



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

January 24, 2023

The Honorable Mike Morath
Commissioner
Texas Education Agency
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, TX 78701

Dear Commissioner Morath:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education's (the Department's) assessment peer review process under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). I appreciate the efforts of the Texas Education Agency (TEA) to prepare for the review, which occurred in August 2022.

State assessment systems provide essential information that States, districts, schools, and educators 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, including students with disabilities and English learners. 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 TEA's submission and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that these components of Texas' assessment system meet all the statutory and regulatory requirements of the ESEA. As a result, I have determined the following:

- General assessments in reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics for grades 3-8 (STAAR): **Meet requirements of the ESEA.**
- General assessments in R/LA and mathematics in high school (STAAR Algebra I and English I and II): **Meet requirements of the ESEA.**
- General assessments in science in grades 5 and 8 (STAAR): **Meet requirements of the ESEA.**
- General assessments in science in high school (STAAR Biology): **Meet requirements of the ESEA.**

Congratulations on this significant accomplishment. Assessments that produce valid and reliable results are fundamental to a State's accountability system. Please be aware that approval of TEA's assessments is not a determination that the system complies with Federal civil rights requirements, including Title VI of the Civil Rights Acts of 1964, Title IX of the Americans with Disabilities Act, and requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Please remember that if Texas makes significant

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.

changes to any of its assessments, the State must submit information about those changes to the Department for review and approval. The full peer review notes are enclosed. We encourage you to read the full peer review notes for additional suggestions and recommendations for improving your assessment system.

Regarding the other assessments for which TEA submitted evidence, the Department found, based on evidence received, that these components of Texas' assessment system meet many, but not all, of the statutory and regulatory requirements of the ESEA. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and our own internal analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

- Alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) in R/LA and mathematics for grades 3-8 and high school (STAAR Alternate 2): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- AA-AAAS in science for grades 5, 8, and high school (STAAR Alternate 2): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**
- Alternate English language proficient assessments (Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment or TELPAS Alternate): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA.**

Substantially meeting the requirements of the ESEA means that these components of the State's assessment system meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. The list of items required for TEA to meet all statutory and regulatory requirements of the ESEA is enclosed with this letter. The Department expects that TEA will likely be able to provide this additional information within one year.

Because additional evidence has been requested for these assessments, the Department is continuing the conditions on the State's Title I grant award related to those components of the assessment system. To satisfy these conditions, TEA must submit satisfactory evidence to address the items identified in the enclosed list. The conditions will remain until all required evidence has been resubmitted and peer reviewed. If the outcome of the re-review by peers indicates full approval, then the conditions will be removed. If adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action.

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.

I request that TEA submit a plan within 30 days outlining when it will submit all additional required documentation for peer review. Upon submission of the plan, the Department will reach out to TEA to schedule the next peer review. Resubmission of the State's documentation for peer review should occur once the State has all remaining evidence for a particular assessment component.

TEA submitted the documentation regarding the following assessments for the winter 2023 peer review, which will occur in March 2023:

- English language proficiency (ELP) general assessment: TELPAS (**Partially meets requirements of the ESEA.** A resubmission.¹

¹ <https://oese.ed.gov/files/2020/04/Texas-9.pdf>.

Page – The Honorable Mike Morath

- Advanced mathematics assessment for students who take the TEA high school assessment (Algebra I) in 8th grade (ACT): A new submission.

Thank you for your ongoing commitment to improving educational outcomes for all students. 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/

James F. Lane, Ed.D.
Senior Advisor, Office of the Secretary
Delegated the Authority to Perform the
Functions and Duties of the Assistant Secretary
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Iris Tian, Department of Assessment and Reporting Associate Commissioner
Cory Green, Associate Commissioner and Chief Grants Officer

Critical Elements Where Additional Evidence is Needed to Meet the Requirements for Texas’ Assessment System to Meet ESEA Requirements

| Critical Element | Additional Evidence Needed |
|--|---|
| 1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards / Coherent and Progressive ELP Standards that Correspond to the State’s Academic Content Standards | <p>For the TELPAS Alternate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State’s English language proficiency (ELP) standards align to the State’s academic content standards and contain language proficiency expectations that reflect the language needed for English learners (ELs) to acquire and demonstrate their achievement of the knowledge and skills identified in the State’s academic content standards appropriate to each grade-level/grade-band in at least reading/language arts, mathematics, and science. |
| 1.3 – Required Assessments | <p>For the TELPAS Alternate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State’s assessment system includes an annual general and alternate ELP assessment administered to all ELs in grades K-12 (i.e., evidence demonstrating that the TELPAS K-1 holistically rated assessment is an appropriate assessment for ELs with and without disabilities, as well as those with the most significant cognitive disabilities). |
| 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration | <p>For the TELPAS Alternate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence demonstrating the State monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools (e.g., summary data from monitoring for the most recent year of test administration). |
| 2.5 – Test Security | <p>For the TELPAS Alternate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence demonstrating investigations of alleged or factual test irregularities (e.g., summary of test security incidents and the results of investigations from the most recent year of test administration). |
| 4.4 – Scoring | <p>For the TELPAS Alternate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that describes how ELs with a disability that precludes assessment in one or more of the required domains/components (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) such that there are no appropriate accommodations for the affected domain(s)/component(s), are assessed in the remaining domain(s) / component(s) in which it is possible to assess the student (e.g., how a composite score is calculated when fewer than four domains are assessed). |
| 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance | <p>For the TELPAS Alternate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence regarding the system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving the quality of the TELPAS Alternate assessment (e.g., how TEA will evaluate test administrator training and scoring of observable behaviors by test administrators to identify and address potential drift over time). |
| 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations | <p>For the TELPAS Alternate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence demonstrating the State monitors test administration to ensure students with disabilities and ELs are appropriately included in the assessment and receive accommodations that are consistent with |

