "MCAS Testing — Do Not Disturb" Sample Sign (2.3.38) "Examples of Prohibited Materials During MCAS Testing" Sample Sign 2.5.2 Security Section – Measured Progress bid 2.5.3 Information and Technology Security Appendix from Measured Progress and Pearson bid (2.4.2–2.4.6) Information about school observations, which are also a preventative measure 2.5.4 MCAS Test Security and Admin Protocols for Returning Staff, slides 5–28 2.5.5 MCAS Test Security and Admin Protocols for New Staff, slides 5–28 (2.3.15) Training slides template for schools training their test administrators (2.3.1) Test Administrator’s Manual for Computer-based Testing (CBT TAM), ELA and Mathematics scripts, pp. 33–82 (2.3.2) Test Administrator’s Manual for Paper based Testing (PBT TAM): ELA and Mathematics scripts, pp. 27–75</p>	<p>The evidence submitted is sufficient to meet this CE.</p> <p>The reviewers noted this is a comprehensive and impressive list of test security measures. The categorization of the methods, starting with prevention, then detection, then investigation, and finally remediation is easily understood. The State includes site monitoring and typical data forensics.</p>

	<p>Detection of irregularities (2.4.2–2.4.6) School observations, Web monitoring, and reporting of irregularities from schools 2.5.6 Data forensics criteria</p> <p>Investigations of irregularities 2.5.7 Recommendations for MCAS Misconduct Investigations (1.4.1) Principal’s Administration Manual (PAM) pp. 8–9</p> <p>Remediation of testing irregularities and security incidents 2.5.8 2019 Grade 10 ELA breach list 2.5.9 2019 Grade 10 Math breach list 2.5.10 Invalidation Rules and Precedents</p>	
Section 2.5 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or <input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:		

Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 	<p>(1.3.5) Principal’s Administration Manual (Spring 2019), Responsibilities of the Principal, pp. 3-4 – Shared Responsibilities of Principals, Test Administrators, Technology Staff, and Other School Personnel Authorized to Have Access to Secure Materials, pp. 4-5 – Responsibilities of Test Administrators, pp. 6-7 – Testing Irregularities, pp. 8-9 (2.3.31) Secure Materials Internal Tracking Form (2.4.1) Principal’s Certification of Proper Test Administration Statements (PCPA) (2.3.32) Superintendent’s Assurance of Proper Test Administration (2.3.33) MCAS Nondisclosure Agreement (2.3.34) Confirmation of Training Participation and Receipt of Test Administrator’s Manuals (TAMs) and Test Security Requirements (2.3.39) Student Responsibilities during MCAS Testing (Grade 6–8) (2.5.1) Materials Summary 2.6.1 Request for Permission to Test a Student in an Alternate Setting 2.6.2 User Role Matrix (permissions granted to each user role in PearsonAccessNext) 2.6.3 Security Response from Measured Progress (Cognia) Bid 2.6.4 Measured Progress (Cognia) Confidentiality Form for All Employees 2.6.5 Information Security Appendix 2.6.6 Measured Progress (Cognia) NonDisclosure Agreement for Employees 2.6.7 ESE Gateway (Edwin Analytics) Security Roles 2.6.8 Policies Relating to the Collection and Use of Student Data 2.6.9 Data Access Policy 2.6.10 Non-disclosure Agreement for members of the MCAS Bias and Sensitivity Committee, Assessment</p>	<p>The evidence submitted is sufficient to meet this CE.</p>

	Development Committee, or Technical Advisory Committee	
Section 2.6 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or		
<input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:		

