



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Penny Schwinn
Commissioner
Tennessee Department of Education
710 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, TN 37243

June 23, 2020

Dear Commissioner Schwinn:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education's (the Department) assessment peer review process under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). I appreciate the efforts of the Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE) 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 TDOE's submission and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that this component of your assessment system met some, but not all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of the ESEA. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and our own analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

- General assessments in mathematics and reading/language arts (R/LA) for grades 3-8 (TNReady): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- General assessments in mathematics and R/LA for high school (TNReady): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- AA-AAAS for grades 3-8 and high school in R/LA and mathematics (MSAA): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**

The assessments that substantially meet requirements of the ESEA means that these assessments meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. The Department expects that TDOE may be able to provide this additional information within one year. Please note that while your State met many of the requirements related to State administration of the TNReady assessments, the Department has significant concerns related to test design and alignment with your State's academic content standards. Alignment to the State's challenging academic standards is critical to having a valid and reliable assessment system. The Department must

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.

see that the State has made substantial progress on these critical elements in the next peer review or the Department may take additional enforcement action.

The specific list of items required for the TDOE to submit is enclosed with this letter. I request that the TDOE 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 than 30 days to submit your plan, please let my staff know at ESEA.Assessment@ed.gov. Upon submission of the plan, the Department will reach out to the SEA to determine a mutually agreeable schedule. Resubmission should occur once all necessary evidence is complete (rather than in multiple submissions).

The full peer review notes from the review are enclosed. These recommendations to the Department formed the basis of our determination. Please note that the peers' recommendations may differ from the Department's feedback; we encourage you to read the full peer notes for additional suggestions and recommendations for improving your assessment system beyond what is noted in the Department's feedback. Department staff will reach out to your assessment director in the next few days to discuss the peer notes and the Department's determination and to answer any questions you have.

The Department placed a condition on TDOE's Title I, Part A grant award beginning July 1, 2019. The condition stated that until TDOE provided all of the requested information from assessment peer reviews held in 2018, the condition would remain on the grant. The condition also stipulated that the Department may take further action if the condition was not resolved in a timely manner. The condition will continue until the State provides information that the Tennessee assessments have met all requirements and demonstrates, through the Department's peer review, that the other components of your assessment system also meet all ESEA requirements.

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

If you have any questions, please contact my staff at: ESEA.Assessment@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank T. Brogan
Assistant Secretary
for Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Casey Haugner Wrenn, Assistant Commissioner, Assessment

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

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
2.1 – Test Design and Development	<p>For the TNReady reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics in grades 3-8 and high school:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the test blueprints describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that address the depth and breadth of the State’s grade level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results. • Evidence of processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills). <p>For the MSAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards for the grade that is being assessed. • Evidence the assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills). • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results.
2.2 – Item Development	<p>For the TNReady R/LA and mathematics in grades 3-8 and high school:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills (e.g., the analytic criteria used in the evaluation of test item data, or “business rules” used in evaluating these data).
2.3 – Test Administration	<p>For the MSAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State 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 the alternate assessment.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy	<p>For the TNReady R/LA and mathematics in grades 3-8 and high school:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State policies and procedures to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its personally identifiable student information. <p>For the MSAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies and procedures related to protecting the integrity of its test-related data, test materials, and personally identifiable information, and/or documentation of how MSAA policies apply in the state (e.g., the updated data and student privacy document that was to be completed in January 2020).
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	<p>For the TNReady R/LA and mathematics in grades 3-8 and high school:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment (e.g., an independent evaluation of the alignment) of the tests 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), the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity. <p>For the MSAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence requested for critical element 2.1 will address this critical element.
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes	<p>For the TNReady R/LA and mathematics in grades 3-8 and high school:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State’s assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	<p>For the TNReady R/LA and mathematics in grades 3-8:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the scoring and reporting structures are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based (e.g., interpretations of internal correlations of sub-scores provided in the technical reports, or additional evidence such as factor analysis, et. al.).
4.2 – Fairness and accessibility	<p>For the TNReady R/LA and mathematics in grades 3-8 and high school:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that TDOE has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments (e.g., the analytic criteria used in the evaluation of test item data, or “business rules” used in evaluating these data for fairness). • Evidence that the State supports and enhances the accessibility of the assessments through appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities, and, to the extent practicable, by incorporating principles of universal design for learning (section 1111(b)(2)(B)(xiii) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act).

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	<p>For the TNReady R/LA and mathematics in grades 3-8 and high school:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system. • Evidence that adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website. <p>For the MSAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system. • Evidence that adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website.
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	<p>For the MSAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State ensures 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. • Evidence that the State does 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.
5.2 – Procedures for Including ELs	<p>For the MSAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of guidance 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.
5.3 - Accommodations	<p>For the TNReady R/LA and mathematics in grades 3-8 and high school:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed and (iii) 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. <p>For the MSAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and ELs, including ELs with disabilities.
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	<p>For the MSAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that students receive accommodations that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations. ○ Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered. ○ Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice. ○ Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP or other instructional plan.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students	<p>For the TNReady R/LA and mathematics in grades 3-8:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades. <p>For the MSAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State formally adopted alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.
6.4 – Reporting	<p>For the TNReady R/LA and mathematics in grades 3-8 and high school:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that student assessment reports: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian. ○ Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent. • Evidence that the State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. <p>For the MSAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that student assessment reports: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian. ○ Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent. • Evidence that the State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

March 2020 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MSAA

Contents

<u>SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS</u>	4
<u>Critical Element 1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</u>	4
<u>Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content Standards</u>	5
<u>Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments</u>	6
<u>Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</u> ..	8
<u>Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments</u>	10
<u>SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS</u>	11
<u>Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development</u>	11
<u>Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development</u>	13
<u>Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration</u>	14
<u>Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</u>	16
<u>Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security</u>	17
<u>Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</u> ..	19
<u>SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY</u>	20
<u>Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content</u>	20
<u>Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</u>	22
<u>Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</u>	23
<u>Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables</u>	24
<u>SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER</u>	25
<u>Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability</u>	25
<u>Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</u>	27
<u>Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</u>	28
<u>Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring</u>	29
<u>Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</u>	30
<u>Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</u>	31
<u>Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</u>	32
<u>SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS</u>	33
<u>Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</u>	33
<u>Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments</u>	36
<u>Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations</u>	37
<u>Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</u>	

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.....41

<u>Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</u>	41
<u>Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting</u>	43
<u>Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</u>	44
<u>Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting</u>	46

SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS..49

<u>Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments</u>	49
<u>Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments</u>	51
<u>Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State Assessments</u>	53

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 MSAA

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic content standards:</u></p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public schools and public school students in the State.</p>		
<p>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</p> <p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/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 MSAA

Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content Standards

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic content standards:</u> The State’s challenging academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science are aligned with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards.</p>		
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p> <p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/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 MSAA

Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments aligned with <u>grade-level academic achievement standards</u> or alternate academic achievement standards in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 9-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). <p>AND</p> <p>The State’s <u>academic content assessments</u> must be the same assessments administered to all students in the tested grades, with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may take an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards. • A State may permit an LEA to administer a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in lieu of the State high school assessment if certain conditions are met. • A State that administers an end-of-course high school mathematics assessment may exempt an 8th grade student from the mathematics assessment typically administered in 		

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 MSAA

<p>eighth grade and allow the student to take the State end-of-course mathematics test instead.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Department may have approved the State, under the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority, to permit students in some LEAs to participate in a demonstration assessment system in lieu of participating in the State assessment. 		
Section 1.3 Summary Statement		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [list additional evidence needed w/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 MSAA

Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For students with disabilities, policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including those children with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system; • For ELs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policies state that all ELs must be included in all aspects of the content assessment system, unless the State has chosen the statutory option for recently arrived ELs under which such ELs are exempt from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment. ○ If a State has developed native language assessments for ELs in R/LA, ELs must be assessed in R/LA in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except, if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native 		

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 MSAA

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

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

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

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

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to <u>the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards</u> for the grade that is being assessed and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of <u>the State’s grade-level academic content standards</u> and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results. • Processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <u>the State’s academic content standards</u>, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills). • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design 		

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 MSAA

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

Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess student achievement based on the <u>State's academic content standards</u> in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills. 		
Section 2.2 Summary Statement		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [list additional evidence needed w/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 MSAA

Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; Has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities; If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>MSAA 402 MSAA 2018-2019_TA System User Guide p. 8, p.24</p> <p>MSAA 404 MSAA_2018_2019 Test Administration Manual 2019 p. 11, p. 14, p. 19, and p. 21</p> <p>MSAA 400 edCount Management NCSC License Agreement Technology System and Test Items p. 8</p> <p>MSAA 401 Email from D. Spitz</p> <p>MSAA 403 MSAA Practice Site Screenshot (with Sample Items)</p>	<p>The evidence is sufficient.</p>
Section 2.3 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 MSAA

Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. Monitoring of test administration should be demonstrated for all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS.</p>		
<p>Section 2.4 Summary Statement</p> <p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/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 MSAA

Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; Detection of test irregularities; Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State's assessments; Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. Application of test security procedures to all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS. 		
Section 2.5 Summary Statement		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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 MSAA

Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results; To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 		
Section 2.6 Summary Statement		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [list additional evidence needed w/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 MSAA

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. The State’s validity evidence includes evidence that:</p> <p><u>The State’s academic assessments</u> measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards; • If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards and administers alternate assessments aligned with those standards, the assessments show adequate alignment to the State’s academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content 		

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 MSAA

and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.		
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
<input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or		
<input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• [list additional evidence needed w/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 MSAA

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: <u>the intended cognitive processes</u> appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>		
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p> <p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/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 MSAA