| Critical Element | Additional Evidence Needed |
|--|--|
| | <p>the accommodations identified in the student’s IEP, 504 plan, or language development plan (e.g., summary data from monitoring for the most recent year of test administration).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence demonstrating State monitoring to ensure students with disabilities and ELs are assessed on the appropriate assessments (e.g., evidence demonstrating monitoring to ensure students are participating in the appropriate assessments). |
| <p>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</p> | <p>For the STAAR Alternate 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA (e.g., disaggregation of existing post-secondary education and employment reporting of exited students with IEPs that include STAAR Alternate 2 participants by proficiency status or other studies or documentation examining alternate assessment achievement and postsecondary success). <p>For the TELPAS Alternate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA (e.g., disaggregation of existing post-secondary education and employment reporting of that include TELPAS Alternate participants by proficiency status or other studies or documentation examining alternate assessment achievement and post-secondary success). |
| <p>6.4 – Reporting</p> | <p>For the TELPAS Alternate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence demonstrating student score reports are available in an alternate accessible format for parents with a disability. |

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

January-May 2022 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.

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS4

Critical Element 1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students..... 4

Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content Standards 4

Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments..... 4

Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments .. 4

Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments..... 4

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

Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development 4

Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development 4

Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration..... 4

Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration 4

Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security..... 4

Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy 4

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY4

Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content 5

Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes 5

Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure..... 5

Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables..... 5

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER.....5

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability 5

Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility 5

Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum 5

Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring..... 5

Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms..... 5

Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment 5

Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance 5

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

Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities.. 5

Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments..... 5

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations 5

Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations

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

..... 5

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING.....5

Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students..... 5

Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting 5

Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 6

Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting 7

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

Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments 7

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

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

Critical Element 1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students – Met in prior review.

Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content Standards – Met in prior review.

Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments – Met in prior review.

Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments – Met in prior review.

Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments – Met in prior review.

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development – Met in prior review.

Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development – Met in prior review.

Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration – Met in prior review.

Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration – Met in prior review.

Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security – Met in prior review.

Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy – Met in prior review.

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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 Texas

Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content – Met in prior review.

Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes – Met in prior review.

Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure – Met in prior review.

Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables – Met in prior review.

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability – Met in prior review.

Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility – Met in prior review.

Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum – Met in prior review.

Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring – Met in prior review.

Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms – Met in prior review.

Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment – Met in prior review.

Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance – Met in prior review.

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities – Met in prior review.

Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments – Met in prior review.

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations – Met in prior review.

Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations – Met in prior review.

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students – Met in prior review.

Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting – Met in prior review.

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 Texas

Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|--|---|
| <p><u>For academic achievement standards:</u></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards and with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards such that a student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards (1) are aligned with the State’s challenging academic content standards for the grade in which a student is enrolled; (2) promote access to the general curriculum consistent with the IDEA; (3) reflect professional judgment as to the highest possible standards achievable for such students; (4) are designated in the IEP for each student for whom alternate academic achievement standards apply; and (5) are aligned to ensure that a student who meets the alternate academic achievement standards is on track to pursue postsecondary education or competitive</p> | <p>Additional Evidence Needed by USED for STARR:</p> <p>For the STAAR assessments in grades 3–8 and high school in R/LA and mathematics and grades 5, 8, and high school in science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the academic achievement standards are aligned with the State’s academic content standards based upon the revised performance level descriptors (PLDs). <p>TEA Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6.3.1-STAAR Performance Level Descriptors, 2019 • 6.3.2-STAAR Performance Labels and Policy Definitions <hr/> <p>Additional Evidence Needed by USED for STARR Alternate 2:</p> <p>For the STAAR Alternate 2 tests in R/LA, mathematics and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. <p>TEA Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6.3.3-About District Profile of SPP Indicators Report (See highlights.) • 6.3.4-Texas’ Post School Outcomes Survey (See highlighted text on page 3.) | <p>To ensure Texas’ academic achievement standards are aligned with its academic content standards, Texas has updated the STAAR PLDs for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. mathematics in grades 3–8 and high school, b. R/LA in grades 3–8 and high school, and c. science in grades 5, 8, and high school. (Per TEA) <p>The peer reviewers appreciated the two pieces of evidence submitted but would have thought that there would have been some explanation about the individuals and their credentials that did the work to revise the PLDs.</p> <hr/> <p>As previously submitted in the standard setting technical reports, Texas’ alternate academic achievement standards are aligned to its general academic achievement standards, which were developed to determine postsecondary readiness. Texas has created new resources to help improve and track the postsecondary outcomes of students who take STAAR Alternate 2. (Per TEA)</p> <p>The Peer Reviewers did not find specific evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA.</p> <p>The Peer Reviewers recommend a longitudinal study that specifically monitors students with the most significant cognitive disabilities over time. This study can be used to determine if students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who took STAAR Alternate 2 are on track to</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 Texas

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|--|---|
| integrated employment. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6.3.5-IDD Access Report (See highlights on pages 6–8.) • 6.3.6-IDD Recruitment Report (See highlighted text on page 7.) • 6.3.7-IEP Model Form (See section Q, pages 8–9.) • 6.3.8-Texas Transition & Employment Guide (See Next Steps section on pages 37–41.) | pursuing postsecondary education or employment. |
| Section 6.3 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: More evidence needs to be submitted specific to students that took STAAR Alternate 2 to ensure they are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA</p> | | |

Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting – Met in prior review.

SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS

Not applicable

:

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

January-May 2022 State ELP 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.