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. The State’s validity evidence includes evidence that:</p> <p><u>The State’s academic assessments</u> measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), balance of content, and cognitive complexity • Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards; • If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards and administers alternate assessments aligned with those standards, the assessments show adequate alignment to the State’s academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for 	<p>Overall validity (1.3.4) 2019 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report (Draft), Section 2.4, pp. 15-17 3.1.1 Appendix T of 2019 Technical Report – MCAS Validity Evidence</p> <p>Documentation of alignment (1.3.4) 2019 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report (Draft) – ELA, Section 3.2.2, p. 21-25 – Mathematics, Section 3.2.3, pp. 25-30 – Item and Test Development Process, Section 3.2.5, pp. 33-37 3.1.2 Appendix A of 2019 Technical Report - Grade-Specific Achievement Level Descriptors (2.1.28) 2019 MCAS Content Alignment Study, Grade 10 ELA and Mathematics and Grades 5 and 8 STE (Draft)</p>	<p>The alignment study (by Boston College) did not adhere to the reporting structure for the MCAS. It therefore underestimates the alignment evidence (validity evidence) because the link to scores is indirect. The actual alignment statistics, especially for ELA, would be considerably better if they had.</p> <p>The reviewers are concerned that the alignment study found no items at level 3 for the math test, despite about 30% of the standards being at level 3.</p> <p>The reviewers noted that the conclusions of the alignment study, which say excellent for the ELA test and solid alignment for the math test, seem overly positive given the results. Numbers and operations did not meet any but the Balance of Representation criterion. 7 of the 20 alignment criteria were not met for math. 4 of 16 not met for ELA.</p> <p>The reviewers require that a supplement to the alignment report should include information on how MA will address the findings through item development or other means. The State needs to submit a plan on how the State will address the alignment criteria that were not met.</p> <p>In the technical report, the validity evidence (pg. 16) would be better classified as reliability, accuracy, or test quality indicators. There is validity evidence there, but the labeling is misleading. These factors can impact validity. Consider keeping with the definition that deals with score inferences.</p> <p>The reviewers noted that DESE’s validity studies relating MCAS scores to other variables is valuable, but limited. They look at internal convergent and discriminant validity coefficients, but focus on the “high” correlations. Grades and course taking correlations follow expected patterns, but</p>

students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.		ELA and math SR are more highly correlated with each other than either are to corresponding reading and math test components. It would be nice to have an external assessment to correlate with MCAS (or college grades).
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State needs to submit a plan on how the State will address the alignment criteria that were not met. 		

Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap: the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>(1.3.4) 2019 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report (Draft)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Cognitive Levels, ELA, p. 25; – Mathematics, pp. 29 – Section 3.9.2, p. 77 <p>3.2.1 The Consequences of High School Exit Examinations for Student Life Outcomes: Evidence from a Research-Practice Partnership in Massachusetts (Summary of Research Grant)</p> <p>3.2.2 Principal’s Administration Instructions, Spring 2018 High School Field Tests and Tryouts</p> <p>3.2.3 TAC Presentation: Cognitive Process Evidence and Low Motivation Responses</p> <p>3.2.4 New Methods of Detecting Low Motivation Responses in Low-stakes Tests (NCME Presentation)</p>	<p>The evidence submitted is sufficient to meet this CE.</p> <p>The reviewers note that much of the evidence here is focused on motivation. Without a cognitive lab or similar, the State relies on item developers to “predict” the cognitive processes of students. The technical manual provides some guidance and has PLDs that include cognitive processing language. Item statistics and analyses only relate to difficulty, not necessarily complexity. Reviewers expect additional evidence for this CE to come from the IES Grant.</p>
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</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>		

Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s <u>academic content standards</u>.</p>	<p>(1.3.4) 2019 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report (Draft) – Information on reporting categories: pp. 24 and 27 – Reporting categories on Parent/Guardian reports: p. 80</p> <p>3.3.1 Edwin Analytics Report: MCAS Results by Reporting Category 3.3.2 School and District Profiles, Item Results (Screenshot) 3.3.3 MCAS Digital Item Library Grade 10 Mathematics Item - Released Test Questions and Practice Tests (screenshot) 3.3.4 Edwin Analytics Results by Reporting Categories and Standards</p> <p>Test Structure (1.3.4) 2019 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report (Draft), Section 3.5.3, pp. 56-58 3.3.5 Appendix Y of 2019 Technical Report – Confirmatory Factor Analysis</p>	<p>The evidence submitted is sufficient to meet this CE.</p> <p>There is little evidence that the reporting categories contain unique information; MCAS is highly unidimensional.</p> <p>The State might consider that the weaker evidence for unique information captured by sub-scores may limit their utility for individual students. Sub-scores may be useful for program evaluation and school level decision making but are less appropriate for individual student diagnostic purposes.</p> <p>The reviewers recognize the difficulty in producing both a unidimensional test and viable sub-scores.</p>
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</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>		

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>(3.1.1) Appendix T of 2019 Technical Report – MCAS Validity Evidence (3.2.1) Consequences of High School Exit Examinations for Student Life Outcomes: Evidence from a Research-Practice Partnership in Massachusetts (Summary of Research Grant)</p>	<p>The evidence submitted is sufficient to meet this CE.</p> <p>It appears to the reviewers that the State is working on documentation for this critical element. One key aspect is the IES report which the State has shared on its index will have preliminary results in January 2020.</p> <p>The reviewers commend the State for their efforts to empirically investigate issues related to consequential validity.</p>
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</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>		