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
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State's <u>academic content standards</u> .	<p>MSAA 405 2018_2019 MSAA Technical Report Chapter 3 Test Content pp. 15-27</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.3.4 Item Components pp. 24-25 • Selected-Response: Reading, Writing, Mathematics p. 24 • Open-Response: Writing Prompt p. 25 • 3.4 Content and Blueprints pp. 25-27 • English Language Arts p. 26 <p>Chapter 4 Test Development pp. 28-30</p> <p>Chapter 8 Classical Item Analysis pp. 57-63</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8.3 Dimensionality p. 59 <p>Chapter 9 Item Response Theory Scaling and Equating pp. 64-79</p> <p>Chapter 10 Reliability pp. 80-85</p> <p>Appendix I Differential Item Functioning Results pp. 226-243 of PDF document</p> <p>Appendix O Decision Accuracy and Consistency Results pp. 343-345 of PDF document</p> <p>MSAA 406 MSAA Test Construction Process_nov2018</p>	<p>The evidence is sufficient. Although MSAA discovered minor violations of unidimensionality (due to local item dependence), MSAA intends to monitor the dimensionality in subsequent testing years.</p> <p>Peer recommendation: Peer reviewers encourage MSAA to develop a formal remediation plan as part of their monitoring process. Depending on the impact of dimensionality, a formal remediation plan may include (but not limited to) the following actions:</p> <p>(1) Observe test administration to determine whether there are aspects of administration, delivery, and/or student interaction that may contribute to the dimensionality.</p> <p>(2) Examine whether it would be appropriate to use a different measurement model that accounts for the nuisance dimensions (e.g., bifactor, testlet model, etc.).</p> <p>(3) Review test forms and items, and consider modifying the sequence, number, or visibility of response options.</p> <p>The latter action would be the least desirable given that it would require the field testing of all modified items and the estimation of their parameters.</p>
Section 3.3 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 MSAA

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
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State's assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.		
Section 3.4 Summary Statement		
<div style="margin-bottom: 10px;"> <input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or </div> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] </div>		

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 MSAA

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. If the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, measures of reliability for the assessment overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s academic achievement. 	<p>MSAA 405 2018_2019 MSAA Technical Report</p> <p>Chapter 1 Overview of MSAA and 2019 Updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.2 Intended MSAA Score Interpretations and Uses pp. 6-7 <p>Chapter 6 Scoring pp. 39-51</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Table 6-10 p. 51 <p>Chapter 8 Classical Item Analysis pp. 57-63</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8.2 Dimensionality Analysis pp. 59-63 <p>Chapter 9 Item Response Theory Scaling and Equating pp. 64-79</p> <p>Chapter 10 Reliability pp. 80-85</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Table 10-1 p. 81 <p>Chapter 11 Validity Arguments To Support Intended Score Interpretations and Uses pp. 86-111</p> <p>Appendix N pp. 328-342 of PDF Document</p>	<p>The reviewers noted the thoroughness of the evidence provided to address this critical element.</p>
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 MSAA

Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><i>For all State academic assessments,</i> assessments should be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (see definition¹).</p> <p><u>For academic content assessments,</u> 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>		
Section 4.2 Summary Statement		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

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 MSAA

Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for <u>academic assessments</u>, including performance for high- and low-achieving students.</p>		
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p> <p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/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 MSAA

Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State's <u>academic achievement standards</u> .	<p>MSAA 404 MSAA 2018_2019 Test Administration Manual</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSAA Test Design pp. 13, 15 <i>What Types of Items Make Up the MSAA, Sample Item—Mathematics Grade 3)</i> • Appendix A pp. 28-29 : MSAA Scribe Accommodation Protocol (<i>Scribe Accommodation Protocol for the Writing Prompt</i>) <p>MSAA 407 2019 TA_Module2_Test Design and Experience_Recording</p> <p>MSAA 408 MSAA Level 2 Grade 3 Rubric Final MSAA 409 MSAA Level 2 Grade 11 Rubric Final MSAA 410 MSAA Level 3 Grade 3 Rubric Final MSAA 411 MSAA Level 3 Grade 11 Rubric Final <i>Note: There are Rubrics for every grade level 3-8 and 11 for both Levels 2 and 3</i></p> <p>MSAA 412 MSAA Scoring Specifications 2019 FINAL 031819 CONFIDENTIAL <i>**Note: these are considered confidential as they contain information that may not be shared publicly.**</i></p> <p>MSAA 405 2018_2019 MSAA Technical Report Chapter 6 Scoring pp. 39-51</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6.1 Selected Response and Constructed Response Item Scoring Processes p. 39 • 6.2 Open-Response Writing Prompts Scoring Processes p. 40-51 • 6.2.10 Interrater Agreement p. 51 	Evidence is sufficient for this element.
Section 4.4 Summary Statement		
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 MSAA

Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State administers multiple forms of <u>academic assessments</u> within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State's <u>academic content standards</u> and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>		
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p> <p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/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 MSAA

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; <u>or a native language version of the academic content assessment</u>), grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 		
Section 4.6 Summary Statement		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [list additional evidence needed w/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 MSAA

Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments), and Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State's website. 		
Section 4.7 Summary Statement		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [list additional evidence needed w/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 MSAA

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities

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

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 MSAA

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"> ○ 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; • Ensure that parents of students assessed with an AA-AAAS are informed that their child's achievement will be measured based on alternate academic achievement standards; • Not preclude a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who takes an AA-AAAS from attempting to complete the requirements for a regular high school diploma; and • Promote, consistent with requirements under the IDEA, the involvement and progress of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in the general education curriculum that is based on the State's academic content standards 		

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 MSAA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>for the grade in which the student is enrolled; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. The State has in place and monitors implementation of guidelines for IEP teams to apply in determining, on a case-by-case basis, which students with the most significant cognitive disabilities will be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, if applicable. Such guidelines must be developed in accordance with 34 CFR § 200.6(d).² 		
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

² 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)

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 MSAA

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all ELs in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s academic content assessments and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed with a linguistic accommodation(s); Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for ELs; Assistance regarding selection of appropriate linguistic accommodations for ELs, including to the extent practicable, assessments in the language most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what those students know and can do to determine the students’ mastery of skills in academic content areas until the students have achieved English language proficiency. 		
Section 5.2 Summary Statement		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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 MSAA

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and ELs, including ELs with disabilities. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures that appropriate accommodations, such as, interoperability with, and ability to use, assistive technology, are available to measure the <u>academic achievement</u> of students with disabilities. • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs; • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student's need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. • Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny 		

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 MSAA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.		
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
<div style="margin-bottom: 10px;"> <input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or </div> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] </div>		

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 MSAA

Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures; • Monitored for administrations of all required academic content assessments and AA-AAAS. 	No Evidence Provided for MSAA	See State peer notes.
Section 5.4 Summary Statement		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to the State peer review notes for Critical Element 5.4 		

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 MSAA

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic content standards:</u> The State formally adopted <u>challenging academic achievement standards</u> in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; <p>The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (1) at least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third for lower achievement; (2) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (3) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</p>		
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p> <p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/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 MSAA

Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards.</u> 		
Section 6.2 Summary Statement		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/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 MSAA

Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic achievement standards:</u></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards and with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards such that a student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards (1) are aligned with the State’s challenging academic content standards for the grade in which a student is enrolled; (2) promote access to the general curriculum consistent with the IDEA; (3) reflect professional judgment as to the highest possible standards achievable for such students; (4) are designated in the IEP for each student for whom alternate academic achievement standards apply; and (5) are aligned to ensure that a student who meets the alternate academic achievement standards is on track to pursue</p>	<p>MSAA</p> <p>Evidence 240a-b: MSAA Arizona Exceptional Student Service Outcome Data</p>	<p>The peers determined that the requirement that a student who meets the alternate academic achievement standards is on track to pursue postsecondary education or competitive integrated employment is met.</p> <p>AZ provided data from its Indicator 14 Post School Outcomes (PSO) for school year exiters over a three (3) year period: fiscal year 2015, 2016, and 2017. This data is provided each year to the Office of Special Education (OSEP) as part of the IDEA B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR).</p> <p>The data by subgroup and disability is thorough and gives a comprehensive view of the population, supporting consideration of how to continue to work towards these students being prepared for post-secondary education or competitive integrated employment. The peers appreciated that 240 A and B have reasonably high response rates.</p> <p>It would be beneficial to provide data from each year to provide feedback for program improvement based on the trends. While the data was provided, there was no discussion of improvements over time. If AZ has not developed relationships with career and technology programs as well as workforce and economic development to provide updated skill sets for employment needs, they may wish to consider doing so to enhance the opportunities for training while in school for competitive employment.</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 MSAA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
postsecondary education or competitive integrated employment.		
Section 6.3 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 MSAA

Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State reports its assessment results for all students assessed, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public.</p> <p>The State reports to the public its assessment results on <u>student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level³</u></p> <p>For <u>academic content assessments</u>, the State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the <u>specific academic needs of students</u>, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its academic content assessments that: 	<p>MSAA 417 The Examiner May 2018 (Arizona Specific) p. 6</p> <p>MSAA 416 Planning Meeting Minutes p. 6</p> <p>MSAA 418 The Examiner May 2019 (Arizona Specific) p. 6</p> <p>MSAA 414 New MSAA Contract_Key Deliverables 2019</p> <p>MSAA 413 New MSAA Kick-off Minutes (Day 2 Only) p. 2</p> <p>MSAA 415 New MSAA Contract_Reporting</p> <p>Previously submitted evidence NCSC 103_Reporting Timeline</p>	<p>Evidence is sufficient.</p>

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

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 MSAA

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"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a <u>student's academic achievement</u>; ○ Report the <u>student's academic achievement</u> in terms of the State's grade-level academic achievement standards; ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific <u>academic needs of students</u>; ○ Are provided in an understandable and uniform format; ○ Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian; ○ Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent. ● 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. 		