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS4
Critical Element 1.1 – State Adoption of ELP Standards for All English Learners 4
Critical Element 1.2 – Coherent and Progressive ELP Standards that Correspond to the State’s Academic Content Standards 5
Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments..... 6
Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments .. 7
Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments..... 8

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS.....9
Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development 9
Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development 11
Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration..... 12
Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration 14
Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security..... 15
Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy .. 16

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY17
Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content17
Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Linguistic Processes..... 19
Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure..... 20
Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables..... 21

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER.....22
Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability 22
Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility 24
Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum 25
Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring..... 26
Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms..... 28
Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment..... 29
Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance 30

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS.....31
Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 31
Critical Element 5.2 – DOES NOT APPLY to ELP Assessment Peer Review33
Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations 34
Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations

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

..... 36

SECTION 6: ELP ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING38

Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of ELP Achievement Standards for All Students 38

Critical Element 6.2 – ELP Achievement Standards Setting 39

Critical Element 6.3 –Aligned ELP Achievement Standards 40

Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting 41

SECTION 7: DOES NOT APPLY TO ELP ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW42

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 Texas

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

Critical Element 1.1 – State Adoption of ELP Standards for All English Learners

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|---|--|
| <p><i>For English language proficiency (ELP) standards:</i></p> <p>The State formally adopted K-12 ELP standards for all ELs in public schools in the State.</p> | <p>01: Texas Register, Vol. 32, No. 51, page 1 (see highlighted text)</p> <p>02: Texas Administrative Code, §74.4</p> | <p>01: Texas Register, Vol. 32, No. 51, page 1 (see highlighted text)</p> <p>The State Board of Education (SBOE) adopted new Texas Administrative Code (TAC), §74.4, concerning English language proficiency standards (ELPS). The revised ELPS is part of the curriculum requirements.</p> <p>02: Texas Administrative Code, §74.4</p> <p>ELPS apply to all English language learners (ELLs) in K-12. School districts are required to provide evidence of the student's English language proficiency levels in the domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing in accordance with the proficiency level descriptors for the beginning, intermediate, advanced, and advanced high levels.</p> <p>The State developed proficiency level descriptors to define four proficiency levels in listening, speaking, reading, and writing (see pages 7 and 11-19).</p> |
| <p>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <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 Texas

Critical Element 1.2 – Coherent and Progressive ELP Standards that Correspond to the State’s Academic Content Standards

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|--|---|
| <p>For ELP standards: The ELP standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing; • address the different proficiency levels of ELs; and <p>align to the State academic content standards (see definition²). The ELP standards must contain language proficiency expectations that reflect the language needed for ELs to acquire and demonstrate their achievement of the knowledge and skills identified in the State’s academic content standards appropriate to each grade-level/grade-band in at least reading/language arts, mathematics, and science.</p> | <p>02: Texas Administrative Code, §74.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subsection (b), school district responsibilities, page 1 • Subsection (c), cross curricular second language acquisition essential knowledge and skills, pages 1–5 • Subsection (d), proficiency level descriptors, pages 5–13 <p>03: TELPAS and TELPAS Alternate Educator Guide</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alignment with State Curriculum, page 111 • Language Domains, page 112 <p>04: TELPAS Alternate Proficiency Labels and Definitions</p> <p>05: TELPAS Alternate Proficiency Level Descriptors</p> | <p>Texas Administrative Code, §74.4 (see pages 1, 5-13) and TELPAS and TELPAS Alternate Educator Guide (see pages 111 and 112) describe the ELP standards and alternate language proficiency expectations that English language learners should acquire. For listening, speaking, reading, and writing, there are five proficiency levels: basic fluency, developing independence, early independence, imitation, and awareness (see page 1 in TELPAS Alternate Proficiency Labels and Definitions).</p> <p>Texas Administrative Code, §74.4 mentions cross-curricular second language acquisition to refer to proficiency in all content areas (e.g., language arts) but it is not entirely clear how it is linked to other core subject areas.</p> <p>The Peer Reviewers are requesting more evidence of how the ELP standards and proficiency expectations are related to students’ achievement in reading/language arts, math, and science.</p> |
| <p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More evidence of how the ELP standards and proficiency expectations are related to the achievement of student with the most significant cognitive disabilities in reading/language arts, math, and science should be included | | |

² see page 24 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 Texas

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 an <i>annual general and alternate ELP assessment</i> (aligned with State ELP standards) administered to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All ELs in grades K-12. | | <p>Department staff note that TEA documentation indicates that ELs with significant cognitive disabilities in kindergarten and first grade are assessed on the TELPAS K-1 holistically rated assessment rather than the TELPAS Alternate. Department staff believe the State must provide evidence demonstrating the TELPAS K-1 is an appropriate assessment for English learners with, and without disabilities, as well as those with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p> |
| <p>Section 1.3 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State’s assessment system includes an annual general and Alternate assessment ELP assessment administered to all ELs in grades K-12 (e.g., evidence demonstrating the TELPAS K-1 holistically rated assessment is an appropriate assessment for ELs with, and without disabilities, as well as those with the most 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 Texas

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 |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State has policies that require the inclusion <i>of all public elementary and secondary ELs in the State’s ELP assessment</i>, including ELs with disabilities. | Reviewed by Department Staff Only | Department staff reviewed evidence for this critical element. Staff believe the documentation sufficiently demonstrated the adoption and implementation of policies requiring all public schools include all English learners, in all grades K-12, in the State’s annual English language proficiency assessments. |
| <p>Section 1.4 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] | | |

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 Texas

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 <i>ELP</i> standards and assessments, the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education). • Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas). • Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State. • Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents. | | <p>Department staff reviewed evidence for this critical element. Staff note the documentation provided demonstrates meaningful and timely stakeholder consultation was conducted in the development of challenging English language proficiency standards. Staff also note that, as a practical matter, that the State had adopted the ELP standards prior to the passage of the ESSA in December 2015, and as such this critical element did not apply to the State’s ELP standards.</p> |
| <p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <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 Texas

