



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Margie Vandeven  
Commissioner of Education  
Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education  
P.O. Box 480  
Jefferson City, MO 65102-0480

June 23, 2020

Dear Commissioner Vandeven:

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), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). I appreciate the efforts of the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in March 2020.

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

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

- Reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics general assessments for grades 3-8 (Missouri Grade Level Assessments (MAP GLA)): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- R/LA and mathematics general assessments in high school (Missouri End of Course (MAP EOC)): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**

The assessments that substantially meet requirements of the ESEA meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. The Department expects that DESE may be able to provide this additional information within one year.

The specific list of items required for DESE to submit is enclosed with this letter. I request that 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 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

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

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

than 30 days to submit your plan, please let my staff know at [ESEA.Assessment@ed.gov](mailto: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 Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE) placed a condition on DESE's Title I, Part A grant award beginning July 1, 2019, as a result of the 2018 peer review. DESE advised the Department that it intended to replace the general assessments cited in that letter and submit a complete set of new evidence after the 2018-19 administration of Missouri's assessments. As such, DESE did not need to provide the information from its 2016 and 2018 peer reviews. Once DESE demonstrates that its assessment system meets all requirements through assessment peer review, the condition will be removed.

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](mailto:ESEA.Assessment@ed.gov).

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank T. Brogan  
Assistant Secretary  
for Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Lisa Sireno, DESE Standards and Assessment Administrator

## Critical Elements Where Additional Evidence is Needed to Meet the Requirements for Missouri's Assessment System

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<b>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</b>	For Missouri's assessment system: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that those students with disabilities who are publicly placed in private schools for special education services must be included in the assessment system.</li> </ul>
<b>1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments</b>	For Missouri's R/LA, mathematics, and science standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State conducted meaningful and timely consultation with each of the required entities.</li> </ul>
<b>2.3 – Test Administration</b>	For the MAP GLA and EOC in R/LA and mathematics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that ensures 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.</li> <li>• Evidence of a contingency plan to address possible technology failures.</li> </ul>
<b>2.5 – Test Security</b>	For the MAP GLA and EOC in R/LA and mathematics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 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:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration.</li> <li>○ Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State's assessments.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</b>	For the MAP EOC in R/LA and mathematics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 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.</li> </ul>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b>	For the MAP EOC in R/LA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State's assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), balance of content, and cognitive complexity (e.g., a plan and timeline to address issues raised in the alignment study).</li> </ul>
<b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b>	For the MAP GLA and EOC in R/LA and mathematics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the multiple versions of their assessments are comparable for meaningful interpretation of the results.</li> </ul>
<b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b>	For the MAP GLA and EOC in R/LA and mathematics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a system for maintaining and improving the quality of its assessment system.</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<b>5.2 – Procedures for Including ELs</b>	<p>For the MAP GLA and EOC in R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State clearly communicates to parents its procedures to ensure the inclusion of all ELs in public elementary and secondary schools (e.g., available linguistic accommodations and selection of appropriate accommodations).</li> </ul>
<b>5.3 - Accommodations</b>	<p>For the MAP GLA and EOC in R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the accommodations and accessibility features are effective for meeting the individual student’s needs, do not alter the construct, and allow meaningful interpretations of results.</li> <li>• Evidence of a process to review exceptional accommodations requests.</li> </ul>
<b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b>	<p>For the MAP GLA and EOC in R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations.</li> <li>○ Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered.</li> <li>○ Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice.</li> <li>○ Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</b>	<p>For the MAP GLA and EOC in R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State formally adopted challenging achievement standards in R/LA and mathematics.</li> </ul>
<b>6.4 – Reporting</b>	<p>For the MAP GLA and EOC in R/LA and mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that individual student reports are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian.</li> <li>• Evidence that upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, ISRs are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.</li> </ul>

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## March 2020 State Assessment Peer Review Notes Missouri



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI

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 ..... 5**

**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 ..... 14**

**Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration..... 15**

**Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration ..... 17**

**Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security ..... 18**

**Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy .. 19**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY .....20**

**Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content20**

**Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes ..... 22**

**Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure..... 23**

**Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables..... 24**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER.....25**

**Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability ..... 25**

**Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility ..... 27**

**Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum ..... 28**

**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring..... 29**

**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms..... 30**

**Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment ..... 31**

**Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance ..... 32**

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS.....33**

**Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 33**

**Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments..... 36**

**Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations ..... 37**

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

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

..... 39

**SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING.....40**

**Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students..... 40**

**Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting ..... 41**

**Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards ..... 42**

**Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting ..... 44**

**SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS**

.....ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

**Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic AssessmentsError! Bookmark not defined.**

**Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic AssessmentsError! Bookmark not defined.**

**Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State AssessmentsError! Bookmark not defined.**

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI**

**SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS MISSOURI**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b><u>For academic content standards:</u></b>                      The State 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>Exhibit A: Missouri State Board Minutes April 19, 2016                      Exhibit B: Missouri Learning Standards web links                      Exhibit C: Missouri Learning Standards combined</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state provided evidence of the State Board adoption of ELA and mathematics standards, Exhibit A: Missouri State Board Minutes April 19, 2016.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>X No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI**