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 MSAA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
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 MSAA

SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS

(if applicable; evidence for this section would be submitted in ADDITION to evidence for sections 1 through 6)

Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has established technical criteria to use in its review of any submission of a locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment. The State has completed this review using its established technical criteria and has found the assessment meets its criteria <u>prior to</u> submitting for the Department’s assessment peer review.</p> <p>The State’s technical criteria include a determination that the assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is aligned with the challenging State academic standards; and • Addresses the depth and breadth of those standards. <p>AND</p> <p>The State has procedures in place to ensure that a district that chooses to use a nationally recognized high school academic assessment administers the same assessment to all high school students in the district except for students with the most significant</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 MSAA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>cognitive disabilities who may be assessed with an AA-AAAS.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The technical criteria established by the State in reviewing a locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment must ensure that the use of appropriate accommodations does not deny a student with a disability or an EL—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The opportunity to participate in the assessment; and • Any of the benefits from participation in the assessment that are afforded to students without disabilities or students who are not ELs. 		
<p>Section 7.1 Summary Statement</p> <p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/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 MSAA

Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School

Academic Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State must have procedures in place to ensure that:</p> <p>Before a district requests approval from the State to use a nationally recognized high school academic assessment, the district notifies all parents of high school students it serves—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the district intends to request approval from the State to use a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in place of the statewide academic assessment; • Of how parents and, as appropriate, students may provide meaningful input regarding the district’s request (includes students in public charter schools who would be included in such assessments); and • Of any effect of such request on the instructional program in the district. 		
Section 7.2 Summary Statement		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/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 MSAA

Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is equivalent to or more rigorous than the statewide assessment, with respect to— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The coverage of academic content; ○ The difficulty of the assessment; ○ The overall quality of the assessment; and ○ Any other aspects of the assessment that the State may establish in its technical criteria; • Produces valid and reliable data on student academic achievement with respect to all high school students and each subgroup of high school students in the district that— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Are comparable to student academic achievement data for all high school students and each subgroup of high school students produced by the statewide assessment at each academic achievement level; ○ Are expressed in terms consistent with the State’s academic achievement standards; and ○ Provide unbiased, rational, and consistent differentiation among schools within the State for the purpose of the State determined accountability system including calculating the Academic Achievement indicator and annually meaningfully differentiating between schools. 		

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 MSAA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 7.3 Summary Statement		
<input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or		
<input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• [list additional evidence needed w/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.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

March 2020 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TENNESSEE

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	6
Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments	8
Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments	10
 SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS.....	 11
Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development	11
Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development	13
Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration	14
Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration	16
Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security	17
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 Content	20
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

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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations.....	39
---	-----------

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING	41
Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students	41
Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting	43
Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	44
Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting.....	46

SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS..	49
Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments	49
Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments	51
Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State Assessments	53

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 TENNESSEE

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic content standards:</u></p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public schools and public school students in the State.</p>	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.1.1 TN SBE 4-15-16_Minutes (pages 4-5 and page 9)</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.1.2 238179_Setting_the_Standards_Report_Book__FINAL_7-25-17</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.1.3 Public Chapter 423, page 1, explicitly states that the academic standards shall be fully implemented in Tennessee public schools.</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.1.4 TCA 49-1-309</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.1.5 Press release on standards adoption</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.1.6 Standards Review Policy 7_24_15</p>	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>State engaged in a standards review process that led to development of state-specific standards modified from the Common Core State Standards.</p> <p>Evidence presented is related to the State’s general academic content standards.</p>
Section 1.1 Summary Statement		
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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content Standards

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic content standards:</u> The State's challenging academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science are aligned with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards.</p>	<p>MSAA Exhibit 1.2.1 Copy of Higher Ed Faculty_content teams_Standards reviewers who completed review</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.2.2 Copy of Math and ELA Educator Team Contact List_9.17.15</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.2.3 Higher Ed Feedback Report_V4</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.2.4 SREB_TN External Review</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.2.5 SRC_Bios_Updated</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.2.6 Recommendations for revision_SRC_FINAL</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.2.7 SRP Process Diagram</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.2.8 Tennessee Academic Standards Review - ELA – submitted</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.2.9 Tennessee Academic Standards Review - Math- submitted</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.2.10 Position Statement_SRC_1.20.16_FINAL</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.2.11 4-Subject Level ELA</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.2.12 4-Subject Level Math</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.2.13 5-GradeLevelReports (003) (math standards feedback summary)</p>	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math The State has provided evidence that representatives from higher education were involved in the standards review. The Higher Ed Feedback Report supports that high education representatives found the State's academic content standards are aligned with college and career readiness.</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.2.20, which is a memo regarding NCSC's development of new AA-AAS for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. NCSC ended in fall 2015 and several states formed the MSAA Multi-State Alternate Assessment.</p> <p>The peers recommend the State show clear linkage between the alternate academic achievement standards and the general academic content standards.</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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>MSAA Exhibit 1.2.14 5-GradeLevelReports (ELA standards feedback summary)</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.2.15 Public Feedback-Website Roundtables (information about public feedback collection)</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.2.16 stds_english_language_arts</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.2.17 stds_math</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.2.18 New_MathELA_Standards1 (press release)</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.2.19 Standards Review FAQs</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.4.4 Criterion_2_Considerations</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.2.20 MSAA</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.2.21 2048001 MSAA Participation.pdf</p>	
Section 1.2 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments aligned with <u>grade-level academic achievement standards</u> or alternate academic achievement standards in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 9-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). <p>AND</p> <p>The State’s <u>academic content assessments</u> must be the same assessments administered to all students in the tested grades, with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may take an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards. • A State may permit an LEA to administer a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in lieu of the State high school assessment if certain conditions are met. • A State that administers an end-of-course high school mathematics assessment may exempt an 8th grade student from the mathematics assessment typically administered in 	<p>MSAA Exhibit 1.3.1: alt_guide_decision_making_IEP_teams</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.3.2: Overview of Testing in Tennessee</p>	<p>This critical element was previously met for reading/language arts and mathematics in the 2018 peer review.</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 TENNESSEE

<p>eighth grade and allow the student to take the State end-of-course mathematics test instead.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Department may have approved the State, under the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority, to permit students in some LEAs to participate in a demonstration assessment system in lieu of participating in the State assessment.		
Section 1.3 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For students with disabilities, policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including those children with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system; • For ELs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policies state that all ELs must be included in all aspects of the content assessment system, unless the State has chosen the statutory option for recently arrived ELs under which such ELs are exempt from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment. ○ If a State has developed native language assessments for ELs in R/LA, ELs must be assessed in R/LA in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except, if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native 	<p>MSAA Exhibit 1.3.1: alt_guide_decision_making_IEP_teams</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.3.2: Overview of Testing in Tennessee.pdf</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.4.1: TCA 49-1-617.pdf</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.4.2: OptoutMemo.pdf</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.4.3: Criterion_1_Considerations.pdf</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.4.4: Criterion_2_Considerations.pdf</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.4.5: Criterion_3_Considerations.pdf</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.4.6: BTC Guide.pdf</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.4.7: Medical Exemption Doc.pdf</p>	<p>This critical element was previously met for reading/language arts and mathematics in the 2018 peer review.</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 TENNESSEE

<p>language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If the State uses the flexibility for Native American language schools and programs: (1) the State provides the content assessment in the Native American language to all students in the school or program; (2) the State submits such content assessment for peer review as part of its State assessment system; and (3) the State continues to provide ELP assessments and services for ELs as required by law. The State must assess in English the students' achievement in R/LA in high school. 		
Section 1.4 Summary Statement		
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 TENNESSEE

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State has developed or amended challenging academic standards and assessments, the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education). • Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas). • Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State. • Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents. 	<p>MSAA Exhibit 1.2.1 Copy of Higher Ed Faculty_content teams_Standards reviewers who completed review</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.2.2 Copy of Math and ELA Educator Team Contact List_9.17.15</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.2.3 Higher Ed Feedback Report_V4</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.2.4 SREB_TN External Review</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.2.5 SRC_Bios_Updated</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.2.7 SRP Process Diagram</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.2.8 Tennessee Academic Standards Review - ELA – submitted</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.2.9 Tennessee Academic Standards Review - Math- submitted</p>	<p>In its standards revision process in 2015 and 2016, TDOE's Standards Review Committee solicited and reviewed multiple types of feedback. Data and comments collected from the public website on standards were reviewed, along with feedback gathered through a series of regional roundtable conversations. Additional feedback from a team of Tennessee higher education faculty and the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) were also considered. Department staff note that there was no evidence that representatives of Indian tribes in the State were consulted; however, staff determined that there are no federally-recognized or state-recognized tribes in the State of Tennessee.</p>
Section 1.5 Summary Statement		
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 TENNESSEE

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State's test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to <u>the depth and breadth of the State's academic content standards</u> for the grade that is being assessed and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of <u>the State's grade-level academic content standards</u> and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results. • Processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <u>the State's academic content standards</u>, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills). • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design 	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>MSAA coordinated evidence for all states.</p>	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>No State-specific evidence was submitted for this critical element. Although the State is part of the MSAA, the peers would like to see State-specific evidence of the State's involvement in the MSAA test design and development process.</p> <p>Also, the State should provide evidence regarding the statement of purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and use of results.</p> <p>The peers would like to see evidence, such as an external alignment study, that illustrates the States' processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State's academic content standards, reflects the appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills. Even if the common evidence submitted for MSAA includes an alignment study, does that alignment study specifically address alignment to Tennessee's standards?</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 TENNESSEE

<p>and intended uses and interpretations of results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the student is enrolled and uses that determination for all reporting. If the State administers a content assessment that includes portfolios, such assessment may be partially administered through a portfolio but may not be <i>entirely</i> administered through a portfolio. 		
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State-specific evidence of the State's involvement in the MSAA test design and development process. Evidence regarding the statement of purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and use of results. Evidence, such as an external alignment study, that illustrates the States' processes to ensure that the State's alternate academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State's academic content standards, reflects the appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills. 		