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 <i>the depth and breadth of the State’s ELP standards</i>, 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 <i>the State’s ELP standards</i>, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results. • Processes to ensure that the ELP assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <i>the State’s ELP standards</i> and reflects appropriate inclusion of the range of complexity found in the standards. • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design and intended uses and interpretations of results. • 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 | <p>13: TELPAS Alternate Test Administrator Manual, page 5</p> <p>14: Technical Digest, Chapter 7, TELPAS Alternate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview, pages 1–2 • Use of Test Results, page 12 <p>03: TELPAS and TELPAS Alternate Educator Guide, pages 119–121 (see highlighted sections)</p> <p>15: TELPAS Alternate Advisory Committee Presentation, slides 28–38</p> <p>17: TELPAS Alternate Blueprint</p> <p>18: TELPAS Alternate Observable Behaviors</p> <p>19: Alignment of Observable Behaviors to ELP Standards</p> | <p>Texas’ AELPA is not a computer adaptive or content portfolio assessment. (Per TEA)</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 Texas

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| 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 | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 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 Texas

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 English language proficiency based on the <i>State’s ELP standards</i> in terms of content and language processes. | <p>14: Technical Digest, Chapter 7, TELPAS Alternate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overview, pages 1–2 Test Development, pages 4–6 <p>03: TELPAS and TELPAS Alternate Educator Guide, pages 119–121 (see highlighted sections)</p> <p>12: TELPAS Alternate Advisory Committee Rosters</p> <p>15: TELPAS Alternate Advisory Committee Presentation, slides 28–38</p> <p>16: TELPAS Alternate Item Development Meeting Presentation, slides 7–13 and 21–41</p> <p>18: TELPAS Alternate Observable Behaviors</p> <p>19: Alignment of Observable Behaviors to ELP Standards</p> | <p>The Peer Reviewers commended TEA for the TELPAS Alternate (Notes Version) for the Observable Behaviors Inventory referenced in the Alternate Educator Guide (03: TELPAS and TELPAS Alternate Educator Guide, page 120).</p> <p>The Peer Reviewers commended TEA for having a diverse group of stakeholders in the Advisory Committee.</p> <p>The Peer Reviewers commended TEA for the timeline on page 13 of Document #16 that showed where the meeting participants are in the timeline for the test development.</p> <p>The Peer Reviewers recommend having an introductory paragraph describing the roles of the Advisory Committee members during each of the four meetings.</p> |
| <p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <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 Texas

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>20: District and Campus Coordinator Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TELPAS Alternate overview, pages 58–62 • Training overview, page 73 • District testing coordinator training, pages 81–82 • Campus testing coordinator training, pages 91–94 • Test administrator training, pages 105–109 • Technology staff training, page 113 • Plan for online activities, pages 239–240 • Prepare test details, page 244 • Review and update records, pages 260–263 • Completing an administration, pages 284–285 • Verify student records, pages 290–291 • Collect materials, pages 293–294 • Test security, pages 391–418 <p>13: TELPAS Alternate Test Administrator Manual, pages 13–22</p> <p>21: Additional TELPAS Alternate Trainings</p> | <p>Texas’ AELPA is not a technology-based assessment. (Per TEA)</p> <p>The District and Campus Coordinator Resources is an online manual for detailed information on each testing program within the Texas Assessment Program. The policies and procedures that LEAs must be trained on to administer Texas’ AELPA are outlined in this document. (Per TEA)</p> <p>The procedures for standardized test administration (which is just observational measurements in this case) are clearly described in 20: District and Campus Coordinator Resources and 13: TELPAS Alternate Test Administrator Manual (pages 13–22).</p> <p>Information on the training materials on administration procedures was available through an external link: https://tea.texas.gov/student-assessment/testing/telpas/telpas-alternate-resources</p> <p>The Peer Reviewers commended TEA for the example of the notes in Document #13, page 20.</p> <p>The Peer Reviewers commended TEA for the links in Document #21 for access to the alternate trainings.</p> <p>TEA is to be commended for listing so many examples of different kinds of test security breaches and how they should be handled</p> <p>The Peer Reviewers recommend that the USED investigate the law “Senate Bill 1267, which recently passed during the 87th Regular Legislative Session, 2021, which eliminates annual training requirements in test security 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 Texas

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | | <p>administration procedures for most testing personnel.” See PDF page 29 of Document #20.</p> <p>The Peer Reviewers recommend that TEA use consistent language. For example, on PDF page 105 of Doc #20, in the paragraph under TELPAS Alternate, it says "required" in the first sentence but later says "strongly encouraged." Similar language was found on other pages.</p> |
| <p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <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 Texas

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 ELP assessments and the AELPA.</p> | <p>Reviewed by Department Staff Only</p> | <p>Department staff reviewed evidence for this critical element. Staff note the documentation submitted described adequate protocols for in-person monitoring of test administration by State staff, guidance and requirements for district and school monitoring of test administrations, and procedures for monitoring computer-based assessment administrations. Department staff believe summary documentation of monitoring results is required to demonstrate implementation of the protocols.</p> |
| <p>Section 2.4 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence demonstrating the State monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools (e.g., summary data from monitoring for the most recent year of 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 Texas