**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><b><u>For academic content standards:</u></b>                      The State’s challenging academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science are aligned with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards.</p>	<p>Exhibit E CTE Perkins V Presentation                      Exhibit E.1 Task Force on College and Career Readiness                      Exhibit E.2 Joint Task Committee Letter                      Exhibit E.3 Academic Research Feedback                      Exhibit E.4 Higher Education Dr Monhollon                      Career and technical education state plan includes increasing and documenting academic and technical rigor in both secondary and post-secondary Missouri Career Education courses.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state provided documents about the alignment between the statewide assessment and “entrance requirement for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education.” The submitted documents Exhibit E.2 Joint Task Committee Letter, Exhibit E.3 Academic Research Feedback, and Exhibit E.4 Higher Education Dr Monhollon gives mixed opinions about the alignment. In Exhibit E.4 Higher Education Dr. Monhollon, it states, “Only after the assessments have been identified and reviewed, with particular attention given to where achievement levels are set, can we make that determination.”</li> <li>• The state must submit evidence that the ELA and mathematics standards are aligned with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the state. Two examples that might be helpful include:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reports of external independent reviews of the State’s academic content standards by content experts or other documentation to confirm that the State’s academic content standards adequately specify what students should know and be able to do aligned with credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education.</li> <li>• Endorsements or certifications by the State’s network of institutions of higher education (IHEs), professional associations and/or the business community that the State’s academic content standards represent the</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>knowledge and skills in the content area(s) under review necessary for students to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state submitted evidence of a task force that is working on the GLA. Meeting minutes or a report from the task force would be helpful evidence.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state must submit evidence that the ELA and mathematics standards are aligned with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the state.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI

### 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 <b><u>grade-level academic achievement standards</u></b> or alternate academic achievement standards in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 9-12);</li> <li>• Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12).</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <p>The State’s <b><u>academic content assessments</u></b> must be the same assessments administered to all students in the tested grades, with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may take an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards.</li> <li>• A State may permit an LEA to administer a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in lieu of the State high school assessment if certain conditions are met.</li> <li>• A State that administers an end-of-course high school mathematics assessment may exempt an 8<sup>th</sup> grade student from the mathematics assessment typically administered in</li> </ul>	<p>Exhibit F: LEA Guide page 2 Overview –MAP Grade-Level and End-of-Course</p> <p>Exhibit F.1 Appendix B from Missouri School Improvement Program Guide (page 79)</p>	<p>Missouri provided evidence that it administers assessments in R/LA, mathematics, and science in the required grades or grade spans. Missouri provides an alternate assessment in the required grades for those students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI

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

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For students with disabilities, policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including those children with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system;</li> <li>• For ELs:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Policies state that all ELs must be included in all aspects of the content assessment system, unless the State has chosen the statutory option for recently arrived ELs under which such ELs are exempt from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment.</li> <li>○ If a State has developed native language assessments for ELs in R/LA, ELs must be assessed in R/LA in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except, if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Missouri State Statute: 160.518.6 RSMo Missouri State Statute: 160.518.5 RSMo</p> <p>Exhibit I.4 MSIP Comprehensive Guide</p>	<p>Missouri demonstrated that it has policies requiring the inclusion of all students in its assessment system and that these requirements are clearly communicated in its guidance to LEAs. The State utilizes the one year exemption for ELs on the R/LA assessment in their first year of arrival.</p> <p>The State does not require that those students with disabilities who are publicly placed in private schools for special education services must be included in the assessment system.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI**