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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess student achievement based on the State's academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills. 	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>MSAA coordinated evidence for all states.</p>	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>No state-specific evidence was submitted.</p>
Section 2.2 Summary Statement		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See MSAA peer review notes. 		

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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; Has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities; If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.3a.1 Accessibility Guidebook 040519 Updated</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.3a.2 Spring 2019 BTC Guide Updated 3-7-20192</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.3a.3 MSAA Test Administration Manual March 18-May 3, 2019.pdf</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.4.6: BTC Guide.pdf</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.4.7: Medical Exemption Doc.pdf</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.3a.4: MSAA communication to the field.doc</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.3a.5 MSAA Online Assessment System User Guide for Test Administrators</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.3a.6 MSAA Online Assessment System Guide for Test Coordinators</p>	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>Evidence shows the State has various documents – accessibility guidebook, BTC Guide, test administration manuals, and system user guides – that communicate policies and procedures for standardized test administration; however, the State should provide specific evidence to demonstrate it 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. The State should provide evidence, such as training meeting agendas, PowerPoints, etc. to show how the training is delivered.</p> <p>The MSAA is an online assessment. The State should provide evidence that it has defined technology and other related requirements.</p> <p>The State also should provide a contingency plan to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</p> <p>The State should provide evidence of the process to ensure standardized test conditions are implemented. For example, the State could document how much percent of test administrators reviewed the corresponding guidebook(s), took the training, actually followed the guidance in testing, scribed accommodation protocols, maintained test security, and reported test irregularities.</p>
Section 2.3 Summary Statement		
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 TENNESSEE

- Documentation the State provides training for test administration, including descriptions of the training and evidence of implementation.
- Documentation the State has defined technology and other related requirements for the online administration of MSAA.
- A technology contingency plan to address possible technology challenges during test administration.
- The process to ensure standardized test conditions are implemented.

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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
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>MSAA Exhibit 2.4.1 Site Visits Monitoring Plan</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.4.2 TCAP Site Monitoring Protocol</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.4.3 Site Monitor Training Spring 2019</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.4.4 TCAP Monitoring Checklist</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.4.5 TCAP Sp2019 Site Visit Form</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.4.6 Test Administration and Security Agreement</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.4.7 Testing Code of Ethics BTC</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.4.8 Testing Code of Ethics TA</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.4.9 Testing Code of Ethics Proctor</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.4.10 Med_Exemption_DistrictDocumentationRecord_revMarch 19 2019</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.4.11 Unique_Accommodation_Request_Form_3-19-2019</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.4.12 MSAA Checklist for Test Coordinator – Spring 2019</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.4.13 MSAA Observations for Test Administrator for Spring 2019</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.4.14 TCA 49-1-607</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.4.15 Caveon Scope Summary</p>	Department staff note that TDOE provided a monitoring protocol and checklist that is completed online, as well as a schedule of monitoring visits and a training Powerpoint for monitors. The monitoring protocol appears to be comprehensive, covering test administration, use of accommodations, and test security. No additional evidence is required.
Section 2.4 Summary Statement		
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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; Detection of test irregularities; Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State's assessments; Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. Application of test security procedures to all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS. 	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.4.14 TCA 49-1-607</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.4.6 Test Administration and Security Agreement</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.4.7 Testing Code of Ethics BTC</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.4.8 Testing Code of Ethics TA</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.4.9 Testing Code of Ethics Proctor</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.5.1 TNSBE Licensure Policies</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.5.2 Test Materials Chain of Custody</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.5.3 Test Security Log</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.5.4 Potential Breach of Security Cover Sheet</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.5.5 Decision Tree Operational Test As Practice</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.5.6 RI Sample Circumstances</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.5.7 Potential Breach of Security Circumstances</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.5.8 Summary Report of Irregularities 2017-18</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.5.9 AY19MSAA Bullpen_TN</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.5.10 Caveon Contract 2019</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.5.11 AY19 Bullpen File Instructions.pdf</p>	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>Tennessee state code includes statement regarding noncompliance with security guidelines for TCAJP or successor test.</p> <p>The State contracts with Caveon for test security monitoring.</p> <p>For paper-based test administration, the State requires completion of Test Materials Chain of Custody Form.</p> <p>State has a Potential Breach of Security Breach Report Form and a Protocol for District Response to Potential Breach.</p> <p>Remediation following any test security incidents is indicated on Summary Report of Irregularities.</p> <p>Sufficient evidence is provided for this critical element.</p> <p>The peers suggest the State compile a more complete report regarding follow-ups to test irregularities, such as investigations of test security violations and irregularities, analysis of data, and summaries of incidences for reporting to identify potential new issues and plans for improvement.</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 TENNESSEE

Section 2.5 Summary Statement
<u> X </u> No additional evidence is required

Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>MSAA coordinated evidence for all states.</p>	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>No State-specific evidence was submitted for this critical element. Although the State is part of the MSAA and references evidence submitted as part of the MSAA common submission, the State should provide state policies and procedures related to protecting the integrity of its test-related data, test materials, and personally identifiable information, and/or documentation of how MSAA policies apply in the state. In its resubmission of the TCAP general assessments, evidence demonstrated the State has suppression rules to protect PII.</p> <p>The State indicates it is presently developing an updated data and student privacy document that was to be completed in January 2020. The peers would like to see this document as further evidence the State meets the requirements for this critical element.</p>
Section 2.6 Summary Statement		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies and procedures related to protecting the integrity of its test-related data, test materials, and personally identifiable information, and/or documentation of how MSAA policies apply in the state. • The updated data and student privacy document that was to be completed in January 2020. 		

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 TENNESSEE

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. The State’s validity evidence includes evidence that:</p> <p><u>The State’s academic assessments</u> measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards; • If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards and administers alternate assessments aligned with those standards, the assessments show adequate alignment to the State’s academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content 	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>MSAA coordinated evidence for all states.</p>	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>No State-specific evidence was submitted for this critical element. Although the State is part of the MSAA, the peers would like to see State-specific evidence that the MSAA measures the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, such as an external alignment or linking study.</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 TENNESSEE

and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.		
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• See MSAA peer review notes.• See evidence for alignment study requested in CE.2.1.		

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 TENNESSEE

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
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap: <u>the intended cognitive processes</u> appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.	Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math MSAA coordinated evidence for all states.	Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math No State-specific evidence was submitted for this critical element.
Section 3.2 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See MSAA peer review notes. 		

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 TENNESSEE

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
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State's <u>academic content standards</u> .	Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math MSAA coordinated evidence for all states.	Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math No State-specific evidence was submitted for this critical element. Although the State is part of the MSAA, the peers would like to see State-specific evidence that the scoring and reporting of the assessment is consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State's academic content standards.
Section 3.3 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See MSAA peer review notes. 		

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 TENNESSEE

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
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State's assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.	Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math MSAA coordinated evidence for all states.	Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math No State-specific evidence was submitted for this critical element. The peers suggest the State collaborate with the MSAA Consortium to include validity evidence of how assessment scores specifically from the State relate as expected to other variables.
Section 3.4 Summary Statement		
X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See MSAA peer review notes. 		

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 TENNESSEE

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. If the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, measures of reliability for the assessment overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a <u>student’s academic achievement</u>. 	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>MSAA coordinated evidence for all states.</p>	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>No State-specific evidence was submitted for this critical element. Although the State is part of the MSAA, the peers would like to see State-specific evidence regarding the reliability for the assessment overall and each student group.</p> <p>Is there reliability evidence specifically for Tennessee?</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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none">See MSAA peer review notes.		

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 TENNESSEE

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 definition⁴).</p> <p><u>For academic content assessments</u>, 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>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>MSAA coordinated evidence for all states.</p>	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>No State-specific evidence was submitted for this critical element.</p>
Section 4.2 Summary Statement		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See MSAA peer review notes. 		

⁴ 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

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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for <u>academic assessments</u> , including performance for high- and low-achieving students.	Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math MSAA coordinated evidence for all states.	Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math No State-specific evidence was submitted for this critical element.
Section 4.3 Summary Statement		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See MSAA peer review notes. 		

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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State's <u>academic achievement standards</u> .	Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math MSAA coordinated evidence for all states.	Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math No State-specific evidence was submitted for this critical element.
Section 4.4 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See MSAA peer review notes. 		

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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
If the State administers multiple forms of <u>academic assessments</u> within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State's <u>academic content standards</u> and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.	Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math MSAA coordinated evidence for all states.	Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math No State-specific evidence was submitted for this critical element.
Section 4.5 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See MSAA peer review notes. 		

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 TENNESSEE

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; <u>or a native language version of the academic content assessment</u>), grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>MSAA coordinated evidence for all states.</p>	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>No State-specific evidence was submitted for this critical element.</p>
Section 4.6 Summary Statement		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See MSAA peer review notes. 		

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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments), and Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State's website. 	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>MSAA coordinated evidence for all states.</p>	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>No State-specific evidence was submitted for this critical element. Although the State is part of the MSAA, the peers would like to see State-specific evidence of the State's involvement with the MSAA consortium in monitoring, maintaining, and improving the quality of its alternate assessment. Are there notes from State-specific meetings (e.g., State advisory committee meetings, TAC meetings showing the State TAC's involvement and recommendations, etc.)?</p> <p>The State should provide evidence that the adequate technical quality of the MSAA is made public, including on the State's website.</p>
Section 4.7 Summary Statement		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See MSAA peer review notes. Documentation of the State providing input on monitoring, maintaining, and improving the quality of the MSAA (e.g., State advisory committee meetings, TAC meetings showing the State TAC's involvement and recommendations, etc.). Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State's website. 		