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. If the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, measures of reliability for the assessment overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a <u>student’s academic achievement</u>. 	<p>(1.3.4) 2019 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report (Draft)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Overall and subgroup reliability (internal consistency reliability) – Section 3.7, pp. 69-74; – Reliability of Achievement-Level Categorization, Section 3.7.4, pp. 712 – Decision Accuracy and Consistency Results, Section 3.7.5, pp. 72-74 – Equating and linking procedures: Section 3.6.3, pp. 62-67 <p>4.1.1 Appendix O of 2019 Technical Report– Classical Reliability 4.1.2 Appendix J of 2019 Technical Report – Plots and IRT parameters 4.1.3 Appendix N of 2019 Technical Report – Scaled Score Distributions and Look-Up Tables</p> <p>Scoring accuracy (1.3.4) 2019 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report (Draft), Section 3.4, pp. 41-52 4.1.4 Appendix F of 2019 Technical Report – Interrater Consistency 4.1.5 Appendix E of 2019 Technical Report – Scoring Specifications</p>	<p>The evidence submitted is sufficient to meet this CE.</p> <p>The reviewers noted that there were no equating plots for grade 10 math in appendix J, but technical manual has Stocking/Lord values, but assume this omission will be corrected in the final version of the Technical Report.</p>
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><i>For all State academic assessments,</i> assessments should be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (see definition¹).</p> <p>For academic content assessments, the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in their design, development and analysis.</p>	<p>Bias and Sensitivity/Fairness (1.3.4) 2019 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report (Draft), pp. 33-36, 38, 55-56 (2.2.2) Appendix B of 2019 Technical Report - Committee Membership, p. 10 (Bias and Sensitivity) 4.2.1 Appendix I – Differential Item Functioning Results 4.2.2 Bias and Sensitivity Orientation 2019 4.2.3 MCAS Bias and Sensitivity Training March 2019 4.2.4 MCAS Bias and Sensitivity Training May 2019 Accessibility and Accommodations (1.4.1) Accessibility and Accommodations Manual for the 2019-2020 MCAS Tests and Retests, pp. 1, 12, 14, 21, 26-27 4.2.5 Next-Gen MCAS Accessibility Work Group Members 4.2.6 MCAS Accessibility Work Group Recommendations 2016 4.2.7 Student Tutorial and Practice Tests (screenshot of MCAS Resource Page at mcas.pearsonsupport.com/student/) 4.2.8 Practice Tests in Accommodated Formats (Screenshot of MCAS Resource Page at mcas.pearsonsupport.com/student/) 4.2.9 Appendix C – Accessibility Features and Test Accommodations 4.2.10 Differential Item Functioning – TAC Presentation – October 2019</p>	<p>The evidence submitted is sufficient to meet this CE.</p> <p>If the State does not already track the disposition of items during data review, they might consider keeping records of the rationale for inclusion of items with poor statistics in the eligible item pool.</p> <p>The reviewers commend the State for looking at subgroup analyses where sample sizes are small. (Evidence 4.2.10)</p>
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p>		

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

___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for academic assessments, including performance for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>(4.1.1) Appendix O of 2019 Technical Report – Classical Reliability (1.3.4) 2019 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report (Draft), Section 3.7.5, pp. 72-74 4.3.1 Appendix K of 2019 Technical Report – TCCs and TIFs</p>	<p>The evidence submitted is sufficient to meet this CE.</p> <p>The reviewers noted that the measurement scale is typical (higher SEM toward the ends, lower in the middle), with the cut scores in the area of lower SEM. Differentiation is reasonable for most of the scoring range.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</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>		

Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s <u>academic achievement standards</u>.</p>	<p>(1.3.4) 2019 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report (Draft), – Item and Test Development Process, pp. 33-34, pp. 34-36 – Scoring Procedures, pp. 41-52 4.4.1 2018-2019 MCAS Scoring Specifications 4.4.2 ELA MCAS Scoring Process 4.4.3 Mathematics Pre-Reading for scoring meeting 4.4.4 Mathematics Post-Scoring Checklist 4.4.5 Mathematics Item Checklist for use at scoring meeting 4.4.6 ELA MCAS Student Exemplars selection 4.4.7 Mathematics MCAS Student Exemplars selection 4.4.8 Online access to student released exemplars 4.4.9 ELA MCAS ADC Data and Item Review presentation 4.4.10 ELA MCAS Staff Procedures for Data Review 4.4.11 Mathematics MCAS Staff Procedures for Data Review 4.4.12 ELA MCAS Stat Review Descriptions 4.4.13 Mathematics MCAS Stat Review Descriptions</p> <p>Reporting results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards (1.3.4) 2019 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report (Draft) – Mode Comparability and Adjustment, pp. 64-67 – Reported Scaled Scores, pp. 67-69 4.4.14 MCAS 2019 Standard Setting Meeting: Grade 10 ELA and Mathematics; Grade 5 and 8 Science and Tech/Engineering (August 2019), pp. 11-12; 14; 21-22; 25-26; 27-29; 32-34; 40-41; Appendix A – Achievement Level Descriptors (pp. 54-86); (2.1.25) Grade 10 ELA MCAS Item Reporting Categories</p>	<p>The evidence submitted is sufficient to meet this CE.</p> <p>The reviewers noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hand scoring results look very good, especially for math. • Scoring process (machine and hand scoring) were well-described and reasonable.

	(2.1.26) Grade 10 Mathematics MCAS Item Reporting Categories	
Section 4.4 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or		
<input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:		

Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State administers multiple forms of academic assessments within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p>(1.3.4) 2019 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report (Draft) – MCAS IRT Linking and Scaling and Equating Procedures, Section 3.6 (pp. 58-64) – Mode Comparability and Adjustment, Section 3.6.4, (pp. 64-67) 4.5.1 Appendix L – Mode Adjustment Lookup Table</p>	<p>The evidence submitted is sufficient to meet this CE.</p>
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</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>		

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; or a native language version of the academic content assessment), grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<p>4.6.1 Guidance on Computer-Based Testing Presentation (1.3.4) 2019 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report (Draft), Mode Comparability and Adjustment, pp. 64-67</p>	<p>The reviewers did not find evidence of the design and development process used to ensure consistent interpretations between the English and Spanish versions of the Math assessment. The State is required to submit this evidence.</p>
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State is required to submit evidence of the design and development process used to ensure consistent interpretations between the English and Spanish versions of the Math assessment. 		

Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments), and Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website. 	<p>(1.3.4) 2019 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report (Draft), pp. 15-16; 69-72; 76-77</p> <p>4.7.1 Assessment Support Services RFR 20172018</p> <p>4.7.2 Assessment Support Services RFR 20182019</p> <p>4.7.3 Assessment Support Services RFR 20192020</p> <p>4.7.4 TAC Agenda November 2016</p> <p>4.7.5 TAC Agenda May 2017</p> <p>4.7.6 TAC Agenda October 2017</p> <p>4.7.7 TAC Agenda May 2018</p> <p>4.7.8 TAC Agenda October 2018</p> <p>4.7.9 TAC Agenda January 2019</p> <p>4.7.10 TAC Agenda May 2019</p> <p>4.7.11 TAC Agenda October 2019</p> <p>4.7.12 TAC Minutes November 2016</p> <p>4.7.13 TAC Minutes May 2017</p> <p>4.7.14 TAC Minutes October 2017</p> <p>4.7.15 TAC Minutes May 2018</p> <p>4.7.16 TAC Minutes October 2018</p> <p>4.7.17 TAC Minutes January 2019</p> <p>4.7.18 TAC Minutes May 2019</p> <p>4.7.19 Appendix S of Technical Report – 2017 Alignment Study</p> <p>(2.1.28) 2019 MCAS Content Alignment Study, Grade 10 ELA and Mathematics and Grades 5 and 8 STE (Draft)</p> <p>4.7.20 MCAS Technical Reports webpage (screenshot of www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/tech)</p>	<p>The evidence submitted is sufficient to meet this CE.</p> <p>The reviewers noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TAC members make recommendations for ongoing analyses and maintenance. The TAC meets regularly and its members are available as needed. There is sufficient publicly available documentation of technical quality to allow for reasonable public scrutiny of the MCAS.
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</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>		