<p>language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If the State uses the flexibility for Native American language schools and programs: (1) the State provides the content assessment in the Native American language to all students in the school or program; (2) the State submits such content assessment for peer review as part of its State assessment system; and (3) the State continues to provide ELP assessments and services for ELs as required by law. The State must assess in English the students' achievement in R/LA in high school.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 1.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that those students with disabilities who are publicly placed in private schools for special education services must be included in the assessment system.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>If the State has developed or amended challenging <b>academic</b> standards and assessments, the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education).</li> <li>• Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas).</li> <li>• Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State.</li> <li>• Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents.</li> </ul>	<p>Exhibit D</p> <p><a href="https://dese.mo.gov/college-career-readiness/curriculum/hb-1490-timeline-keep-info">https://dese.mo.gov/college-career-readiness/curriculum/hb-1490-timeline-keep-info</a></p> <p>Exhibit D.1</p>	<p>Missouri provided evidence that the State went through a consultation process in the development of its standards, which were approved in April 2016. This process clearly included the input of educational professionals, parents, and educational organizations. However, Missouri did not make clear whether each of the required entities, particularly local educational agencies in rural areas, and representatives of Indian tribes located in the State.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State conducted meaningful and timely consultation with each of the required entities.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS MISSOURI**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to <b><u>the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards</u></b> for the grade that is being assessed and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of <b><u>the State’s grade-level academic content standards</u></b> and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results.</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <b><u>the State’s academic content standards</u></b>, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills).</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design</li> </ul>	<p>Exhibit G GLA Technical Report                      Exhibit G.1 EOC Technical Report                      Exhibit H – Grade-Level Blueprints                      Exhibit H.1 – EOC Blueprints                      Exhibit T. Executive Summary of Alignment Study                      Exhibit T.1 Alignment Study</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state provided evidence in the two technical reports, Exhibit G GLA Technical Report and Exhibit G.1 EOC Technical Report of the purposes of the GLA and EOC assessments.</li> <li>• The blueprints, Exhibit H – Grade-Level Blueprints and Exhibit H.1 – EOC Blueprints detailed the structure that measures the breadth of the MLS to support the development of assessments that are technically sound. A suggestion would be to demonstrate complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills) in the blueprints.</li> </ul>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI

<p>and intended uses and interpretations of results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the student is enrolled and uses that determination for all reporting.</li> <li>• If the State administers a content assessment that includes portfolios, such assessment may be partially administered through a portfolio but may not be <i>entirely</i> administered through a portfolio.</li> </ul>		
<b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b>		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI**

**Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess student achievement based on the <b>State’s academic content standards</b> in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</li> </ul>	<p>Exhibit G Grade-Level Technical Report                      Exhibit G.1 EOC Technical Reports                      Exhibit G.2 Grade-Level Item Writing Training                      Exhibit G.3 EOC Item Writing Training                      Exhibit G.4 Item Writing Checklist                      Exhibit G.5 TE Item Type Screenshots                      Exhibit G.6 General Item Writing                      Exhibit G.7 Item Specifications</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The state provided evidence in the technical reports (Exhibit G Grade-Level Technical Report and G.1 EOC Technical Reports) of the development and selection process of items on the GLA and EOC. The items were reviewed or developed by adequately qualified and trained stakeholders (Exhibit G.2 Grade-Level Item Writing Training and Exhibit G.3 EOC Item Writing Training). In the technical reports, there was evidence of field testing items before their operational use.</li> <li>Webb’s DOK was used in the training and the process of item writing for the GLA and EOC for cognitive processes, including higher-order thinking skills.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>X No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI**

**Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>• Has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities;</li> <li>• If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>	<p>Exhibit F. 2017-2018 Missouri LEA Guide to Assessment v2</p> <p>Grade-Level:                      Exhibit V: Grade-Level Test Coordinator Manual                      Exhibit V.3 Grade-Level DTC Training                      Exhibit V. 5 Grade-Level Manuals Combined</p> <p>End-of-Course Assessments:                      Exhibit V.2 End-of Course Test Administration Manual                      Exhibit V.4 End-of-Course DTC Training                      Exhibit V.6 EOC Examiner Manual</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state provided evidence of clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments: For Grade-Level Assessments: Exhibit V: Grade-Level Test Coordinator Manual, Exhibit V.3 Grade-Level DTC Training, Exhibit V. 5 Grade-Level Manuals Combined and End-of-Course Assessments: Exhibit V.2 End-of Course Test Administration Manual, Exhibit V.4 End-of-Course DTC Training, and Exhibit V.6 EOC Examiner Manual.</li> <li>• The state provided evidence that the DTC serves as the liaison attending training and assuring that all personnel are trained in their districts. However, no evidence was provided to ensure that personnel all have been trained. The state must provide evidence that ensures 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.</li> <li>• In the Test Coordinator/Administration Manual and Examiner Manuals, technology related requirements and standardized procedures exist.</li> <li>• The state must provide evidence of technology contingency plans for the GLA and EOCs.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b>		
X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI

- The state must provide evidence that ensures 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.
- The state must provide evidence of technology contingency plans for the GLA and EOCs.