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 TENNESSEE

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system. Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, the placement team under Section 504, or the individual or team designated by a district to make that decision under Title II of the ADA, as applicable, based on each student’s individual abilities and needs.</p> <p>If a State adopts alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and administers an alternate assessment aligned with those standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(1)(E) and (b)(2)(D), respectively, the State must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish guidelines for determining whether to assess a student with an AA-AAAS, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A State definition of “students with the most significant cognitive disabilities” that addresses factors related to cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior; Provide information for IEP Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that: 	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.3.1: alt_guide_decision_making_IEP_teams</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.4.3: Criterion_1_Considerations.pdf</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.4.4: Criterion_2_Considerations.pdf</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.4.5: Criterion_3_Considerations.pdf</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 5.1.1 Updated_waiver_request_2018.pdf</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 5.1.2 Notice of your DistrictCharter Exceeding 1% Cap 18-19.doc</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 5.1.3 Alternate Assessment Justification 18-19</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.4.6 BTC Guide.pdf</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.4.7 Medical Exemption Doc.pdf</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 1.4.2 OptoutMemo.pdf</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 5.1.4 IAIEP_Self-Assessment_Rubric.pdf</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 5.1.5 IEP Protocol 18-19 CM-LD edits.doc</p>	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>The State provides an alternate assessment guide for IEP teams use in deciding whether students should participate in the alternate assessment.</p> <p>The State provides documents related to three criteria to help determine if the student should take the alternate assessment.</p> <p>The State should provide evidence that it ensures parents of students assessed with an AA-AAAS are informed that their child’s achievement will be measured based on alternate academic achievement standards and that the State does 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.</p> <p>The peers note that parents are informed that taking the alternate assessment preclude students from participating in curriculum that will lead to a regular high school diploma. Is this a violation of ESSA?</p> <p>The State should provide evidence that it 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.</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 TENNESSEE

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"> ○ 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; • Ensure that parents of students assessed with an AA-AAAS are informed that their child's achievement will be measured based on alternate academic achievement standards; • Not preclude a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who takes an AA-AAAS from attempting to complete the requirements for a regular high school diploma; and • Promote, consistent with requirements under the IDEA, the involvement and progress of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in the general education curriculum that is based on the State's academic content standards 		

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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>for the grade in which the student is enrolled; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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).⁵ 		
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence the State ensures parents of students assessed with an AA-AAAS are informed that their child's achievement will be measured based on alternate academic achievement standards and that the State does 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. • Evidence the State 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. 		

⁵ 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)

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 TENNESSEE

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all ELs in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s academic content assessments and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed with a linguistic accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for ELs; • Assistance regarding selection of appropriate linguistic accommodations for ELs, including to the extent practicable, assessments in the language most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what those students know and can do to determine the students’ mastery of skills in academic content areas until the students have achieved English language proficiency. 	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 5.2.1 Accessibility Guide 18-19</p>	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>The State should provide evidence that contains information on procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed with a linguistic accommodation.</p> <p>The evidence provided a list of tools but not how to determine appropriate use.</p>
Section 5.2 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information on the State’s procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed with a linguistic accommodation. 		

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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and ELs, including ELs with disabilities. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that appropriate accommodations, such as, interoperability with, and ability to use, assistive technology, are available to measure the <u>academic achievement</u> of students with disabilities. Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs; Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny 	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math MSAA Exhibit 5.2.1 Accessibility Guide 18-19.pdf</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 5.3.2 Unique_Accommodation_Request_Form_3-19-19</p>	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math The State has provided evidence regarding accommodations in its Accessibility Guide.</p> <p>For the MSAA, the State provided a copy of the Unique Accommodation Request Form that clearly states: “If a student with a disability or an English learner requires an accommodation (i.e., a ‘unique accommodation’) that is not listed and does not change the construct being measured by the test, the school may request approval for use of the accommodation using this request form.”</p> <p>However, the State should provide a specific description of how it reviews and decides on which “unique accommodations” to approve.</p> <p>Although the State provides accommodations of word-to-word dictionary and oral presentations for ELs, additional evidence should be provided to ensure that these allowable accommodations meet the special needs of ELs with 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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.		
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
<p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A specific description of how the State reviews and decides on which “unique accommodations” to approve. • The State’s process for ensuring that allowable accommodations, such as word-to-word dictionary and oral presentations for ELs, meet the special needs of ELs with significant cognitive disabilities. 		

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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures; • Monitored for administrations of all required academic content assessments and AA-AAAS. 	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.4.5 TCAP Sp2019 Site Visit Form</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.4.12 MSAA Observations Checklist for Test Coordinator</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 2.4.13 MSAA Observation Checklist for Test Administrator</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 5.1.4 IAIEP_Self-Assessment_Rubric.pdf</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 5.1.5 IEP Protocol 18-19 CM-LD edits</p>	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>The State should provide evidence of how it ensures assessment accommodations are consistent with accommodations provided during instruction and appropriate for addressing student disabilities or language needs.</p> <p>The State should provide additional evidence on how to monitor the process with follow-ups, such as review and analysis of collected information/data, evaluation of current status, and implementation of improvement plans.</p>
Section 5.4 Summary Statement		
<p>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</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 TENNESSEE

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">• Evidence of how the State ensures assessment accommodations are consistent with accommodations provided during instruction and appropriate for addressing student disabilities or language needs.• Additional evidence on how to monitor the process with follow-ups, such as review and analysis of collected information/data, evaluation of current status, and implementation of improvement plans.	

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 TENNESSEE

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic content standards:</u></p> <p>The State formally adopted <u>challenging academic achievement standards</u> in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; <p>The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include:</p> <p>(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>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 6.1.1 MSAA Tech Report 17-18</p>	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>Standard setting was conducted for NCSC, but Tennessee was not part of the consortium at that time. However, when NCSC became MSAA and Tennessee joined, MSAA conducted a standards validation. Tennessee teachers were part of the standards validation process, but the State indicates it utilizes the achievement standards described in the MSAA technical and standard setting reports.</p> <p>While the evidence supports that MSAA conducted standard setting and Tennessee uses those achievement levels, no evidence to indicate the State formally adopted the academic achievement standards has been provided.</p> <p>The State should provide evidence to show it formally adopted alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>
Section 6.1 Summary Statement		
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 TENNESSEE

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">Documentation of the State's formal adoption of alternate academic achievement standards.	

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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards.</u> 	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>MSAA coordinated evidence for all states.</p>	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>No State-specific evidence was submitted for this critical element.</p>
Section 6.2 Summary Statement		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See MSAA peer review notes. 		

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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic achievement standards:</u></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards and with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards such that a student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards (1) are aligned with the State’s challenging academic content standards for the grade in which a student is enrolled; (2) promote access to the general curriculum consistent with the IDEA; (3) reflect professional judgment as to the highest possible standards achievable for such students; (4) are designated in the IEP for each student for whom alternate academic achievement standards apply; and (5) are aligned to ensure that a student who meets the alternate academic achievement standards is on track to pursue</p>	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>MSAA coordinated evidence for all states.</p>	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>No State-specific evidence was submitted for this critical element.</p> <p>As requested in CE.2.1 and CE.3.1., the State should provide an external alignment study to support its claim the MSAA academic achievement standards are aligned with the State’s academic content standards.</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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
postsecondary education or competitive integrated employment.		
Section 6.3 Summary Statement		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See MSAA peer notes. • An external alignment study to support its claim the MSAA academic achievement standards are aligned with the State's content standards and ensure a state who meets the alternate academic achievement standards is on track to pursue postsecondary education or competitive integrated employment. 		

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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State reports its assessment results for all students assessed, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public.</p> <p>The State reports to the public its assessment results on <u>student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level⁶</u></p> <p>For <u>academic content assessments</u>, the State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the <u>specific academic needs of students</u>, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its academic content assessments that: 	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 6.4.1: 2019_DEMO_StateSummaryReport.pdf</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 6.4.2: 2019_DEMO1_SchoolRosterStudent.pdf</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 6.4.3: 2019_DEMO1_SchoolStudentReport.pdf</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 6.4.4: 2019_DEMO1_SchoolSummaryReport.pdf</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 6.4.5: 2019_DEMOA_DistrictSummaryReport.pdf</p> <p>MSAA Exhibit 6.4.6: CUFD Newsletter Blurb MSAA</p>	<p>Tennessee MSAA Program ELA and Math</p> <p>The State should provide evidence that it makes the individual student reports available, when requested, in other languages and in an alternative format for a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA.</p> <p>The State should provide interpretive guides to help parents understand what is in the reports and should provide reports with 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 peers recommend that the State provide 2019 reports for USED to review.</p> <p>The peers believe the DEMO reports should provide achievement level information by subgroup.</p> <p>The State should provide evidence of the process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</p>

⁶ 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 TENNESSEE

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"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a <u>student's academic achievement</u>; ○ Report the <u>student's academic achievement</u> in terms of the State's grade-level academic achievement standards; ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific <u>academic needs of students</u>; ○ Are provided in an understandable and uniform format; ○ Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian; ○ Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent. ● 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. 		

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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of how the State ensures results in an alternative, accessible format are provided to a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA. • Interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results and should provide reports with appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public. • The State's process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. 		