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system. Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, the placement team under Section 504, or the individual or team designated by a district to make that decision under Title II of the ADA, as applicable, based on each student’s individual abilities and needs.</p> <p>If a State adopts alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and administers an alternate assessment aligned with those standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(1)(E) and (b)(2)(D), respectively, the State must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish guidelines for determining whether to assess a student with an AA-AAAS, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A State definition of “students with the most significant cognitive disabilities” that addresses factors related to cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior; • Provide information for IEP Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provides a clear explanation of the differences between 	<p>MCAS Participation Requirements - General</p> <p>(1.4.1) Accessibility and Accommodations Manual for the 2019-2020 MCAS Tests and Retests, Including Participation Requirements for Students with Disabilities and English Learners, pp. 1, 6-10 (1.3.5) Principal’s Administration Manual (Spring 2019), pp. 12-19 5.1.1 MCAS Participation Requirements (Screenshot)</p> <p>Participation Requirements and Guidelines for IEP Team Decision-making Regarding Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities</p> <p>5.1.2 Principal's Manual for the 2020 MCASAlt, p. 3 5.1.3 Educator's Manual for the 2020 MCASAlt, pp. 6, 8-10 5.1.4 Decision-Making Tool for MCAS Participation by Students with Disabilities (Updated: June 2019) 5.1.5 Guidance on Designating Students for the MCAS-Alt</p> <p>Parent Notification Regarding Alternate Assessment</p> <p>5.1.6 Sample Parent Notification Letter regarding student taking an alternate MCAS assessment (opening page with translations) 5.1.7 Sample Parent Notification Letter in English 5.1.8 Parent Notification re MCAS-Alt Web Screenshot 5.1.9 Parent Notification slide from Fall 2019 presentations to educators and administrators</p>	<p>The evidence submitted is sufficient to meet this CE.</p> <p>The reviewers commend the State for the organization of the evidence, moving from general participation, significant cognitive disability participation, and parent notification.</p>

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that parents of students assessed with an AA-AAAS are informed that their child's achievement will be measured based on alternate academic achievement standards; • Not preclude a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who takes an AA-AAAS from attempting to complete the requirements for a regular high school diploma; and • Promote, consistent with requirements under the IDEA, the involvement and progress of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in the general education curriculum that is based on the State's academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled; and • Develop, disseminate information on, and promote the use of appropriate accommodations to ensure that a 		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State has in place and monitors implementation of guidelines for IEP teams to apply in determining, on a case-by-case basis, which students with the most significant cognitive disabilities will be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, if applicable. Such guidelines must be developed in accordance with 34 CFR § 200.6(d).² 		
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
<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>		

² See the full regulation at 34 CFR § 200.6(d) (online at https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=07e168e9e7a6c5931b4549cc15547ce9&mc=true&node=se34.1.200_16&rgn=div8)

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all ELs in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s academic content assessments and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed with a linguistic accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for ELs; • Assistance regarding selection of appropriate linguistic accommodations for ELs, including to the extent practicable, assessments in the language most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what those students know and can do to determine the students’ mastery of skills in academic content areas until the students have achieved English language proficiency. 	<p>(1.3.5) Principal’s Administration Manual (Spring 2019), pp. 12-13, 43, 126-129</p> <p>(1.4.1) Accessibility and Accommodations Manual for the 2019-2020 MCAS Tests and Retests, Including Participation Requirements for Students with Disabilities and English Learners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – pp. 1-3, 6, 25-29, 32 (accommodations for ELs); – pp. 1-5 (accessibility features for all students); – pp. 26-29 (guidelines for selecting linguistic accommodations) – p. 32 (documentation of MCAS accommodations for an EL student – sample form) <p>5.2.1 Bilingual Dictionaries and Glossaries Authorized for Use by English Learners on MCAS Tests (Updated Fall 2019)</p> <p>5.2.2 MCAS Accessibility and Accommodations Training Module – EL Accommodations</p>	<p>The evidence submitted is sufficient to meet this CE.</p>
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</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>		