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI**

**Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. Monitoring of test administration should be demonstrated for all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS.</p>	<p>Exhibit P Quality Assurance Draft Letter                      Exhibit P.1 QA District Letter                      Exhibit P.2 Testing irregularities process flow chart                      Exhibit P.3 Narrative Report                      Exhibit P.4 District Response Form</p>	<p>Missouri provided evidence of a process for monitoring LEAs in test administration for the MAP and MAP-A assessments, as well as a process for addressing concerns raised during the monitoring. Additionally, each LEA is required to do self-monitoring. Department staff note that it would have been helpful to see the monitoring forms and any training or guidance provided to monitors. Department staff were able to find the monitoring forms on the DESE website.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>x No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI**

**Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> <li>• Application of test security procedures to all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS.</li> </ul>	<p>Exhibit P.2 Testing irregularities process flow chart                      Exhibit J.1 Assessment Security 2013                      Exhibit J.2 MSBA Security Rules</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state provided evidence in Exhibit J.2 MSBA Security Rules that each Missouri district must have a test security policy adopted annually by the School Board. Information on test security is found in the manuals and training for the DTCs and STCs. The manuals also have basic test security information for all personnel. The state must provide documentation of annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration.</li> <li>• There is evidence for the test incident reporting procedures for the GLA and EOC with standardized response for district superintendents conducting an investigation. However, no data was given as to the remediation of any test security incidents. The state needs to provide evidence of procedures of remediation.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state must provide documentation of annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration.</li> <li>• The state needs to provide evidence of procedures of remediation</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results;</li> <li>• To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> <li>• To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.</li> </ul>	<p>5 CSR 20-700.100 Statewide Longitudinal Data System                      - See Notes for State Statue                      Exhibit K.1 DRC Annual Security                      Exhibit K.2 DRC Data Privacy</p> <p>Additional Evidence Exhibit I.4 MSIP-5-2018 Comprehensive Guide</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state provided evidence, 5 CSR 20-700.100 Statewide Longitudinal Data System, that is the framework to protect the integrity of test-related data, PII information, and test materials.</li> <li>• Exhibit V 2018 MAP Grade-level TCM and V.2 21171_MO1805_EOC_TCM_FINAL have detailed guidance for the districts to protect the integrity of the data and privacy of PII.</li> <li>• The state produced evidence, Exhibit K.1 DRC Annual Security and K.2 DRC Data Privacy, showing security and data policies for the GLA.</li> <li>• The state needs to provide evidence that there are security and data policies for the EOC assessments.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state needs to provide evidence that there are security and data policies for the EOC assessments.</li> </ul>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY MISSOURI

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. The State’s validity evidence includes evidence that:</p> <p><b><u>The State’s academic assessments</u></b> measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> <li>• Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards;</li> <li>• If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards and administers alternate assessments aligned with those standards, the assessments show adequate alignment to the State’s academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content</li> </ul>	<p>Exhibit G.1 End-of-Course Technical Report                      Exhibit G: GLA Technical Report                      Exhibit T. Executive Summary of Alignment Study                      Exhibit T.1 Alignment Study</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state provided validity evidence in Exhibit G: GLA Technical Report that the GLA was designed to measure in terms of content and cognitive complexity. The alignment studies, Exhibit T. Executive Summary of Alignment Study and Exhibit T.1 Alignment Study detail that the Mathematics Overall Alignment Index Table reported: “The mathematics items represented for each grade level indicate very strong levels of alignment with respect to cognitive demand (range = .66 - .95).” For ELA, “further investigation of the cognitive demand attributes of the EOC item pools in general and the English I item pool in particular seem warranted.” See page 19 for the rationale and statistical details. The state needs to provide evidence that demonstrates the reanalysis of the Language Arts EOC Writing Pool as recommended on page 19 of the Exhibit T Alignment Study.</li> <li>• The Peers believe the state could also consider following the recommendation in the Exhibit T Alignment Study to analyze the test forms in addition to item pool for the balance of representation/content.</li> </ul>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI

and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.		
<b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b>		
X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The state needs to provide evidence that demonstrates the reanalysis of the Language Arts EOC Writing Pool as recommended on page 19 of the Exhibit T Alignment Study.</li></ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI**

**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: <b><u>the intended cognitive processes</u></b> appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>Exhibit G.1 End-of-Course Technical Report Exhibit G: GLA Technical Report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The state provided evidence in the technical reports, Exhibit G.1 End-of-Course Technical Report and Exhibit G: GLA Technical Report that Overall Alignment Indices were acceptable ranges for the authors of the alignment study. See 3.1. The Peers believe the state could consider conducting cognitive labs or think aloud protocols to better demonstrate assessments elicit the intended cognitive processes.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>X No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI**

**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 <b><u>academic content standards</u></b>.</p>	<p>Exhibit G: GLA Technical Report Exhibit G.1 End-of-Course Technical Report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state provided evidence in the Exhibit G: GLA Technical Report that the scoring and reporting structures are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the academic standards. For the GLA, the correlations among reporting category scores were strong with .45-.99 for ELA and .63-1 for mathematics. The Peers believe the state could consider using the following alternative method. Since the test was scored using unidimensional IRT models, results of overall IRT model fit might be more directly relevant than PCA results. Item-level IRT model fit statistics did not indicate any items that needed to be removed from the item pool based on fit.</li> <li>• The state provided evidence in Exhibit G.1 End-of-Course Technical Report, the correlations for the EOC were moderate to strong. The Peers believe the state could consider the EOC test form assembly guidelines about item discrimination be made more stringent as the item pool grows.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>X No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI**