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.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

March 2020 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TENNESSEE

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	6
Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments	8
Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments	10
 SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS.....	 11
Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development	11
Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development	13
Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration	14
Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration	16
Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security	17
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 Content	20
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

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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations.....	39
---	-----------

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING	41
Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students	41
Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting	43
Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	44
Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting.....	46

SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS..	49
Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments	49
Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments	51
Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State Assessments	53

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 TENNESSEE

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<u>For academic content standards:</u> 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.	Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math NA	Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math No additional evidence requested.
Section 1.1 Summary Statement		
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 TENNESSEE

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
<u>For academic content standards:</u> The State's challenging academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science are aligned with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards.	Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math NA	Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math No additional evidence requested.
Section 1.2 Summary Statement		
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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments

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

<p>eighth grade and allow the student to take the State end-of-course mathematics test instead.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Department may have approved the State, under the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority, to permit students in some LEAs to participate in a demonstration assessment system in lieu of participating in the State assessment.		
Section 1.3 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments

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

<p>language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If the State uses the flexibility for Native American language schools and programs: (1) the State provides the content assessment in the Native American language to all students in the school or program; (2) the State submits such content assessment for peer review as part of its State assessment system; and (3) the State continues to provide ELP assessments and services for ELs as required by law. The State must assess in English the students' achievement in R/LA in high school. 		
Section 1.4 Summary Statement		
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 TENNESSEE

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State has developed or amended challenging academic standards and assessments, the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education). • Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas). • Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State. • Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents. 		<p>In its standards revision process in 2015 and 2016, TDOE's Standards Review Committee solicited and reviewed multiple types of feedback. Data and comments collected from the public website on standards were reviewed, along with feedback gathered through a series of regional roundtable conversations. Additional feedback from a team of Tennessee higher education faculty and the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) were also considered. Department staff note that there was no evidence that representatives of Indian tribes in the State were consulted; however, staff determined that there are no federally-recognized or state-recognized tribes in the State of Tennessee.</p>
Section 1.5 Summary Statement		
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 TENNESSEE

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State's test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to <u>the depth and breadth of the State's academic content standards</u> for the grade that is being assessed and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the depth and breadth of <u>the State's grade-level academic content standards</u> and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results. Processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <u>the State's academic content standards</u>, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills). If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design 	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math</p> <p>2.1.1. TCAP 2019-20_Grade 3 ELA_Test Specifications Final v1_082719</p> <p>2.1.2. TCAP 2019-20_Grade 3 Math_Test Specifications Final v10_10092019</p> <p>2.1.3. TCAP 2019-20_Grade 4 ELA_Test Specifications Final v.1_090319</p> <p>2.1.3. TCAP 2019-20_Grade 4 Math_Test Specifications Final v6_10092019</p> <p>2.1.4. TCAP 2019-20_Grade 5 ELA_Test Specifications Final v.1_090319</p> <p>2.1.5. TCAP 2019-20_Grade 5 Math_Test Specifications Final v6_10092019</p> <p>2.1.6. TCAP 2019-20_Grade 6 ELA_Test Specifications Final v1_082719</p> <p>2.1.7. TCAP 2019-20_Grade 6 Math_Test Specifications Final v9_10092019</p> <p>2.1.8. TCAP 2019-20_Grade 7 ELA_Test Specifications Final v1_082919</p> <p>2.1.9. TCAP 2019-20_Grade 7 Math_Test Specifications Final v5_10092019</p> <p>2.1.10. TCAP 2019-20_Grade 8 ELA_Test Specifications Final v1_090319</p> <p>2.1.11. TCAP 2019-20_Grade 8 Math_Test Specifications Final v5_10092019</p> <p>2.1.12. TCAP 2019-20_Integrated Math I_Test Specifications_Final_09042019</p> <p>2.1.13. TCAP 2019-20_Integrated Math II_Test Specifications_Final_09042019</p> <p>2.1.14. TCAP 2019-20_Integrated Math III_Test Specifications_Final_09042019</p> <p>2.1.15. TCAP 2019-20_Algebra I_Test Specifications_Final_09042019</p>	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math</p> <p>The State should provide evidence of a statement of the purpose and intended use of test scores. The content domains (or standards) the test is intended to measure should be provided as part of the test specifications.</p> <p>An external alignment report for the high school EOCs is provided. The State indicates that a comparable alignment study for grades 3-8 ELA and mathematics has been scheduled and the final report will be available in July 2020. In light of the high school alignment report identifying issues, the 3-8 alignment report and the State's specific plan to address issues identified in the high school alignment report is crucial for the State to have been considered to have met the requirements of this critical element.</p> <p>The external alignment report indicates each of the EOC blueprints meets expectations for Domain Concurrence and Range of Knowledge, but the Algebra I and English I EOC test blueprints could not be evaluated for Balance of Representation. Also, the reports say none of the three EOC assessments meet the Cognitive Complexity alignment criteria.</p> <p>Tennessee provided a copy of the minutes from an assessment design meeting. The minutes indicate that the State will evaluate the results from the alignment study "once it is finalized" and will develop an internal plan for implementing the recommendations from the alignment study. The State should provide a final copy of the internal</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 TENNESSEE

<p>and intended uses and interpretations of results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the student is enrolled and uses that determination for all reporting. • If the State administers a content assessment that includes portfolios, such assessment may be partially administered through a portfolio but may not be <i>entirely</i> administered through a portfolio. 	<p>2.1.16. TCAP 2019-20_Algebra II_Test Specifications_Final_09042019 2.1.17. TCAP 2019-20_Geometry_Test Specifications_Final_09042019 2.1.18. TCAP 2019-20_English I and II Test Specifications_Final_081519 2.1.20. TCAP EOC Evaluation Report 2.1.21. Assessment Design Planning Meeting Agenda 4.2.1. IWW_ELA_February2018_Draft</p>	<p>plan. The peers recommend this plan include tasks related to the specific issues raised in the alignment study report.</p> <p>One reviewer commented that it is not clear if the test length in reading is fixed or in variation across forms (2.1.1 Table 2, p.5). The two-way test specifications are expected to specify how each content domain is assessed with cognitive complexity.</p> <p>Considering the State's plan to transition from CBT to PBT in 2019-2020 with changes of timed sections for reading (2.1.1. p.11) and EOCs (2.1.12. p.11), the State should ensure the mode comparability studies mentioned in CE.4.6. examine the impacts of testing mode on item parameters from field test and the comparability of test scores between online and paper administrations.</p>
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</p> <p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence the State includes a statement of the purpose and intended use of test scores. • A copy of the final report for external alignment study for the State's 3-8 assessment that is expected to be available in July 2020. • A copy of the State's plan to address issues identified in the external alignment study for the State's high school EOC exams. • A copy of the State's plan to address any issues that might be identified in the external alignment study for the State's 3-8 assessments. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TENNESSEE

Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills. 	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math</p> <p>2.2.1. TCAP 2019-20_Grade 3 ELA_Test Specifications Final v1_082719</p> <p>2.2.2. TCAP 2019-20_Grade 3 Math_Test Specifications Final v10_10092019</p> <p>2.2.3. TCAP 2019-20_Grade 4 ELA_Test Specifications Final v.1_090319</p> <p>2.2.3. TCAP 2019-20_Grade 4 Math_Test Specifications Final v6_10092019</p> <p>2.2.4. TCAP 2019-20_Grade 5 ELA_Test Specifications Final v.1_090319</p> <p>2.2.5. TCAP 2019-20_Grade 5 Math_Test Specifications Final v6_10092019</p> <p>2.2.6. TCAP 2019-20_Grade 6 ELA_Test Specifications Final v1_082719</p> <p>2.2.7. TCAP 2019-20_Grade 6 Math_Test Specifications Final v9_10092019</p> <p>2.2.8. TCAP 2019-20_Grade 7 ELA_Test Specifications Final v1_082919</p> <p>2.2.9. TCAP 2019-20_Grade 7 Math_Test Specifications Final v5_10092019</p> <p>2.2.10. TCAP 2019-20_Grade 8 ELA_Test Specifications Final v1_090319</p> <p>2.2.11. TCAP 2019-20_Grade 8 Math_Test Specifications Final v5_10092019</p> <p>2.2.12. TCAP 2019-20_Integrated Math I_Test Specifications_Final_09042019</p> <p>2.2.13. TCAP 2019-20_Integrated Math II_Test Specifications_Final_09042019</p> <p>2.2.14. TCAP 2019-20_Integrated Math III_Test Specifications_Final_09042019</p> <p>2.2.15. TCAP 2019-20_Algebra I_Test Specifications_Final_09042019</p>	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math</p> <p>Much of this evidence appears to be the same evidence submitted for 2.1 but saved with a different number.</p> <p>In the State’s previous peer review letter, the State was asked to provide in its resubmission: “Evidence that the State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills (e.g., the analytic criteria used in the evaluation of test item data, or “business rules” used in evaluating these data).”</p> <p>The State still has not provided sufficient evidence to address this critical element. The peers recommend the State review USED guidance document for the list of evidence necessary to meet the requirements of this critical element. For example, one piece of evidence the State could provide is a description of procedures to evaluate the quality of items (e.g., item parameters, as well as statistical measures of item quality, including item-to-total correlations, percent correct, etc.). Another recommended piece of evidence is that item writers are specifically trained in content standards, cognitive complexity, scoring rubrics, and bias and sensitivity.</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 TENNESSEE

	2.2.16. TCAP 2019-20_Algebra II_Test Specifications_Final_09042019 2.2.17. TCAP 2019-20_Geometry_Test Specifications_Final_09042019 2.1.18. TCAP 2019-20_English I and II Test Specifications_Final_081519 2.2.19. Exhibit 3.3.34 ALG1_EOC_TN1704_Data Review_new_FT 2.2.20. TCAP E02 TN1808 Item Analysis_Decisions 2.2.21. TN1904_E1_data_review_D071719 2.1.20. TCAP EOC Evaluation Report 2.1.21. Assessment Design Planning Meeting Agenda 4.2.1. IWW_ELA_February2018_Draft	
Section 2.2 Summary Statement		
X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State's academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills (e.g., the analytic criteria used in the evaluation of test item data, or "business rules" used in evaluating these data). 		