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 the general ELP assessments and the AELPA. | <p>25: Texas Education Code, §39.0301, §39.0302, §39.0303 22: Texas Education Code, §39.056(a), (b), (g), and (h); Texas Education Code §39.057(a) 26: Texas Administrative Code, §101.3031 27: Texas Administrative Code, §249.15(a), (b), and (g) 20: District and Campus Coordinator Resources,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test security and confidentiality, page 391 • Secure materials, pages 391–392 • Maintaining security of test materials, pages 392–393 • Testing irregularities, pages 394–398 • How to avoid testing irregularities, pages 399–402 • Investigating and reporting testing irregularities, pages 403–406 • Penalties for violating security and confidentiality of assessments, page 407 • Oaths of security and confidentiality, page 417 <p>28: Test Security Training 29: Test Security Oaths 13: TELPAS Alternate Test Administrator Manual, pages 9–12 30: Investigation of Testing Irregularities Flowchart 31: Test Security Step-by-Step Process 23: Technical Digest, Chapter 2, High Quality Assessments, pages 12–15 (see highlighted sections) 24: Differentiated Monitoring and Support Guide, page 12–14</p> | <p>The Peer Reviewers commend TEA for the level of detail in Document #20: District and Campus Coordinator Resources (see specific pages on the left).</p> <p>All the listed Texas Education Codes and Texas Administrative Codes are very comprehensive. This is something one would expect from a state with a long history of student assessment history and experience.</p> <p>The Peer Reviewers recommend that the USED investigate the law “Senate Bill 1267, which recently passed during the 87th Regular Legislative Session, 2021, eliminates annual training requirements in test security and administration procedures for most testing personnel.”</p> <p>The Peer Reviewers recommend that TEA use consistent language. For example, on PDF page 105 of Document #20, in the paragraph under TELPAS Alternate, it says "required" in the first sentence but later says "strongly encouraged." Similar language was found on PDF page 29 of Document #20 under Texas Assessment Program Highlights that “Senate Bill 1267, which recently passed during the 87th Regular Legislative Session, 2021, eliminates annual training requirements in test security and administration procedures for most testing personnel.”</p> |
| <p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <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 Texas

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>32: Cambium Information Security Plan</p> <p>33: Cambium Service Level Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment technology and online administration, pages 3–6 • Scoring and reporting, pages 7–9 • Security, pages 11–13 <p>34: Test Information Distribution Engine User Guide</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction to TIDE, page 7 • How to Activate Your Account, pages 13–16 <p>35: User Roles Permissions for the Texas Assessment Program</p> <p>36: State FERPA Training, slides 33–47</p> <p>37: Accountability Manual, Chapter 1, Overview, pages 8–9 (see highlighted section)</p> <p>38: Explanation of Masking Rules for Accountability</p> <p>39: Texas Education Code, §39.030</p> | <p>Texas and its vendor, Cambium, adhere to strict security standards for test-related data and personally identifiable information as indicated in the documents included. (Per TEA)</p> <p>The Peer Reviewers commend TEA for the level of detail as it relates to protecting data integrity and privacy.</p> <p>32: Cambium Information Security Plan (pages 3-5; 6-8; and 12) summarizes the security measures and policies related to data protection and privacy.</p> <p>35: User Role Permissions, was very detailed and well organized</p> <p>36: State FERPA Training shows the training materials around the definition of personally identifiable information.</p> <p>37: Accountability Manual, Chapter 1 (pages 8-9) briefly outlines the procedures for ensuring data integrity.</p> <p>38: Explanations of Masking Rules was easy to understand.</p> |
| <p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] | | |

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 Texas

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><i>The State’s ELP assessments</i> measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s ELP standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s ELP assessment and the ELP standards the assessment is designed to measure in terms of language knowledge and skills, the depth and breadth of the State’s ELP standards, across all proficiency levels, domains, and modalities identified therein; • Documentation of alignment (as defined) between the State’s ELP standards and the language demands implied by, or explicitly stated in, the State’s academic content standards; • If the State administers an AELPA aligned with alternate ELP achievement standards, the assessment shows adequate linkage to the State’s ELP standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and that the breadth of content and linguistic complexity | <p>02: Texas Administrative Code, §74.4 03: TELPAS and TELPAS Alternate Educator Guide,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alignment with State Curriculum, pages 7–8 • Test Development Process, page 9 • Developing and Assessing English Proficiency, page 10 • Language Domains, page 11 • Cross-Curricular Second Language Acquisition, pages 11–13 • Proficiency Level Descriptors, pages 13–15 • Fundamentals of Second Language Acquisition, pages 15–18 • ELPS in Instruction, page 18 • Role of PLDs, page 18–19 • Alignment with State Curriculum, page 111 • Language Domains, page 112 • Response Modes, pages 112–113 • Proficiency Level Descriptors, pages 113–114 • Test Development Process, page 119 • Design of TELPAS Alternate, pages 119–121 <p>17: TELPAS Alternate Blueprint 18: TELPAS Alternate Observable Behaviors 19: Alignment of Observable Behaviors to ELP Standards 12: TELPAS Alternate Advisory Committee Rosters 15: TELPAS Alternate Advisory Committee Presentation, slides 28–38 16: TELPAS Alternate Item Development Meeting Presentation, slides 21–41 14: Technical Digest, Chapter 7, TELPAS Alternate, pages 15–21</p> | <p>Many of the citations in the Evidence Column are references to the TELPAS. The information for the TELPAS Alternate starts on page 111 of 03: TELPAS and TELPAS Alternate Educator Guide.</p> <p>The Peer Reviewers commend TEA for the level of details on the validity of TELPAS Alternate as presented in 14: Technical Digest.</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 Texas

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| determined in test design is appropriate for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. | | |
| Section 3.1 Summary Statement | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or <input type="checkbox"/> 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 Texas

Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Linguistic 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 <i>the intended language processes</i> appropriate for each grade level/grade-band as represented in the State’s ELP standards.</p> | <p>40: Technical Digest, Chapter 3, Standard Technical Processes, pages 31–35</p> <p>14: Technical Digest, Chapter 7, TELPAS Alternate, pages 16–17</p> <p>41: TELPAS Alternate Cognitive Lab and Pilot Test Report, pages 1, 11, and 27–32 (see highlighted text and sections)</p> | <p>40: Technical Digest, Chapter 3, Standard Technical Processes and 4: Technical Digest, Chapter 7, TELPAS Alternate are either too broad or based on generic information on test development.</p> <p>41: The description of the Cognitive Lab and the Appendix D of Compiled Notes provides useful information. TELPAS Alternate Cognitive Lab and Pilot Test Report provide some evidence regarding the pilot testing of the TELPAS observational behaviors.</p> <p>The Peer Reviewers recommend analyzing the results from the cognitive labs by grade band to determine if there should be different expectations by grade level.</p> |
| <p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> | | |

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 Texas

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 <i>ELP standards</i> on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p> | <p>40: Technical Digest, Chapter 3, Standard Technical Processes, pages 31–35</p> <p>14: Technical Digest, Chapter 7, TELPAS Alternate, page 17</p> <p>42: Technical Digest, Appendix E4, Internal Consistency</p> | <p>“Reliability” provides information on the internal <u>consistency</u> of assessments, not about their dimensionality or internal structure.</p> <p>40: Technical Digest, Chapter 3, Standard Technical Processes (page 33) presents reliability information to support the discussion around internal structure.</p> |
| <p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further evidence beyond coefficient alpha could be provided (e.g., exploratory or confirmatory factor analysis, factor analytic reliability coefficients, and other measures of “unidimensionality” to confirm the internal structure of each domain (i.e., reading, writing, listening, and speaking). | | |

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 Texas

Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|---|---|
| <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p> | <p>40: Technical Digest, Chapter 3, Standard Technical Processes, pages 31–35</p> <p>14: Technical Digest, Chapter 7, TELPAS Alternate, pages 17–20</p> <p>43: Boxplots of STAAR Alternate 2 and TELPAS Alternate</p> | <p>EL students in Texas who take TELPAS Alternate are administered STAAR Alternate 2 as their academic achievement test. The evidence included demonstrates the relationship between student performance on these two assessments. (Per TEA)</p> <p>The Peer Reviewers recommend adding correlations between STAAR and TELPAS (for the entire sample as well as by proficiency levels).</p> <p>In addition to the boxplots in 43: Boxplots of STAAR Alternate 2 and TELPAS Alternate, effect sizes regarding the significance of the average score differences between different proficiency levels would have been beneficial.</p> |
| <p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> | | |

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 Texas

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 (<i>for ELP assessments, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable</i>); • 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 <i>an EL’s English</i> | <p>40: Technical Digest, Chapter 3, Standard Technical Processes, pages 26–31</p> <p>14: Technical Digest, Chapter 7, TELPAS Alternate, pages 14–15</p> <p>44: Technical Digest, Appendix E1, Classification Consistency</p> <p>45: Technical Digest, Appendix E2, Correlations</p> <p>46: Technical Digest, Appendix E3, CSEM</p> <p>42: Technical Digest, Appendix E4, Internal Consistency</p> <p>47: Technical Digest, Appendix E5, Frequency Distributions</p> | <p>TEA noted that Texas’ AELPA is not a computer-adaptive assessment. (Per TEA)</p> <p>The Peer Reviewers noted that the classification consistency seems a bit low. The State could have provided more information on the potential reasons behind this finding.</p> <p>Did the TEA involve its Technical Advisory Committee in reviewing the TELPAS Alternate as it relates to the high number of students who either get the lowest or highest scores on TELPAS?</p> <p>Has the state investigated the exceedingly large number of students with high scale scores? This could potentially indicate misclassification of students for the assessment.</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 Texas

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|---|---|
| <i>proficiency.</i> | | |
| Section 4.1 Summary Statement | | |
| <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the Technical Advisory Committee’s recommendations regarding floor and ceiling on the TELPAS Alternate. • Classification consistency seems low. The State must provide more information on misclassification rates. | | |

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 Texas

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 ELP assessments,</i> assessments should be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (see definition³).</p> <p><i>For ELP assessments,</i> the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all EL students and fair across student groups, including ELs with disabilities, in their design, development, and analysis.</p> | <p>23: Technical Digest, Chapter 2, High Quality Assessments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Item Development and Review, pages 4–7 • Field Testing and Data Review, pages 8–9 <p>07: LPAC Decisions Educator Guide, pages 4–7 13: TELPAS Alternate Test Administrator Manual, pages 13–15</p> | <p>The documents provided by TEA present sufficient evidence regarding fairness and accessibility of TELPAS Alternate.</p> <p>The Peer Reviewers commend TEA on the TELPAS Alternate Glossary on pages 37-38 in 13: TELPAS Alternate Test Administrator Manual.</p> |
| <p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] | | |

³ 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 Texas

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 <i>ELP assessments</i>, including performance for EL students with high and low levels of English language proficiency and with different proficiency profiles across the domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing.</p> | <p>14: Technical Digest, Chapter 7, TELPAS Alternate, pages 7–10</p> <p>46: Technical Digest, Appendix E3, CSEM</p> <p>47: Technical Digest, Appendix E5, Frequency Distributions</p> <p>18: TELPAS Alternate Observable Behaviors</p> <p>05: TELPAS Alternate Proficiency Level Descriptors</p> <p>19: Alignment of Observable Behaviors to ELP Standards</p> | <p>Did the TEA involve its Technical Advisory Committee in reviewing the TELPAS Alternate as it relates to the high number of students who either get the lowest or highest scores on TELPAS Alternate?</p> <p>Has the state investigated the exceedingly large number of students with high scale scores? This could potentially indicate misclassification of students for the assessment.</p> |
| <p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the Technical Advisory Committee’s recommendations regarding floor and ceiling on the TELPAS Alternate. | | |

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 Texas

Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|---|--|
| <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments (and <i>for ELP assessments, any applicable domain or component sub-tests</i>) that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s <i>ELP standards</i>.</p> <p><i>For ELP assessments</i>, if an English learner has a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains/components (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) such that there are no appropriate accommodations for the affected domain(s)/component(s), the State must provide a description of how it will ensure that the student is assessed in the remaining domain(s)/component(s) in which it is possible to assess the student, and a description of how this will occur.⁴</p> | <p>07: LPAC Decisions Educator Guide, pages 4–7</p> <p>09: TELPAS Alternate Participation Requirements</p> <p>18: TELPAS Alternate Observable Behaviors</p> <p>14: Technical Digest, Chapter 7, TELPAS Alternate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scores and Reports, pages 7–10 • Scaling, pages 12–14 | <p>Test administrators use the Observable Behaviors to classify students into one of the five proficiency levels for each of the ten items per domain. (Per TEA)</p> <p>TEA’s documents (especially Technical Digest, Chapter 7, TELPAS Alternate; pages 7-14) provide sufficient evidence regarding the scoring procedures and protocols for TELPAS Alternate.</p> <p>The Peer Reviewers commended TEA for 9: TELPAS Alternate Participation Requirements form completed for students to determine alternate participation.</p> |
| <p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] | | |

⁴ See full reference in regulation, 34 CFR § 200.6(h)(4)(ii) (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 Texas

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 Texas

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 <i>ELP assessments</i> within or across grade-spans, ELP levels, or school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s <i>ELP standards</i> and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across settings.</p> | | <p>Texas’ AELPA does not have multiple forms.</p> |
| <p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <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 Texas

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), 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>Texas' AELPA does not have multiple versions.</p> |
| <p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] | | |

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 Texas

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>49: TEA TELPAS Alternate Resources Webpage</p> <p>50: TEA Assessment Reports and Studies Webpage</p> <p>51: Annual Stakeholder Satisfaction Survey Draft</p> <p>52: Assessment Educator Advisory Committee</p> | <p>TEA designed and administered Student Assessment Annual Stakeholder Satisfaction Survey to measure stakeholders’ satisfaction with the assessment but there are no reported findings based on this survey. The Peer Reviewers would like to see the improvements to the system based on the survey results.</p> <p>The Peer Reviewers recommend evidence regarding how the system is being monitored, maintained, or improved.</p> <p>The Peer Reviewers recommend listing the title and roles of members of 52: Assessment Educational Advisory Committee.</p> |
| <p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence regarding how the system is being monitored, maintained, or improved 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 Texas

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 students⁵ 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For ELP assessments, policies that require the inclusion of an EL with a disability that precludes assessment of the student in one or more of the required domains (speaking, listening, reading, and writing) such that there are no appropriate accommodations for the affected component (the State must assess the student’s English language proficiency based on the remaining components in which it is possible to assess the student). | <p>06: Texas Administrative Code, §101.1003(a) and (b)</p> <p>07: LPAC Decisions Educator Guide, pages 4–7</p> <p>08: TELPAS Alternate Student Eligibility Training, slides 2–4</p> <p>09: TELPAS Alternate Participation Requirements</p> <p>10: Medical Exception Eligibility Requirements</p> <p>11: NAAR Eligibility Requirements</p> | <p>The Peer Reviewers commend TEA for the thoroughness in explaining the procedures to identify and select students who are eligible to participate in TELPAS Alternate.</p> |

⁵ For ELP peer review, this refers to ELs with 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 Texas

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|---|---|
| Section 5.1 Summary Statement | | |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <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 Texas

Critical Element 5.2 – DOES NOT APPLY to ELP Assessment Peer Review

| 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"> Note: This critical element does not apply to ELP assessments, as the requirements only apply to the inclusion of ELs in academic assessments. | | Does not apply to ELP assessments. |
| Section 5.2 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 Texas

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 are available for ELs; • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. • Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment. | <p>07: LPAC Decisions Educator Guide, pages 4–7</p> <p>13: TELPAS Alternate Test Administrator Manual</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Eligibility Requirements, page 7 • Accessibility, page 13–15 | <p>The Test Administration Manual describes test accommodations and alternate response modes that enable ELs taking TELPAS Alternate to participate meaningfully in learning and testing. For example, if a student is physically unable to write in the traditional way, he or she may routinely use the accommodation of adaptive writing equipment to produce written text. This accommodation has been determined to be appropriate and effective in meeting student needs, does not alter the construct of the assessment, and allows for meaningful interpretation of results. (Per TEA)</p> <p>Because alternate response modes and instructional accommodations are allowable during the assessment, no student is denied participation in nor denied benefits from TELPAS Alternate. (Per TEA)</p> |
| <p>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required or</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 Texas

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

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 Texas

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 ELP assessments, and AELPA. | <p>22: Texas Education Code, §39.056(a), (b), (g), and (h); Texas Education Code §39.057(a)</p> <p>23: Technical Digest, Chapter 2, High Quality Assessments, pages 12–15 (see highlighted sections)</p> <p>24: Differentiated Monitoring and Support Guide, page 12–14</p> <p>20: District and Campus Coordinator Resources, pages 412–414 (see highlighted sections)</p> | <p>All assessments within the Texas Assessment Program follow the same policies and procedures for the monitoring of test administrations. Monitoring and investigations occur through a collaboration between various divisions of the Texas Education Agency. In addition, district testing coordinators and campus testing coordinators are responsible for monitoring test sessions. (Per TEA)</p> <p>The Peer Reviews commend TEA for 20: District and Campus Coordinator Resources. It is very comprehensive.</p> <p>The Peer Reviews commend TEA for 24: Differentiated Monitoring and Support Guide. It is informative about the monitoring process in Texas.</p> <p>The Peer Reviewers request additional information about how TEA is monitoring whether students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are being appropriately assessed on the TELPAS Alternate.</p> <p>The Peer Reviewers request state summary data of instances of misadministration of the TELPAS Alternate.</p> |
| <p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p>___ No additional evidence is required or</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 Texas

| 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"> • Additional evidence about how TEA is monitoring whether students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are being appropriately assessed on the TELPAS Alternate. • Additional evidence of the state summary data of instances of misadministration of the TELPAS Alternate. | | |

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 Texas

SECTION 6: ELP ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of ELP 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>For ELP standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State adopted ELP achievement standards that address the different proficiency levels of ELs; If the State has developed alternate ELP achievement standards, it has adopted them only for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who cannot participate in the regular ELP assessment even with appropriate accommodations. | <p>53: Technical Digest, Chapter 6, TELPAS, page 14–15</p> <p>54: ELPS-TELPAS Proficiency Level Descriptors</p> <p>55: TELPAS Listening and Speaking Proficiency Standards Approval</p> <p>56: TELPAS Reading Proficiency Standards Approval</p> <p>14: Technical Digest, Chapter 7, TELPAS Alternate, page 12</p> <p>04: TELPAS Alternate Proficiency Labels and Definitions</p> <p>05: TELPAS Alternate Proficiency Level Descriptors</p> <p>57: TELPAS Alternate Proficiency Standards Approval</p> | <p>In Texas, the Commissioner of Education officially approves performance and proficiency standards. (Per TEA)</p> <p>The procedures followed to identify proficiency levels (e.g., standard setting meetings) are clearly described in the evidence provided by TEA. The documents describe the adjustments made to the ELP achievement standards to ensure that TELPAS Alternate is suitable for EL students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p> |
| <p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <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 Texas

Critical Element 6.2 – ELP 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"> • <i>ELP achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate ELP achievement standards,</i> such that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cut scores are developed for every grade/grade band, content domain/language domain, and/or composite for which proficiency-level scores are reported. | <p>58: TELPAS Standard Setting Technical Report</p> <p>59: TELPAS Alternate Standard Setting Technical Report</p> | <p>There is sufficient evidence (especially in 59: TELPAS Alternate Standard Setting Technical Report) regarding the procedures followed to establish the cut scores and standards for TELPAS Alternate.</p> <p>The Peer Reviewers noted that there were only two men on the committee of 28 members (7.14%).</p> <p>The Peer Reviewers commended the Standard Setting report and seeing the results of the surveys from the committee members when they completed their task.</p> <p>58: TELPAS Standard Setting Technical report (page 24) stated “TEA did not adjust any of the cut scores recommended by the standard-setting committees during their reasonableness review.” The Peer Reviewers commend the TEA for not making any changes.</p> <p>59: TELPAS Alternate Standard Setting Technical Report did a good job of reporting on the entire standard setting process for the TELPAS Alternate.</p> |
| <p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <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 Texas

Critical Element 6.3 –Aligned ELP Achievement Standards

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|--|--|
| <p>For ELP achievement standards: The State has ensured that ELP assessment results are expressed in terms that are clearly aligned with the State’s ELP standards, and its ELP performance-level descriptors.</p> <p>If the State has adopted alternate ELP achievement standards for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate ELP achievement standards should be linked to the State’s grade-level/grade-band ELP standards, and should reflect professional judgment of the highest ELP achievement standards possible for ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p> | <p>53: Technical Digest, Chapter 6, TELPAS, page 14–15</p> <p>54: ELPS-TELPAS Proficiency Level Descriptors</p> <p>14: Technical Digest, Chapter 7, TELPAS Alternate, page 12</p> <p>04: TELPAS Alternate Proficiency Labels and Definitions</p> <p>05: TELPAS Alternate Proficiency Level Descriptors</p> | <p>There is sufficient evidence regarding how the State has adjusted the ELP achievement standards based on ELs who are students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p> |
| <p>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <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 Texas

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 <i>English language proficiency for all ELs including the number and percentage of ELs attaining ELP</i>.</p> <p>For the <i>ELP assessment</i>, the State provides coherent and timely information about each student’s attainment of the State’s ELP standards to parents that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports the <i>ELs’ English proficiency</i> in terms of the State’s grade level/grade-band ELP standards (including performance-level descriptors); • 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 | <p>60: TELPAS Interpretive Guide</p> <p>61: TELPAS Statewide Summary</p> <p>62: TELPAS Frequency Distribution</p> <p>63: A Walkthrough of the TELPAS Report Card</p> <p>48: TELPAS Alternate Interpretive Guide</p> <p>64: TELPAS Alternate Statewide Summary</p> <p>65: TELPAS Alternate Frequency Distribution</p> <p>66: A Walkthrough of the TELPAS Alternate Report Card</p> <p>67: TELPAS Alternate Parent Brochure, English</p> <p>68: TELPAS Alternate Parent Brochure, Spanish</p> <p>69: Calendar of Events</p> | <p>Parents are able to log in to a Family Portal to see their student’s test results: Texas Assessment. (Per TEA)</p> <p>The Calendar of Events list reporting dates. (Per TEA)</p> <p>The documents provided by TEA provide sufficient information regarding how the State reports its assessment results for ELs who participate in TELPAS Alternate. There are also additional materials regarding how parents are informed about the results.</p> <p>The Peer Reviewers require evidence of procedures used for providing reports in an alternate format to parents with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended.</p> <p>The Peer Reviewers require evidence of procedures used for providing reports to parents who have limited technology skills or do not have access to the internet.</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 Texas

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|---|---|
| individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent. | | |
| Section 6.4 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"> • The Peer Reviewers require evidence of procedures used for providing reports in an alternate format to parents with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended. • The Peer Reviewers require evidence of procedures used for providing reports to parents who have limited technology skills or do not have access to the internet. | | |

SECTION 7: DOES NOT APPLY TO ELP ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW

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.