**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>Exhibit G: GLA Technical Report                      Exhibit G.1 End-of-Course Technical Report                      Exhibit Y.1 Public Presentation of Performance Level Setting</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state provided evidence in Exhibit G: GLA Technical Report that correlations between total MAP scale scores in English Language Arts and mathematics at each grade level are large and positive, but not so large as to indicate that these scores are measuring the same construct. Exhibit G.1 End-of-Course Technical Report provides correlations between total EOC scale scores from English I and II, and the three mathematics courses. These show a logical pattern of relationships, with the strongest correlations between English I and II, and among Algebra I, Algebra II and Geometry, and generally lower correlations between the English Language Arts and mathematics EOC test scores.</li> <li>• The state provided evidence in Exhibit G: GLA Technical Report and Exhibit G.1 End-of-Course Technical Report how the assessment scores are related to NAEP. In Exhibit Y.1 Public Presentation of Performance Level Setting, NAEP 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade performance levels were used during the standard setting process so “their proficient cut scores would be within this range.” For the EOC, ACT CCR benchmarks were used.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>X No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER      MISSOURI**

**Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. If the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, measures of reliability for the assessment overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a <b>student’s academic achievement</b>.</li> </ul>	<p>Exhibit G: GLA Technical Report Exhibit G.1 End-of-Course Technical Report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state provided evidence in Exhibit G: GLA Technical Report and Exhibit G.1 End-of-Course Technical Report that the assessment reliability for the state’s student population such as Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient for overall scores were all above .70 which is acceptable. There were two exceptions. The first is in the ELA Reporting Category Subscore in the GLA; the reliability is .5. The second is in the Geometry EOC assessment Statistics and Probability Cluster Subscore; the reliability is about .4 based on the SEM. The Peers believe the state could consider reviewing the individual items in the subscore categories and determine appropriate action.</li> </ul>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b>		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI

### Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><i>For all State academic assessments,</i> assessments should be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (see definition<sup>1</sup>).</p> <p><b>For academic content assessments,</b> the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in their design, development and analysis.</p>	<p>Exhibit G: GLA Technical Report                      Exhibit G.2 Item Writing Training                      Exhibit I.2 GLA Accommodations                      Exhibit G.1 End-of-Course Technical Report                      Exhibit G.6 General Item writing                      Exhibit I.3 EOC Accommodations                      Exhibit G.7 Item Specifications</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The state provided evidence that the assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups. The Exhibit G: GLA Technical Report and Exhibit G.1 End-of-Course Technical Report described the UDL process for development of the 3-8 and EOC assessments, providing many accessibility features. In addition, Exhibit G.6 General Item writing and Exhibit G.2 Item Writing Training, showed bias training was given to item writers/reviewers. Finally, the state conducts DIF analysis and suggests that they will follow an appropriate process to improve future test administrations.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>X No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI**

**Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for <b>academic assessments</b>, including performance for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>Exhibit G: GLA Technical Report Exhibit G.1 End-of-Course Technical Report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The state provided evidence that that the assessments demonstrate a precise estimate of student performance across the continuum by showing the CSEM values for both the GLA and EOC in Exhibit G: GLA Technical Report and Exhibit G.1 End-of-Course Technical Report. The exception is the CSEM differences between the bottom and middle of the score scale for the grade 4 mathematics forms which indicate low-achieving students were not precisely assessed (Exhibit G GLA Technical Report, p. 148). The Peers believe the state could consider re-evaluating the grade 4 item pool, test specifications, and form assembly process to ensure enough low difficulty items on each form to provide more uniform score precision.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>X No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI**

**Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s <b><u>academic achievement standards</u></b>.</p>	<p>Exhibit G: GLA Technical Report Exhibit G.1 End-of-Course Technical Report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state provided evidence of scoring procedures for the GLA and EOC assessments in Exhibit G: GLA Technical Report and Exhibit G.1 End-of-Course Technical Report . Both assessments had hand-scoring and automated. The vendors created standardized scoring protocols for interrater reliability. Minimum and maximum scale scores were set for all assessments.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>X No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI**

**Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>If the State administers multiple forms of <b>academic assessments</b> within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s <b>academic content standards</b> and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p>Exhibit W MAP ELA and Math Equating plan                      Exhibit W.1 EOC Equating Design and Procedures                      Exhibit G.1 End-of-Course Technical Report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state provided evidence in Exhibit W MAP ELA and Math Equating Plan and Exhibit W.1 EOC Equating Design and Procedures, that both the GLA and EOC assessments had design and procedures in place to ensure all forms adequately represent the academic standards. There is evidence that the equating produced comparable form scores.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>X No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State administers any of its assessments in multiple versions within a subject area (e.g., online versus paper-based delivery; <b><u>or a native language version of the academic content assessment</u></b>), grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>• Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<p>Exhibit W.1 EOC Equating Design and Procedures Exhibit G.1 End-of-Course Technical Report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state needs to provide evidence that the multiple versions of their assessments are comparable for meaningful interpretation of the results.</li> </ul> <p>Examples to meet evidence for this Critical Element could include, 1.) demonstration that the provision of paper-based substitutes for technology-enabled items elicits comparable response processes and produces an adequately aligned assessment 2.) report of results of a comparability study of different versions of the assessments that is technically sound and documents evidence of comparability generally consistent with expectations of current professional standards 3.) or reports of research (quantitative or qualitative) that show that variations resulting from different types of delivery devices do not alter the interpretations of results.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state needs to provide evidence that the multiple versions of their assessments are comparable for meaningful interpretation of the results.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI

### 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"> <li>Has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments), and</li> <li>Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website.</li> </ul>	<p>State Statute: 160.526.2</p> <p>2. The state board of education shall by contract enlist the assistance of such national experts to receive reports, advice and counsel on a regular basis pertaining to the validity and reliability of the statewide assessment system. The reports from such experts shall be received by the state board of education. Within six months prior to implementation of or modification or revision to the statewide assessment system, the commissioner of education shall inform the president pro tempore of the senate and the speaker of the house of representatives about the procedures to implement, modify, or revise the statewide assessment system, including a report related to the reliability and validity of the assessment instruments, and the general assembly may, within the next sixty legislative days, veto such implementation, modification, or revision by concurrent resolution adopted by majority vote of both the senate and the house of representatives.</p> <p>Technical Reports are posted on the Department website for public review.</p> <p><a href="https://dese.mo.gov/college-career-readiness/assessment/assessment-technical-support-materials">https://dese.mo.gov/college-career-readiness/assessment/assessment-technical-support-materials</a></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The state provided evidence that there is a statutory requirement for the Commissioner to inform the legislative branch about the statewide assessment system. There are also references to the TAC in the standard-setting report, and a proposed 5 year review in the technical reports. However, no evidence was submitted to document regular meetings of a TAC and a system of continual improvement. Therefore, the state needs to provide evidence of a system for maintaining and improving the quality of its assessment system.</li> <li>The state provided evidence that there is current data and analysis for the public to review on the Department website.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The state needs to provide evidence of a system for maintaining and improving the quality of its assessment system.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI**

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS MISSOURI**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system. Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, the placement team under Section 504, or the individual or team designated by a district to make that decision under Title II of the ADA, as applicable, based on each student’s individual abilities and needs.</p> <p>If a State adopts alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and administers an alternate assessment aligned with those standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(1)(E) and (b)(2)(D), respectively, the State must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish guidelines for determining whether to assess a student with an AA-AAAS, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A State definition of “students with the most significant cognitive disabilities” that addresses factors related to cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Provide information for IEP Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</li> </ul>	<p>Exhibit I: IEP Form D  Exhibit I.1 Missouri Accommodations Training  Exhibit I.2 GLA Accommodations  Exhibit I.3 EOC Accommodations  Exhibit I.5 504 Student Access  Exhibit I.6 Decision Chart</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state provided evidence that ensures the inclusion of all public school students with disabilities in the assessment system.</li> <li>• The state provided detailed documentation on the available accommodations on all assessments in Exhibit I.2 GLA Accommodations and Exhibit I.3 EOC Accommodations.</li> <li>• The state provided documents to help districts determine if students need accessibility features and/or accommodations on the GLA or EOC assessments in Exhibit I: IEP Form D and Exhibit I.5 504 Student Access.</li> <li>• The state also provided evidence of eligibility criteria for the alternate assessment.</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provides a clear explanation of the differences between assessments aligned with grade-level academic achievement standards and those aligned with alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student's education resulting from taking an AA-AAAS, such as how participation in such assessments may delay or otherwise affect the student from completing the requirements for a regular high school diploma;</li> <li>• Ensure that parents of students assessed with an AA-AAAS are informed that their child's achievement will be measured based on alternate academic achievement standards;</li> <li>• Not preclude a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who takes an AA-AAAS from attempting to complete the requirements for a regular high school diploma; and</li> <li>• Promote, consistent with requirements under the IDEA, the involvement and progress of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in the general education curriculum that is based on the State's academic content standards</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>for the grade in which the student is enrolled; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop, disseminate information on, and promote the use of appropriate accommodations to ensure that a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who does not take an AA-AAAS participates in academic instruction and assessments for the grade in which the student is enrolled.</li> <li>• The State has in place and monitors implementation of guidelines for IEP teams to apply in determining, on a case-by-case basis, which students with the most significant cognitive disabilities will be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, if applicable. Such guidelines must be developed in accordance with 34 CFR § 200.6(d).<sup>2</sup></li> </ul>		
<b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b>		
X No additional evidence is required.		

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all ELs in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s academic content assessments and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed with a linguistic accommodation(s);</li> <li>• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for ELs;</li> <li>• Assistance regarding selection of appropriate linguistic accommodations for ELs, including to the extent practicable, assessments in the language most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what those students know and can do to determine the students’ mastery of skills in academic content areas until the students have achieved English language proficiency.</li> </ul>	<p>Exhibit I FORM D                      Exhibit I.2 Grade-Level EL Accommodations                      Exhibit I.3 End-of-Course EL Accommodations                      Exhibit I.4 MSIP V Comprehensive Guide</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state provided evidence, Exhibit I FORM D, to determine EL accommodations for individual students.</li> <li>• The state provided evidence that ELs are ensured inclusion in the GLA and EOC assessments as they have access to both universal and linguistic accommodations. Exhibit I.2 Grade-Level EL Accommodations and Exhibit I.3 End-of-Course EL Accommodations detail these accessibility features and the process to determine usage.</li> <li>• The state needs to provide evidence that parents of ELs are made aware of the available linguistic accommodations, process used for determination, and assistance regarding selection of appropriate linguistic accommodations.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state needs to provide evidence that parents of ELs are made aware of the available linguistic accommodations, process used for determination, and assistance regarding selection of appropriate linguistic accommodations.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI**

**Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and ELs, including ELs with disabilities. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations, such as, interoperability with, and ability to use, assistive technology, are available to measure the <b><u>academic achievement</u></b> of students with disabilities.</li> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs;</li> <li>• Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> <li>• Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> <li>• Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny</li> </ul>	<p>Exhibit I: IEP Form D                      Exhibit I.1 Missouri Accommodations Training                      Exhibit I.2 GLA Accommodations                      Exhibit I.3 EOC Accommodations                      Exhibit I.5 504 Student Access</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state provided evidence that there are many accessibility features and accommodations available to all students, including those with disabilities and ELs in Exhibit I.2 GLA Accommodations and Exhibit I.3 EOC Accommodations.</li> <li>• The state needs to provide evidence that the accommodations and accessibility features are effective for meeting the individual student’s needs, do not alter the construct, and allow meaningful interpretations of results. A suggestion would be documentation that scores for students based on assessments administered with allowable accommodations allow for valid inferences, such as: description of the reasonable and appropriate basis for the set of accommodations offered on the assessments, such as a literature review, empirical research, recommendations by advocacy and professional organizations, and/or consultations with the State’s TAC.</li> <li>• The state needs to provide evidence of an exceptional request process. The informal statement could be turned into a formal policy.</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.		
<b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state needs to provide evidence that the accommodations and accessibility features are effective for meeting the individual student’s needs, do not alter the construct, and allow meaningful interpretations of results.</li> <li>• The state needs to provide evidence of an exceptional request process.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI**

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures;</li> <li>• Monitored for administrations of all required academic content assessments and AA-AAAS.</li> </ul>	<p>Critical Element 2.4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state provided evidence for CE 2.4 on assessment monitoring which had QA visits and internal monitoring for the GLA and EOC assessments. However, there is limited mention of monitoring special populations such as in the Exhibit P.1 2018 On-site Quality Assurance Letter which states “the interview will include verification of processes for accommodations,” and in Exhibit P Quality Assurance Draft that says “when an issue is reported to the Department...[including] Use/Misuse of Accommodations.” However, this evidence does not guarantee special population monitoring. The state needs to submit evidence for all criteria of Critical Element 5.4. Possible evidence might include the state’s written procedures for monitoring the use of accommodations during test administration or a data summary of Quality Assurance visits focused on accommodations for special populations.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state needs to submit evidence for all criteria of Critical Element 5.4.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI**

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

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

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b><u>For academic content standards:</u></b>                      The State formally adopted <b><u>challenging academic achievement standards</u></b> in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities;</li> <li>• The State applies its academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply;</li> </ul> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include:                      (1) at least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third for lower achievement; (2) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (3) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</p>	<p>Exhibit X: MAP-EOC Results September 2018                      Exhibit X.1: Board Minutes September 2018                      Exhibit X.2: MAP-EPC Results October 2018                      Exhibit X.3: Board Minutes October 2018</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state provided evidence that the Missouri State Board of Education adopted and applied the performance levels for the GLA and EOC assessments in Exhibit X.1: Board Minutes September 2018, Exhibit X.2: MAP-EPC Results October 2018, and Exhibit X.3: Board Minutes October 2018 to all public school students in Missouri.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>X No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI**

**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"> <li>• <b><u>Academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards.</u></b></li> </ul>	<p>Exhibit Y MO Standards Setting Technical Manual GLA Exhibit Y.7 EOC Standard Setting Report Exhibit Y.1 Public Presentation of Performance Level Setting Exhibit Y.2 Survey results breakdown Exhibit Y.3 Public Meeting Comments Exhibit Y.4 Online Comments Exhibit Y.5 MO Policy Meeting Agenda Exhibit Y.6 Policy Committee Members</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state provided evidence that the two vendors, DRC and Questar facilitated the bookmark method of standard-setting for the respective assessments. Both processes were technically sound and involved panelists with appropriate experience. The Peers believe the state could consider for the future, since the proficiency cut scores set in EOC English I and II were determined by the state to be too low as compared to those for Grades 7 and 8 English Language Arts, possible definitions of the borderline proficient student and performance level descriptions used, panel size/composition, or other aspects could be re-considered before future standard-setting processes.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>X No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b><u>For academic achievement standards:</u></b></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards and with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards such that a student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards (1) are aligned with the State’s challenging academic content standards for the grade in which a student is enrolled; (2) promote access to the general curriculum consistent with the IDEA; (3) reflect professional judgment as to the highest possible standards achievable for such students; (4) are designated in the IEP for each student for whom alternate academic achievement standards apply; and (5) are aligned to ensure that a student who meets the alternate academic achievement standards is on track to pursue</p>	<p>Exhibit Y.8 ELA EOC PLDs                      Exhibit Y.9 Math EOC PLDs                      Exhibit Y.10 ELA GLA PLDs                      Exhibit Y.11 Math GLA PLDs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state provided academic achievement standards that are challenging and aligned with the state’s academic content standards . The evidence of PLDs on the GLA and ALDs on the EOCs in ELA and mathematics met Critical Element 6.3.</li> <li>• The state provided evidence using the results of benchmarking the EOC academic achievement standards against ACT’s CCR to ensure the alignment with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the state system of public higher education.</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
postsecondary education or competitive integrated employment.		
<b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b>		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI**

**Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State reports its assessment results for all students assessed, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public.</p> <p>The State reports to the public its assessment results on <b><u>student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level<sup>3</sup></u></b></p> <p>For <b><u>academic content assessments</u></b>, the State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the <b><u>specific academic needs of students</u></b>, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its academic content assessments that:</li> </ul>	<p>Exhibit Z Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education website  <a href="https://apps.dese.mo.gov/MCDS/home.aspx">https://apps.dese.mo.gov/MCDS/home.aspx</a>                      Exhibit Z.2 Guide to Interpreting Results GLA                      Exhibit Z.3 Guide to Interpreting Results EOC                      Exhibit Z.4 Item Analysis Summary ELA                      Exhibit Z.5 Item Analysis Summary Math                      Exhibit Z.6 MAP Information for Parents</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The state provided evidence that the public has access to school, district and state reports at each achievement level in Exhibit Z Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education website  <a href="https://apps.dese.mo.gov/MCDS/home.aspx">https://apps.dese.mo.gov/MCDS/home.aspx</a>.</li> <li>The state submitted evidence of the itemized score analyses in mathematics and ELA for each standard, Exhibit Z.4 Item Analysis Summary ELA and Exhibit Z.5 Item Analysis Summary Math.</li> <li>The state provided evidence in Exhibit Z.2 Guide to Interpreting Results GLA and Exhibit Z.3 Guide to Interpreting Results EOC that the individual student score report has the academic achievement by proficiency level with the PLDs (GLA) and ALDs (EOC). The state also provided a guide for parents to help parents with the GLA in Exhibit Z.6 MAP Information for Parents. Even though the ISRs meet this Critical Element, the Peers believe the state could consider soliciting additional feedback from parents and teachers about the EOC score report format. Specifically, it is not clear whether the current format for reporting the scores’ standard error is likely to be understandable for teachers and parents.</li> <li>The state needs to provide evidence that ISRs 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</li> </ul>

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

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a <b><u>student's academic achievement</u></b>;</li> <li>○ Report the <b><u>student's academic achievement</u></b> in terms of the State's grade-level academic achievement standards;</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific <b><u>academic needs of students</u></b>;</li> <li>○ Are provided in an understandable and uniform format;</li> <li>○ Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian;</li> <li>○ Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.</li> <li>● The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> <li>●</li> </ul>		<p>parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The state needs to provide evidence that upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, ISRs are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.</li> <li>● The state did provide evidence of a process and timeline for reporting public, district, and student scores.</li> </ul>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSOURI

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<p>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state needs to provide evidence that ISRs are to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian.</li> <li>• The state needs to provide evidence that upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, ISRs are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.</li> </ul>		

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