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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration; specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of Els, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math NA</p>	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math No additional evidence requested.</p>
Section 2.3 Summary Statement		
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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
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.	Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math NA	Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math No additional evidence requested.
Section 2.4 Summary Statement		
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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials (both during test development and at time of test administration), proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State's assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. • Application of test security procedures to all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS. 	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math NA</p>	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math No additional evidence requested.</p>
Section 2.5 Summary Statement		
<p><u> X </u> 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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the integrity of its test-related data in test administration, scoring, storage and use of results; To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math</p> <p>2.6.1. TN ETS 33111-00116 Contract PII</p> <p>2.6.2. TN QAI Contract Pages-33111-018616_final_PII</p> <p>2.6.3. report_card_suppression_rules_201718</p>	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math</p> <p>Protection of PII is included in the State's assessment contracts. However, while this information is included in the contracts, the State should provide specific state policies or state code that requires the protection of data integrity and privacy.</p> <p>The State has suppression rules to protect PII.</p>
Section 2.6 Summary Statement		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State policies or state code that requires the protection of data integrity and privacy. 		

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 TENNESSEE

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. The State's validity evidence includes evidence that:</p> <p><u>The State's academic assessments</u> measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State's academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State's assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards; • If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards and administers alternate assessments aligned with those standards, the assessments show adequate alignment to the State's academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content 	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math</p> <p>2.1.20. TCAP EOC Evaluation Report 2.1.21. Assessment Design Planning Meeting Agenda</p>	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math</p> <p>As mentioned in the notes for CE.2.1, Tennessee has provided an external alignment study for the State's EOC tests. The State has indicated it plans to conduct a similar alignment study for its 3-8 assessment with the final report being available in July 2020. The State should provide this new alignment report for 3-8 before it can meet the requirements of this critical element.</p> <p>Furthermore, the alignment study for the EOC tests identified issues. Although the State has provided an agenda that indicates it has met to discuss the issues identified in the alignment study, a final plan for how the State will address those issues has not been provided. The State should submit that plan before peers can say the State has met the requirements for this critical element.</p> <p>See comments for CE.2.1.</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 TENNESSEE

and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.		
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A copy of the final report for external alignment study for the State's 3-8 assessment that is expected to be available in July 2020.• A copy of the State's plan to address issues identified in the external alignment study for the State's high school EOC exams.• A copy of the State's plan to address any issues that might be identified in the external alignment study for the State's 3-8 assessments.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TENNESSEE

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
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap: <u>the intended cognitive processes</u> appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.	Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math 2.1.20. TCAP EOC Evaluation Report 2.1.21. Assessment Design Planning Meeting Agenda	Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math See peer comments provided in CE.2.1. and CE.3.1.
Section 3.2 Summary Statement		
<u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A copy of the final report for external alignment study for the State’s 3-8 assessment that is expected to be available in July 2020. • A copy of the State’s plan to address issues identified in the external alignment study for the State’s high school EOC exams. • A copy of the State’s plan to address any issues that might be identified in the external study for the State’s 3-8 assessments. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TENNESSEE

Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s <u>academic content standards</u>.</p>	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math</p> <p>2.1.20. TCAP EOC Evaluation Report</p> <p>2.1.21. Assessment Design Planning Meeting Agenda</p> <p>3.3.1. Reporting Categories Cluster_Grade 3</p> <p>4.3.4. Technical Report ACH 3-8_2016-17 revised_v4_3</p> <p>4.3.5. Technical Report EOC_2016-17</p> <p>6.4.27. State Summary SubScore NonScience English Language Arts Grade 3</p>	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math</p> <p>The State should note that the peers did not consider 2.1.20. or 4.3.5. because the previous peer review decision letter did not request evidence related to the State’s EOC tests for this critical element.</p> <p>See peer comments for C.E. 2.1, 3.1, and 3.2. for comments related to the 3-8 resubmission.</p> <p>The State should provide more than a list of standards (3.3.1.) for each reporting category. Are all the standards included? What logic and process determined the clustering? The technical reports do not provide any information relevant to those questions. Furthermore, the peers suggest that more recent technical reports provide the needed evidence to address these concerns. Similarly, an example of the categories that are reported (6.4.27.) does not provide evidence of the validity that the reporting structures are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards.</p> <p>The peers noted that the forewords of the two technical reports are identical; both refer to the EOC tests.</p> <p>The State quoted Chapters 8 and 9, and Appendix O (TCAP Subscore Expectation Methodology) in 4.3.4. as evidence for CE 3.3. No theoretical and/or empirical validity evidence is found to support the consistency between sub-domain structure of the state content standards.</p> <p>Intercorrelations of subscores reported in 4.3.4. (Appendix J, pp. 273-280) could be used to support the internal structure of ELA and math in grades 3-8. However, the</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 TENNESSEE

		State should provide interpretations of these results.
Section 3.3 Summary Statement		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A copy of the final report for external alignment study for the State’s 3-8 assessment that is expected to be available in July 2020.• A copy of the State’s plan to address any issues that might be identified in the external study for the State’s 3-8 assessments.• Additional evidence of the validity that the reporting structures are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards.		

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 TENNESSEE

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
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State's assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.	Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math NA	Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math No additional evidence requested.
Section 3.4 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 TENNESSEE

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. If the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, measures of reliability for the assessment overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a <u>student’s academic achievement</u>. 	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math NA</p>	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math No additional evidence requested.</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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
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 TENNESSEE

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 definition⁷).</p> <p><u>For academic content assessments</u>, 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>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math 4.2.1. IWW_ELA_February2018_Draft 4.2.2. June 2019 BSA Application v2</p>	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math The State has provided a sample item writing training that mentions the use of universal design for learning (UDL) in its item development process. However, the presentation of Universal Design Principles in 4.2.1. is simplistic. It does not address the need to “provide flexibility in the way students respond” or “maintain high achievement expectations for all students” [From the definition in <i>A State’s Guide to the U.S. Department of Education’s Assessment Peer Review Process</i>, Sept. 24, 2018].</p> <p>4.2.2. is a survey for potential item reviewers. However, the State should provide additional evidence about the process, training, and analyses to ensure fairness in testing.</p>
Section 4.2 Summary Statement _X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence to address Universal Design for Learning in terms of the need to “provide flexibility in the way students respond” or “maintain high achievement expectations for all students.” Additional evidence about the process, training, and analyses to ensure fairness in testing. 		

⁷ 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

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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for academic assessments , including performance for high- and low-achieving students.	Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math 4.3.1. State Disaggregation Summary Algebra I 4.3.2. State Summary Algebra I 4.3.3. state_assessment_file_suppressed 4.3.4. Technical Report ACH 3-8_2016-17 revised_v4_3 4.3.5. Technical Report EOC_2016-17 4.3.6. TNReady Final Standard Setting Report 25Oct2016 V2 4.3.7. TNReady Final Standard Setting Report 4Oct2017	Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math The peers do not believe that Evidence 4.3.1. and 4.3.2. are particularly relevant to this critical element. Some peers found that the technical reports (4.3.5. and 4.3.6.) provide sufficient evidence to indicate the State has met the requirements for this critical element, particularly regarding CSEM and Classification Accuracy and Consistency. One peer recommends the State generate evidence from reliability and conditional standard error of measurement by test, grade, and subgroup in the two technical documents (4.3.4. and 4.3.5) with brief interpretations for CE.4.3.
Section 4.3 Summary Statement		
<u> X </u> 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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State's <u>academic achievement standards</u> .	Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math NA	Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math No additional evidence requested.
Section 4.4 Summary Statement		
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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
If the State administers multiple forms of <u>academic assessments</u> within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State's <u>academic content standards</u> and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.	Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math NA	Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math No additional evidence requested.
Section 4.5 Summary Statement		
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 TENNESSEE

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; <u>or a native language version of the academic content assessment</u>), grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math</p> <p>4.6.1. Mode Comparability for TCAP 3-8 Report v4</p> <p>4.6.2. TDOE 2017 OP Comparability</p> <p>4.6.3 Pearson Contract – Comparability Study</p>	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math</p> <p>Mode comparability study found few significant differences and recommended no action be taken.</p> <p>The State has documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results between CBT and PBT test administrations. The variations of results across grades or EOC tests could be a challenge to policy decision.</p> <p>The contract with Pearson (4.6.3.) indicates that new comparability study will be designed, conducted, and reported to the State’s TAC prior to implementation. The peers believe this constitutes an adequate response to the request from the previous peer review.</p> <p>The State did not indicate whether it has a native language version of the academic content assessment.</p>
Section 4.6 Summary Statement		
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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments), and Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State's website. 	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math</p> <p>4.7.1. Jan 2016 TCAP-ETS Quarterly Status Report</p> <p>4.7.2. Q3 July_Sept 2019 TCAP-ETS Quarterly Status Report</p> <p>4.7.3. TDOE-ETS TCAP 33111-00116_Contract_Pg14_QualityControl</p> <p>4.7.4. TDOE-QAI TN Contract Pages-33111-01816_QualityControlPg14</p>	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math</p> <p>The State has quarterly status reports with its vendor that support it has a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving the quality of its assessment system.</p> <p>The peers in the previous submission did not request that the State provide evidence that adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State's website. However, the current peers note that this bullet item has been added since the last peer review. The State did not provide this evidence in its resubmission.</p> <p>The State did not provide any evidence of consultation with advisory stakeholders (e.g., state advisory committees; TAC agendas, recommendations, notes, etc.).</p> <p>The peers recommend the State provide additional evidence, such as analyses from TDOE and from contractors, that could be meaningful for CE 4.7.</p>
Section 4.7 Summary Statement		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State's website. Additional evidence, such as analyses from TDOE and from contractors, that could be meaningful for CE 4.7. 		

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 TENNESSEE

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system. Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, the placement team under Section 504, or the individual or team designated by a district to make that decision under Title II of the ADA, as applicable, based on each student’s individual abilities and needs.</p> <p>If a State adopts alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and administers an alternate assessment aligned with those standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(1)(E) and (b)(2)(D), respectively, the State must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish guidelines for determining whether to assess a student with an AA-AAAS, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A State definition of “students with the most significant cognitive disabilities” that addresses factors related to cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior; • Provide information for IEP Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that: 	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math NA</p>	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math No additional evidence requested.</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 TENNESSEE

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"> ○ 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; • Ensure that parents of students assessed with an AA-AAAS are informed that their child's achievement will be measured based on alternate academic achievement standards; • Not preclude a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who takes an AA-AAAS from attempting to complete the requirements for a regular high school diploma; and • Promote, consistent with requirements under the IDEA, the involvement and progress of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in the general education curriculum that is based on the State's academic content standards 		

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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>for the grade in which the student is enrolled; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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).⁸ 		
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required		

⁸ 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)

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 TENNESSEE

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all ELs in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s academic content assessments and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed with a linguistic accommodation(s); Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for ELs; Assistance regarding selection of appropriate linguistic accommodations for ELs, including to the extent practicable, assessments in the language most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what those students know and can do to determine the students’ mastery of skills in academic content areas until the students have achieved English language proficiency. 	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math NA</p>	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math No additional evidence requested.</p>
Section 5.2 Summary Statement		
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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and ELs, including ELs with disabilities. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that appropriate accommodations, such as, interoperability with, and ability to use, assistive technology, are available to measure the <u>academic achievement</u> of students with disabilities. Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs; Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny 	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math</p> <p>5.3.1. – accommodations link 5.3.2. – Parent Guide to TNReady Supports 5.3.3. – Determining accommodations link 5.3.4. – Accessibility Guidebook link 5.3.5. – literature review 5.3.6. – Comprehensive Accessibility Accommodations Manual – Final 2019 4.3.4. – Technical Report ACH 3-8_2016-17revisedv4_3 4.3.5. – Technical Report EOC_2016-17</p>	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math</p> <p>The State provides a webpage for Test Accommodations on the department website that includes an overview of accommodations.</p> <p>The State’s Parent Guide to TNReady Supports also provides parents with information regarding assessments, including charts that include examples of available accommodations. Similar charts are provided in the document “Determining Accommodations for Students with Disabilities.”</p> <p>Evidence includes the “Literature Review of Testing Accommodations and Accessibility Tools for Students with Disabilities.” Although this review was completed in relationship to the Smarter Balanced Assessment, Tennessee has used this review in support of the accommodations made available on its test.</p> <p>Technical reports include information related to accommodations.</p> <p>In its index, the State indicates it planned to consult its TAC in February 2020 to gather recommendations on how to gather data in support of studying the impact of accommodations.</p> <p>The State should conduct statewide studies that determine 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</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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.		<p>do not receive accommodations. The peers do not believe individual IEP teams can answer this question statewide.</p> <p>The State should provide evidence of its process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</p>
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statewide studies that determine the accommodations the State 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. Documentation of the State's process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 		

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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures; • Monitored for administrations of all required academic content assessments and AA-AAAS. 	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math NA</p>	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math No additional evidence requested.</p>
Section 5.4 Summary Statement		
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 TENNESSEE

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic content standards:</u></p> <p>The State formally adopted <u>challenging academic achievement standards</u> in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; The State applies its academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; <p>The State's academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include:</p> <p>(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>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math</p> <p>6.1.1. 10-14-16_IV_U_Standards_Setting_for_End-of-Course_Assessments_Cover_Sheet</p> <p>6.1.2. 10-14-16_IV_U_Standards_Setting_for_End-of-Course_Assessments</p> <p>6.1.3. 8-25-17_IV_C_Standards_Setting_Cover_Sheet</p> <p>6.1.4. 8-25-17_IV_C_Standards_Setting_Attachment_Powerpoint</p> <p>6.1.5. 8-25-17_IV_C_Standards_Setting_Attachment_Clean_Copy</p> <p>6.1.6. https://www.tn.gov/sbc/meetings/past-board-meetings.html</p> <p>6.1.7. TNReady Final Standard Setting Report 4Oct2017</p> <p>6.1.8. TN Standard Setting Report EOC</p> <p>6.1.9. TN Board Meeting 10-14-16_Minutes (p, 12)</p>	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math</p> <p>Evidence 6.1.9. TN Board Meeting Minutes documents the State's adoption of the cut scores for Tennessee's End-of-Course Assessments. However, although the State provided an agenda item for the 3-8 cut scores adoption, the peers could not find where the State provided a similar set of board minutes indicating adoption of the cut scores for the 3-8 assessments.</p>
Section 6.1 Summary Statement		

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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Documentation of the State's formal adoption of academic achievement standards for its 3-8 assessments, similar to the State board minutes provided that showed adoption of the end-of-course academic achievement standards.		

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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards.</u> 	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math NA</p>	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math No additional evidence requested.</p>
Section 6.2 Summary Statement		
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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic achievement standards:</u></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards and with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards such that a student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards (1) are aligned with the State’s challenging academic content standards for the grade in which a student is enrolled; (2) promote access to the general curriculum consistent with the IDEA; (3) reflect professional judgment as to the highest possible standards achievable for such students; (4) are designated in the IEP for each student for whom alternate academic achievement standards apply; and (5) are aligned to ensure that a student who meets the alternate academic achievement standards is on track to pursue</p>	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math</p> <p>NA</p>	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math</p> <p>No additional evidence requested.</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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
postsecondary education or competitive integrated employment.		
Section 6.3 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State reports its assessment results for all students assessed, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public.</p> <p>The State reports to the public its assessment results on <u>student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level</u>²</p> <p>For <u>academic content assessments</u>, the State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the <u>specific academic needs of students</u>, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its academic content assessments that: 	<p>6.4.1. State Disaggregation Summary Algebra I</p> <p>6.4.2. State Disaggregation Summary English Language Arts Grade 3</p> <p>6.4.3. State Disaggregation Summary English Language Arts Grade 4</p> <p>6.4.4. State Disaggregation Summary English Language Arts Grade 5</p> <p>6.4.5. State Disaggregation Summary English Language Arts Grade 6</p> <p>6.4.6. State Disaggregation Summary English Language Arts Grade 7</p> <p>6.4.7. State Disaggregation Summary English Language Arts Grade 8</p> <p>6.4.8. State Disaggregation Summary Mathematics Grade 3</p> <p>6.4.9. State Disaggregation Summary Mathematics Grade 4</p> <p>6.4.10. State Disaggregation Summary Mathematics Grade 5</p> <p>6.4.11. State Disaggregation Summary Mathematics Grade 6</p> <p>6.4.12. State Disaggregation Summary Mathematics Grade 7</p> <p>6.4.13. State Disaggregation Summary Mathematics Grade 8</p> <p>6.4.14. State Summary Algebra 1</p> <p>6.4.15. State Summary English Language Arts Grade 3</p> <p>6.4.16. State Summary English Language Arts Grade 4</p> <p>6.4.17. State Summary English Language Arts Grade 5</p> <p>6.4.18. State Summary English Language Arts Grade 6</p> <p>6.4.19. State Summary English Language Arts Grade 7</p>	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ELA and Math</p> <p>Evidence 6.4.1.-6.4.38. indicate TCAP state-level results are disaggregated by demographics (including gender and migrant status) and subscores.</p> <p>The peers also found spreadsheets on the State website that provide disaggregation at district and school level. However, the peers note that the State did not submit these spreadsheets or a link to the spreadsheets as evidence.</p> <p>Based on the wording of the critical element from the previous peer review submission, the peers requested the State provide documentation of the percentages of students not tested in the EOC assessments. The State did not provide this evidence as requested. However, the current peers note that the current critical element text does not specifically require reporting students not tested.</p> <p>Although the State has provided sample reports documenting the State makes student reports available in native languages (Arabic and Spanish) where practicable to support parents, the State should provide evidence of the process of how it provides student reports, to the extent practicable, written in other languages 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.</p>

⁹ 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 TENNESSEE

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"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a <u>student's academic achievement</u>; ○ Report the <u>student's academic achievement</u> in terms of the State's grade-level academic achievement standards; ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific <u>academic needs of students</u>; ○ Are provided in an understandable and uniform format; ○ Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian; ○ Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent. ● The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. 	<p>6.4.20. State Summary English Language Arts Grade 8 6.4.21. State Summary Mathematics Grade 3 6.4.22. State Summary Mathematics Grade 4 6.4.23. State Summary Mathematics Grade 5 6.4.24. State Summary Mathematics Grade 6 6.4.25. State Summary Mathematics Grade 7 6.4.26. State Summary Mathematics Grade 8 6.4.27. State Summary SubScore NonScience English Language Arts Grade 3 6.4.28. State Summary SubScore NonScience English Language Arts Grade 4 6.4.29. State Summary SubScore NonScience English Language Arts Grade 5 6.4.30. State Summary SubScore NonScience English Language Arts Grade 6 6.4.31. State Summary SubScore NonScience English Language Arts Grade 7 6.4.32. State Summary SubScore NonScience English Language Arts Grade 8 6.4.33. State Summary SubScore NonScience Mathematics Grade 3 6.4.34. State Summary SubScore NonScience Mathematics Grade 4 6.4.35. State Summary SubScore NonScience Mathematics Grade 5 6.4.36. State Summary SubScore NonScience Mathematics Grade 6 6.4.37. State Summary SubScore NonScience Mathematics Grade 7 6.4.38. State Summary SubScore NonScience Mathematics Grade 8 6.4.39. tcap_score_report_arabic 6.4.40. tcap_score_report_spanish 6.4.41. state_release_assessmentfile2017-2018_suppressed 2.6.3. report_card_suppression_rules_201718</p>	<p>Additionally, the State should provide evidence that results, upon request, are made available in an alternative, accessible format for a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA.</p> <p>The State should provide interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results.</p> <p>The State should provide the process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</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 TENNESSEE

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of the process of how the State provides student reports, to the extent practicable, written in other languages 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. Documentation of how the State ensures results in an alternative, accessible format are provided upon request to a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA. Interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results. Process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. 		

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 TENNESSEE

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.