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and ELs, including ELs with disabilities. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures that appropriate accommodations, such as, interoperability with, and ability to use, assistive technology, are available to measure the academic achievement of students with disabilities. • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs; • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. • Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the 	<p>(1.4.1) Accessibility and Accommodations Manual for the 2019-2020 MCAS Tests and Retests</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – pp. 13, 15–29, 34–35 (appropriate accommodations and use of assistive technology); – pp. 1-3, 6, 25-29, 32 (accommodations for ELs); – pp. 1-14 (appropriate and effective); – pp. 12-14, 21-24 (do not alter construct and meaningful interpretation); – pp. 2-4 (accessibility features for all students); – pp. 13-14 (individually review unique accommodations requests) <p>(1.3.5) Principal’s Administration Manual (Spring 2019), pp. 18, 107 (individually review exceptional requests) pp. 12-13, 19, 43, 125-129 (accommodations do not deny students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate)</p> <p>5.3.1 Accessibility and Accommodations web page (Screenshot)</p> <p>5.3.2 Guide to Using Assistive Technology as an MCAS Accommodation</p> <p>5.3.3 Guide to the Student Registration/Personal Needs Profile (SR/PNP) Process for the 2019–2020 MCAS Tests pp. 19-42 (interoperability and assistive technology)</p> <p>(5.2.1) Bilingual Dictionaries and Glossaries Authorized for Use by English Learners on MCAS Tests (Updated Fall 2019)</p> <p>5.3.4 Accessibility Features and Accommodations training module</p> <p>5.3.5 Back-to-School Student Assessment Update, listing training for accessibility and accommodations</p>	<p>The evidence submitted is sufficient to meet this CE.</p> <p>The reviewers recommend that the State consider developing more guidance on exceptional accommodation requests and how the State guards against altering the construct.</p>

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.		
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or <input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:		

Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures; • Monitored for administrations of all required academic content assessments and AA-AAAS. 	<p>Instruments used to monitor compliance by districts 5.4.1 Coordinated Program Review Procedures - School District Information Package - Special Education (2017-2018), pp. 20-21 5.4.2 Coordinated Program Review Procedures - School District Information Package - English Learner Education (ELE) in Public Schools (2017-2018), p. 16</p> <p>Instruments used to collect data on the use of accommodations on MCAS tests 5.4.3 Personal Needs Profile Interface for Spring 2019 Grade 10 MCAS (5.3.3) Guide to the Student Registration/Personal Needs Profile Process for the 2019-2020 MCAS Tests, pp. 4, 6, 17, 19-42 (2.4.3) School Observation Schedule (2.4.4) MCAS Test Administration Observation Form, p. 3 (Students with disabilities and EL students) (2.4.8) Instructions for Reporting an MCAS Irregularity</p>	<p>The evidence submitted is sufficient to meet this CE.</p>
<p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</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"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic content standards:</u></p> <p>The State formally adopted <u>challenging academic achievement standards</u> in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; <p>The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (1) at least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third for lower achievement; (2) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (3) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</p>	<p>Development and adoption of challenging academic achievement standards</p> <p>6.1.1 Development of the Next-Generation Achievement Levels</p> <p>6.1.2 Guiding Principles of Standard Setting Policy Committee</p> <p>6.1.3 Next-Gen MCAS Standard Setting Policy Committee Workgroup</p> <p>6.1.4 November 29, 2016 BESE Meeting – Update on Standard Setting Policy Committee memo</p> <p>6.1.5 February 28, 2017 BESE Meeting – New Achievement Levels and Descriptors Recommendations memo</p> <p>6.1.6 October 23, 2017 BESE Meeting – 2017 Student Performance Results memo</p> <p>Adoption for grade 10 tests</p> <p>6.1.7 March 2019 BESE Meeting Student Assessment Updates</p> <p>6.1.8 March 2019 BESE Meeting Motion Achievement Levels</p> <p>6.1.9 March 2019 BESE Meeting Minutes, pp. 8-9</p> <p>Application to all students</p> <p>6.1.10 Invitation to Apply for Next-Generation MCAS Standard Setting Panels</p> <p>(4.4.14) MCAS 2019 Standard Setting Meeting: Grade 10 ELA and Mathematics; Grade 5 and 8 Science and Tech/Engineering (August 2019)</p> <p>(2.1.15) Appendix A of 2019 Technical Report – Grade-Specific ALDs</p>	<p>The evidence submitted is sufficient to meet this CE.</p> <p>The reviewers commend the State for developing the ALDs first, which is a strong practice.</p>
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>X_ No additional evidence is required or</p>		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:		

Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards.</u> 	<p>(4.4.14) MCAS 2019 Standard Setting Meeting: (August 2019); for panelists, pp. 21-22 6.2.1 MCAS Standard Setting 2019 - Plenary Presentation (panelists – slides 5 and 6) 6.2.2 May 2018 TAC Agenda 6.2.3 May 2018 TAC Minutes 6.2.4 October 2018 TAC Agenda 6.2.5 October 2018 TAC Minutes 6.2.6 Observations on the August 2019 MCAS Standard Setting Panel and High School Competency Determination Validation Meetings (draft)</p>	<p>The evidence submitted is sufficient to meet this CE.</p>
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</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>		

Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic achievement standards:</u></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards and with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards such that a student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards (1) are aligned with the State’s challenging academic content standards for the grade in which a student is enrolled; (2) promote access to the general curriculum consistent with the IDEA; (3) reflect professional judgment as to the highest possible standards achievable for such students; (4) are designated in the IEP for each student for whom alternate academic achievement standards apply; and (5) are aligned to ensure that a student who meets the alternate academic achievement standards is on track to pursue postsecondary education or competitive integrated employment.</p>	<p>6.3.1 College and Career Readiness Definition (adopted by the joint Boards of ESE and Higher Education)</p> <p>Documentation for Validity of Intended Test Uses and Interpretations</p> <p>(1.3.4) 2019 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report</p> <p>(3.2.1) The Consequences of High School Exit Examinations for Student Life Outcomes: Evidence from a Research-Practice Partnership in Massachusetts (Summary of Research Grant)</p> <p>6.3.2 DART: Success After High School – School Overview</p> <p>6.3.3 DART: Success After High School – High School Performance</p> <p>6.3.4 DART: Success After High School – Postsecondary Education Outcomes</p> <p>(4.4.14) MCAS 2019 Standard Setting Meeting: Grade 10 ELA and Mathematics; Grade 5 and 8 Science and Tech/Engineering (August 2019), pp. 47-49</p>	<p>The evidence submitted is sufficient to meet this CE.</p> <p>The reviewers noted that there is clear evidence for how the standards were developed and modified from prior versions. The alignment of the standards to post-secondary skills, consistent with the adopted definition of CCR is well-documented.</p> <p>The reviewers commend the State for the DART Reports.</p>

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 6.3 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or <input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:		

Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State reports its assessment results for all students assessed, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public.</p> <p>The State reports to the public its assessment results on <u>student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level³</u></p> <p>For <u>academic content assessments</u>, the State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the <u>specific academic needs of students</u>, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its academic content assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a 	<p>6.4.1 2019 Assessment and Accountability Reporting and Release schedule</p> <p>6.4.2 Appendix Q of Technical Report – Sample Reports</p> <p>6.4.3 Appendix R of Technical Report - Business Requirements (Decision Rules)</p> <p>6.4.4 Screenshot of MCAS Parent Resources page</p> <p>6.4.5 2019 MCAS achievement and growth results by subgroups and all students</p> <p>6.4.6 2019 MCAS Participation Report</p> <p>6.4.7 2019 MCAS Item by Item Results (Grade 10 ELA Example)</p> <p>6.4.8 2019 MCAS Parent/Guardian Report Templates (English version)</p> <p>6.4.9 Screenshot of MCAS Parent/Guardian Report Templates (Translation in 10 languages):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Arabic – Chinese – Crioulo – French – Haitian Creole – Khmer – Portuguese – Russian – Spanish – Vietnamese <p>6.4.10 Screenshot of MCAS reports in Edwin Analytics (Department’s Security Portal)</p> <p>6.4.11 MCAS Digital Library</p> <p>Interpretive information for parents</p> <p>6.4.12 Class of 2021 Parent Guardian Letter</p> <p>6.4.13 Class of 2023 Parent Guardian Letter</p>	<p>The evidence submitted is sufficient to meet this CE.</p> <p>The reviewers noted that the staged reporting is well-described and a very strong practice for intentionally maximizing assessment data utility.</p> <p>The reviewers commend the State for providing translations in 10 languages.</p>

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>student's academic achievement:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Report the <u>student's academic achievement</u> in terms of the State's grade-level academic achievement standards; ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific <u>academic needs of students;</u> ○ Are provided in an understandable and uniform format; ○ Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian; ○ Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. 	<p>6.4.14 Screenshot of Parent's Guide to the MCAS 6.4.15 Annotated Parent/Guardian Reports 6.4.16 MCAS results description (incl. Achievement Level Descriptors)</p> <p>Resources for educators 6.4.17 Screenshot Next-Generation MCAS Resources Webpage</p> <p>Accessible formats 6.4.18 Screenshot of Parent Resource web page (Obtaining P/G Reports in accessible formats)</p>	
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence