



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

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

October 19, 2018

Dear Commissioner Riley:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education's (the Department) assessment peer review process under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), which governed State assessments through the 2016-2017 school year. The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), which governs State assessments beginning in the 2017-2018 school year, maintains the essential requirements from NCLB that each State annually administer high-quality assessments in at least reading/language arts, mathematics, and science that meet nationally recognized professional and technical standards with a few additional requirements. I appreciate the efforts of the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (MA DESE) to prepare for the review, which occurred in March 2018.

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

External peer reviewers and Department staff carefully evaluated MA DESE's submission and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that the components of MA DESE's assessment system meet most, but not all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of section 1111(b)(1) and (3) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and the Department's analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments for grades 3-8 (Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS)): **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**

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

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.

Please note that the assessment requirements for ESEA, as amended by the NCLB, were in effect through the end of the 2016-2017 school year. The MA DESE peer review was conducted under the requirements of this statute. Beginning in the 2017-2018 school year, the assessment requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, will apply to State assessments. Department staff carefully reviewed the evidence and peer review recommendations in light of the updated requirements for State assessments under the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA.

The specific list of items required for MA DESE to submit is enclosed with this letter. MA DESE must submit a plan and timeline within 30 days for when it will submit all required additional documentation for peer review. The Department will also host regular (e.g., quarterly) progress calls with the State to discuss the State's progress on its timeline. If, following the peer review of the additional evidence, adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action. In addition, 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.

Thank you for your ongoing commitment to improving educational outcomes for all students. I look forward to our continued partnership as we move ahead with this critical work. I appreciate the work you are doing to improve your schools and provide a high-quality education for your students. If you have any questions, please contact LaTisha Putney of my staff at: OSS.Massachusetts@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank Brogan
Assistant Secretary for
Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Simone Lynch, Director of Federal Programs
Michol Stapel, Director of Assessments

Critical Elements Where Additional Evidence is Needed to Meet the Requirements for Massachusetts’ Standards and Assessment System

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
2.1 – Test Design and Development	<p>For the MCAS mathematics and reading/language arts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statements about the purpose(s) of each MCAS assessment in sufficient detail to support validity. • Evidence that the MCAS measures the breadth and depth of the State’s grade level academic content standards. <p>For the MCAS reading/language arts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the tests support the intended interpretations and uses of the results.
2.2 – Item Development	<p>For the MCAS mathematics and reading/language arts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	<p>For the MCAS mathematics and reading/language arts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the adequate alignment between the State’s MCAS assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the breadth and depth of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity (this may include the results of the AIR NAEP-MCAS alignment study, when the results of that study are available, in order to demonstrate support for the cognitive complexity of the MCAS assessments).
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes	<p>For the MCAS mathematics and reading/language arts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level, as represented in the 2011 academic frameworks (the State’s academic content standards).
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	<p>For the MCAS mathematics and reading/language arts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	<p>For the MCAS mathematics and reading/language arts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate validity evidence that the State’s MCAS assessment scores are related as expected with other variables, especially those expected to be more directly related to student achievement.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
4.2 – Fairness and accessibility	<p>For the MCAS mathematics and reading/language arts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments. (e.g., summary analysis of results for students with disabilities versus students who do not have disabilities on each of the MCAS tests (e.g., DIF, subgroup summary statistics and estimates of reliability, decision consistency).
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	<p>For the MCAS mathematics and reading/language arts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards (e.g., evidence that students who score at the proficient or above level have mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do and are on track to succeed in college and the workforce by the time they graduate from high school).
6.4 – Reporting	<p>For the MCAS mathematics and reading/language arts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that assessment results are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

February 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



February 2018

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 ASSESSMENTS .	3
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students	4
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards	7
1.3 – Required Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only).....	9
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only).....	11
1.5 – Participation Data (reviewed by Department staff only).....	13
SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS	14
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	15
2.2 – Item Development.....	17
2.3 – Test Administration	19
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)	25
2.5 – Test Security	28
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....	31
SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....	33
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	34
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	36
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	37
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	38
SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER	39
4.1 – Reliability.....	39
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	40
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	41
4.4 – Scoring	43
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	45
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	46
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	47
SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS	48
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	49
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	51
5.3 – Accommodations.....	53
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	56
SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .	58
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students	58
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....	59
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	60
6.4 – Reporting.....	62

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State.</p>	<p>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <p>Adoption of Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks</p> <p>1.1.1 <u>Minutes from the December 2010 meeting of the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education re: Adoption of the New Massachusetts Curriculum Framework for English Language Arts and Literacy, Incorporating the Common Core State Standards, and the New Massachusetts Curriculum Framework for Mathematics, Incorporating the Common Core State Standards, pp. 3-4</u></p> <p>1.1.2 <u>Massachusetts Curriculum Framework for Mathematics (March 2011)</u></p> <p>1.1.3 <u>Massachusetts Curriculum Framework for English Language Arts and Literacy (March 2011)</u></p> <p>1.1.4 <u>Minutes from the March 2017 meeting of the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education re: Revised English Language Arts/Literacy and Mathematics Curriculum Frameworks, pp. 4-5</u></p> <p>1.1.5 <u>2017 Mathematics Curriculum Framework (March 2017)</u></p> <p>1.1.6 <u>2017 English Language Arts and Literacy Framework (March 2017)</u></p> <p>1.1.7 <u>Press release: Massachusetts Adopts Revised English Language Arts and Math Standards</u></p> <p><u>Application to all students</u></p> <p>1.1.8 <u>Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 69, Sections 1D, 1E and 1I</u></p> <p>1.1.9 <u>2017 English Language Arts and Literacy Framework: Commissioner’s letter of preface and Appendix A</u></p> <p>1.1.10 <u>2017 Mathematics Curriculum Framework: Commissioner’s letter of preface and Appendix I</u></p>	<p>The evidence provided by the State (Exhibits 1.1.1 and 1.1.7) indicates that the MA State Board of Education has formally adopted the revised mathematics and English language arts content standards, indicating that they are to be applied to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State (see Exhibits 1.1.2, 1.1.3, 1.1.5, and 1.1.6, and Exhibits 1.1.8, 1.1.9, and 1.1.10).</p> <p>Peers were uncertain as to which set of standards was used for the MCAS under review (2011 or 2017). Exhibit 1.1.4 (p. 4) indicates that the revised standards (Exhibits 1.1.5 and 1.1.6) would be used for the 2018 MCAS See also Exhibit 2.1.1, p. 3 for a timeline of the new Next Generation MCAS. The evidence provided (Exhibit 1.1.4) did indicate that the MA State Board of Education had approved the content standards for the 2017 assessment.</p>
<p>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science specify what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school to succeed in college and the workforce; contain content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.</p>	<p>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <p><u>1.2.1 2017 English Language Arts and Literacy Framework, including Commissioner’s letter and pp. 6-18</u></p> <p><u>1.2.2 2017 Mathematics Curriculum Framework, including Commissioner’s letter and pp. 5-18</u></p> <p><u>1.2.3 Memo to the Board: Update on Revisions to Massachusetts ELA/Literacy and Mathematics Frameworks (September 2016)</u></p> <p><u>1.2.4 Memo to the Board: Proposed Revisions of Curriculum Frameworks for English Language Arts and Literacy and Mathematics - Recommendation to Solicit Public Comment (November 2016)</u></p> <p>1.2.5 Final Report: Massachusetts English Language Arts/Literacy and Mathematics Curriculum Frameworks Review (Abt Associates, October 2016)</p> <p><u>1.2.6 Strong Standards: A Review of Changes to State Standards Since the Common Core (Achieve Inc, November 2017)</u></p> <p><u>1.2.7 Grade 3 ELA: What to Look For</u></p> <p><u>1.2.8 Grade 6 Math: What to Look For</u></p>	<p>Exhibit 1.2.5 provides clear documentation about the process the State used to revise its former content standards to create the 2017 content standards, including the participation of MA educators and other citizens in the review, revisions, and final determination of the revised standards. This Exhibit also shows a comparison of the State’s content standards to those of several other states that had reviewed and revised their CCSS-based content standards.</p> <p>Exhibit 1.2.6 provides evidence of the level of rigor of the State’s academic content standards in ELA and mathematics. The ratings listed in this Exhibit for different test components is as follows:</p> <p><u>English Language Arts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Foundation Skills – Strong (p. 6) ○ Reading Standards for Literature and Informational Text – Strong (p. 7) ○ Evidence Drawn from Text – Strong (p. 10) ○ Academic Vocabulary Acquisition and Use – Strong (p. 10) ○ Writing (Specifically from sources) and Research – Strong (p. 11) ○ Oral Communication – Strong (p. 12) ○ Grammar and Conventions – Strong (p. 13) ○ Analysis of Text Complexity and Guidance – Strong (p. 15, plus footnote: “Massachusetts’ text complexity guidance may cause confusion or result in lowered expectations statewide.”) <p><u>Mathematics</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Structure – Strong (p. 30) ○ Mathematical Practices – Strong (p. 32) ○ Procedures, Conceptual Understandings, and Applications – Strong (p. 33) ○ Sequencing: – Moderate (p. 34)

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"> o Grades K–5 – Strong (p. 36) o Grades 6–8 – Strong (p. 37)
Section 1.2 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p> <p>Note: In the future, MA may wish to use an independent alignment tool such as the Webb Alignment Tool in order to provide a more quantitative analysis of the alignment of its standards and assessments.</p>		

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>1.3 – Required Assessments</p> <p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments (based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate academic achievement standards-AAAS) in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). 	<p>1.3.1 MCAS Request for Responses Appendix B: Tests Planned for Administration 2017-2021</p> <p>1.3.2 Building on Reform, pp. 10–11</p> <p>1.3.3 Massachusetts General Law G.L. c. 69, section 1I</p> <p>1.3.4 Draft 2017 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report, pp. 1, 4-5</p> <p>Principal’s Administration Manual for Grades 3-8 Computer-Based and Paper-Based Tests (Spring 2017), pp. 12-14</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence documents Reading/language arts and mathematics assessments in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12); • Evidence documents Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). <p>evidence meets requirement for this critical element.</p>
<p>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u> x </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
---	--	---

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</p> <p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system; • For English learners (EL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment; ○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years. 	<p>Inclusion of all students in the assessment system</p> <p>1.4.1 Principal’s Administration Manual for Grades 3-8 Computer-Based and Paper-Based Tests (Spring 2017), pp. 12-14</p> <p>1.4.2 Massachusetts General Law G.L. c. 69, section 1I</p> <p>Students with disabilities and English learners</p> <p>1.4.3 Accessibility and Accommodations Manual for the Spring 2017 Grades 3-8 Computer-Based Tests, pp. 1, 5-6, 22</p> <p>1.4.4 Decision-Making Tool for MCAS-Alt</p> <p>1.4.5 Guidance on Designating Students for the MCAS-Alt</p> <p>1.4.6 Student Assessment Updates emailed regularly to principals, superintendents, EL program directors, administrators of special education, and other interested parties</p> <p>1.4.7 Web-based and conference call training sessions offered throughout the year, as publicized in Training Opportunities</p> <p>1.4.8 Principal’s Administration Manual for Grades 3-8 Computer-Based and Paper-Based Tests (Spring 2017), pp. 13, 72-76</p>	<p>Evidence supports the inclusion of all public and elementary school students in the assessment system and the consistent communication of this requirement.</p> <p>Appropriate documentation to support inclusion of children with disabilities and English learners.</p> <p>Evidence meets the requirements of this critical element.</p>
<p>Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
__x_ No additional evidence is required		

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p style="text-align: center;">1.5 – Participation Data</p> <p>The State’s participation data show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system. In addition, if the State administers end-of-course assessments for high school students, the State has procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates on each required assessment and provides the corresponding data.</p>	<p>Requirements for participation in statewide MCAS testing</p> <p>1.5.1 MCAS Participation Requirements for Students in Grades 3–8 and 10</p> <p>1.5.2 Principal’s Administration Manual for Grades 3-8 Computer-Based and Paper-Based Tests (Spring 2017), pp. 12-14</p> <p>1.5.3 Accessibility and Accommodations Manual for the Spring 2017 Grades 3-8 Computer-Based Tests, pp. 1, 5-9, 22</p> <p>Disaggregated participation data (reported annually on the state’s website)</p> <p>1.5.4 2017 MCAS Participation Report by Grade and Subject</p>	<p>Evidence shows that all students (including subgroups) are included in the State’s assessment system.</p>
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u> </u>x_ No additional evidence is required</p>		

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">2.1 – Test Design and Development</p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, 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 full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; • Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design. 	<p>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <p>2.1.1 Draft 2017 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report (page references below)</p> <p>Purposes and intended interpretations</p> <p>2.1.2 Purposes of the MCAS, pp. 1, 2, 4 of Technical Report (2.1.1)</p> <p>2.1.3 Request for Responses, MCAS Comprehensive Assessment System, pp. 3-5</p> <p>2.1.4 Memo to the Board: Recommendation on Student Assessment for Spring 2016 and Beyond</p> <p>Test Designs and Blueprints</p> <p>2.1.5 Test Blueprints, pp. 14, 19 of Technical Report (2.1.1)</p> <p>2.1.5.1 ELA MCAS Blueprint 2017</p> <p>2.1.5.2 Math MCAS Blueprint 2017</p> <p>2.1.6 ELA Test Design pp. 10-15, 21-25 of Technical Report (2.1.1)</p> <p>2.1.6.1 2017 MCAS G3-8 ELA Test Design</p> <p>2.1.7 Mathematics Test Design, pp. 15-20 of Technical Report (2.1.1)</p> <p>2.1.7.1 2017 MCAS G3-8 Math Test Design</p> <p>2.1.7.2 2017 Mathematics reporting categories</p> <p>2.1.8 Item Types for ELA and Mathematics, pp. 8-10 of Technical Report (2.1.1)</p> <p>2.1.9 Grades 3-8 ELA and Mathematics Test Design Presentation</p> <p>2.1.10 Waiver for ELA, Speaking and Listening</p> <p>Connection to Massachusetts Curriculum Standards</p> <p>2.1.11 2011 MA ELA Curriculum Frameworks</p> <p>2.1.12 ELA Standards Coding Anchors</p> <p>2.1.13 2011 MA Math Curriculum Frameworks</p> <p>2.1.14 Cognitive Levels ELA: p. 14; Math: pp. 19-</p>	<p>The evidence provided by the State was reviewed in each of the categories listed below:</p> <p>Purposes and intended interpretations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The purposes of the MCAS assessment are outlined in Exhibit 2.1.2 on pages 1 and 4. A more detailed list of assessment purposes is provided in Exhibit 2.1.3, p. 5. ○ These descriptions are not detailed and do not constitute the basis for a validity argument for the MCAS assessments. The documents should state each purpose or claim in some detail, and indicate the types of evidence needed to support each claim. <p>Test Designs and Blueprints</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The test blueprints (see Exhibits 2.1.5.1 and 2.1.5.2) describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound. ○ Independent evidence that the tests measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards is not provided. ○ Evidence that the tests support the intended interpretations and uses of the results is shown in Exhibit 2.1.7.2 for mathematics; a comparable document is not provided for ELA reporting categories. Only broad information on ELA reporting is provided (see Exhibit 2.1.15 as an example). <p>Connection to Massachusetts Curriculum Standards</p> <p>Evidence to support the connections of the MCAS to the State’s ELA content standards is provided in Exhibit 2.1.11. While comparable documentation was provided for Mathematics (see Exhibit 2.1.13), the cross-grade connections were not provided.</p>

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>20 of Technical Report (2.1.1)</p> <p>Item Descriptions for ELA and Mathematics</p> <p>2.1.15 Next Generation ELA Item Descriptions procedures</p> <p>2.1.16 ELA Item Descriptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Grade 3 ELA Item Descriptions b. Grade 4 ELA Item Descriptions c. Grade 5 ELA Item Descriptions d. Grade 6 ELA Item Descriptions e. Grade 7 ELA Item Descriptions f. Grade 8 ELA Item Descriptions <p>2.1.17 Math Item Descriptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Grade 3 Math Item Descriptions b. Grade 4 Math Item Descriptions c. Grade 5 Math Item Descriptions d. Grade 6 Math Item Descriptions e. Grade 7 Math Item Descriptions f. Grade 8 Math Item Descriptions 	<p>Item Descriptions for ELA and Mathematics A number of Exhibits were provided that gave detailed information on the content of ELA and mathematics assessment for each grade level (Exhibits 2.1.16a-f and 2.1.17a-f).</p> <p>Computer-Adaptive Assessment The State did not need to provide evidence for this aspect of Critical Element 2.1, as the online assessments used in 2017 are fixed form assessments.</p>
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Detailed statements about the purposes of the State’s assessments that support the outline and claims of a validity argument for the MCAS assessments. o Independent evidence of the full range of the standards selected for assessment. o Evidence that the ELA tests support the intended interpretations and uses of the results. 		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">2.2 – Item Development</p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <p>2.2.1 Draft 2017 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment Development Committees, pp. 21-25 • ELA Passage Review Process, pp. 22-23 • Item and Test Development, pp. 20-27 <p>Assessment Development Committees</p> <p>2.2.2 2017 ELA ADC Review Meeting</p> <p>2.2.3 ELA ADC Passage Review Criteria</p> <p>2.2.4 ELA ADC Item Review checklist</p> <p>2.2.5 Math ADC Item Review Checklist</p> <p>Item Development</p> <p>2.2.6 ELA Cognitive Skills</p> <p>2.2.7 Lifecycle of an ELA Test Item</p> <p>2.2.8 Math Cognitive Skills</p> <p>2.2.9 Life Cycle of a Math Item</p> <p>2.2.10 Item Review Process</p> <p>Test Development</p> <p>2.2.11 Test Development Process</p>	<p>The evidence provided by the State is an outline of some of steps in the item development process (see Exhibit 2.2.1, p. 21-25, 22-23, and 20-27).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The assessment review processes are outlined in Exhibits 2.2.2, 2.2.3, 2.2.4, and 2.2.5. ○ An overview of the cognitive complexity of the ELA and mathematics test items is provided in Exhibits 2.2.6 and 2.2.8. ○ The item development process is outlined Exhibits 2.2.7 and 2.2.9. <p>The actual data to show the alignment of the MCAS tests to the MA standards (and the determination that both address higher-order thinking skills) in a comparable manner is not provided.</p>
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actual data to show the alignment of the MCAS tests used to the MA standards showing that both address higher-order thinking skills in a comparable manner. 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">2.3 – Test Administration</p> <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 all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments; • 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>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <p>Establishment and communication of standardized procedures</p> <p>Manuals</p> <p>2.3.1 Principal’s Administration Manual for Grades 3-8 Computer-Based and Paper-Based Tests (Spring 2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • step-by-step tasks to complete for the spring test administration, pp. 46–53 • step-by-step tasks to complete after testing, pp. 56–69 <p>2.3.2 Test Administrator’s Manual for Grades 3-8 ELA and Mathematics Computer-Based Tests, pp. 20–78</p> <p>2.3.3 Test Administrator’s Manual for Grades 3 ELA and Mathematics Paper-Based Tests, pp. 24–63</p> <p>2.3.4 Test Administrator’s Manual for Grades 4-8 Paper-Based Tests, pp. 26–71</p> <p>Training sessions</p> <p>2.3.5 Computer-based testing guidance</p> <p>2.3.6 Student Registration/Personal Needs Profile</p> <p>2.3.7 Technology</p> <p>2.3.8 Administration</p> <p>2.3.9 Pre-administration Office Hours</p> <p>2.3.10 Test Administration Office Hours</p> <p>2.3.11 End of Administration Office Hours</p> <p>Modules</p> <p>2.3.12 Creating Sessions</p> <p>2.3.13 Infrastructure Trial for Test Coordinators and Test Administrators</p> <p>2.3.14 Infrastructure Trial for Technology Coordinators</p>	<p>The evidence provided by the State was reviewed in each of the categories listed below:</p> <p>Establishment and communication of standardized procedures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The State has established clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments (see Exhibits 2.3.1-2.3.4). ○ These procedures have been communicated to educators (see Exhibits 2.3.5 - 2.3.11 as well as Exhibits 2.3.12 – 2.3.19). <p>Communications about procedures for accommodations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The State has established clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments to students with disabilities and English learners (see Exhibits 2.3.20-2.3.25 as well as 2.3.44). These procedures have been communicated to educators as well. <p>Provision of training to all test administrators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The State has established training procedures for all educators (see Exhibits 2.3.26 – 2.3.32). <p>Technology requirements, procedures, and contingency plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The State has developed extensive procedures and documentation to assure that online assessments are adequately implemented (see Exhibits 2.3.33 - 2.3.43). ○ Contingency plans for educators are provided in Exhibit 2.3.39, while contingency plans for vendors are described in Exhibit 2.3.42. <p>Other Documentation</p> <p>The State has adequately documented the assessment</p>

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>2.3.15 Accessibility and Accommodations</p> <p>2.3.16 Student Registration/Personal Needs Profile</p> <p>2.3.17 Resolving Incorrect Accommodations</p> <p>2.3.18 Moving Students Between Sessions</p> <p>2.3.19 Sessions Management</p> <p>Communications about procedures for accommodations</p> <p>2.3.20 MCAS Pre-Administration Guide for the Spring 2017 Grades 3-8 Computer-Based Tests, pp. 2–4</p> <p>2.3.21 Accessibility and Accommodations Manual for the Spring 2017 MCAS Grades 3-8 Tests</p> <p>2.3.22 Principal’s Administration Manual for Grades 3-8 Computer-Based and Paper-Based Tests (Spring 2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English learners, pp. 72–73 • students with disabilities, pp. 78–96 • students with disabilities using a typed response accommodation, pp. 98–100 <p>2.3.23 Test Administrator’s Manual for Grades 3-8 ELA and Mathematics Computer-Based Testing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • students with disabilities using accommodations, p. 18 • students with disabilities using the read-aloud accommodation, pp. 81–82 • students who are deaf or hard of hearing who are having the test signed to them, pp. 84–86 • English learners using bilingual word-to-word dictionaries, p. 88 <p>2.3.24 Test Administrator’s Manual for Grades 3 ELA and Mathematics Paper-Based Tests</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • students with disabilities using accommodations, p. 15 • students with disabilities using the 	<p>administration procedures in its Technical Report (see Exhibit 2.3.44).</p>

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Braille edition, p. 66</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • students with disabilities using the large-print edition, p. 68 • students with disabilities using a typed response accommodation, pp. 70–72 • students who are deaf or hard of hearing who are having the test signed to them, p. 74 • English learners using bilingual word-to-word dictionaries (p. 76) <p>2.3.25 Test Administrator’s Manual for Grades 4-8 Paper-Based Tests</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • students with disabilities using accommodations, p. 15 • students with disabilities using the Braille edition, p. 92 • students with disabilities using the large-print edition, p. 94 • students with disabilities using a typed response accommodation, pp. 96-98 • students who are deaf or hard of hearing who are having the test signed to them, p. 100 • English learners using bilingual word-to-word dictionaries, p. 102 <p>Provision of training to all test administrators</p> <p>2.3.26 MCAS Pre-Administration Guide for the Spring 2017 Grades 3-8 Computer-Based Tests, pp. 3–4</p> <p>2.3.27 Principal’s Administration Manual for Grades 3-8 Computer-Based and Paper-Based Tests (Spring 2017), pp. 3, 4, 6, 8, 32–35, 46, 56, 67, 110–112, 117</p> <p>2.3.28 Test Administrator’s Manual for Grades 3-8 ELA and Mathematics Computer-Based Tests, pp. 3, 4-5, 20–22</p> <p>2.3.29 Test Administrator’s Manual for Grades 3</p>	

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>ELA and Mathematics Paper-Based Tests, pp. 3-5, 18–20</p> <p>2.3.30 Test Administrator’s Manual for Grades 4-8 Paper-Based Tests, pp. 3- 5, 18–20</p> <p>2.3.31 September 7, 2016 Student Assessment Update – Special Back-to-School Edition, p. 7</p> <p>2.3.32 January 20, 2017 Student Assessment Update: “Online Modules and Upcoming Training Sessions” section</p> <p>Technology requirements, procedures, and contingency plans</p> <p>2.3.33 MCAS Pre-Administration Guide for the Spring 2017 Grades 3-8 Computer-Based Tests</p> <p>2.3.34 Principal’s Administration Manual for Grades 3-8 Computer-Based and Paper-Based Tests (Spring 2017), pp. 46–53, 56–59</p> <p>2.3.35 Test Administrator’s Manual for Grades 3-8 ELA and Mathematics Computer-Based Test, pp. 20–78</p> <p>2.3.36 Computer-based testing readiness checklist</p> <p>2.3.37 Technology skills for students</p> <p>2.3.38 Computer-based testing guidance training session</p> <p>2.3.39 March 29, 2017 Student Assessment Update: “Contingency Planning for Issues that Affect Computer-Based Testing Systems” section</p> <p>2.3.40 February 28, 2017 Student Assessment Update: “Recent MCAS Training Opportunities” section and “Upcoming Training Sessions” section</p> <p>2.3.41 Technology Specifications</p> <p>2.3.42 Computer-based Testing Outage Plan</p> <p>2.3.43 Computer-based Testing outage messages</p> <p>Other documentation</p>	

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	2.3.44 Draft 2017 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report, pp. 28-31	
Section 2.3 Summary Statement		
<u>X</u> No additional evidence is required		

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
---	---	---

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p style="text-align: center;">2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</p> <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.</p>	<p>Principal’s Certification 2.4.1 Principal’s Administration Manual for Grades 3-8 Computer-Based and Paper-Based Tests (Spring 2017), pp. 110-111</p> <p>School Observation Program 2.4.2 Principal’s Administration Manual for Grades 3-8 Computer-Based and Paper-Based Tests (Spring 2017), p.8 2.4.3 2017 School Observation Schedule 2.4.4 2017 MCAS Test Administration Observation Report form 2.4.5 School Observation Criteria 2.4.6 Observer introduction letters 2.4.7 2017 MCAS Observation Training (Observers were trained in person at the Department.)</p> <p>Monitoring of Schools’ PBT Return Shipments 2.4.8 MCAS 2016-2017 Login Specifications</p> <p>Reporting of Irregularities 2.4.9 Principal’s Administration Manual for Grades 3-8 Computer-Based and Paper-Based Tests (Spring 2017) , pp. 8-9 2.4.10 Instructions for Reporting an MCAS Irregularity 2.4.11 MCAS Web Patrol Log (Caveon) MCAS Service Center (mcasservicecenter.com, mcas@measuredprogress.org, 800-737-5103)</p>	<p>The state employs a variety of methods to ensure standardized test administration procedures, including a principal certification process, a school observation program, and procedures for monitoring the proper return of test materials. Observation process documents training, selection protocols, observation protocols, number of contracted staff. Evidence includes procedures for monitoring online activity that may pose test security issue.</p>

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
x No additional evidence is required .		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">2.5 – Test Security</p> <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, 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. 	<p>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <p>Prevention of assessment irregularities</p> <p>2.5.1 Principal’s Administration Manual for Grades 3-8 Computer-Based and Paper-Based Tests (Spring 2017), pp. 1-9, 15–44, 110-122</p> <p>2.5.2 Security Section – Measured Progress bid</p> <p>2.5.3 Information and Technology Security Appendix from Measured Progress and Pearson, pp. 12–18</p> <p>2.5.4 Information Security</p> <p>2.5.5 See 2.4.2-2.4.6 for information about school observations</p> <p>2.5.6 Grades 3–8 training slides, 32-52</p> <p>2.5.7 Principal’s Administration Manual for Grades 3-8 Computer-Based and Paper-Based Tests (Spring 2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal’s Certification of Proper Test Administration (PCPA), pp. 110–111 • Superintendent’s Assurance of Proper Test Administration, p. 112 • Test Materials Internal Tracking Form, pp. 108–109, 113–114 • MCAS Nondisclosure Agreement, p. 115 • Confirmation of Training Participation and Receipt of Test Administrator’s Manuals (TAMs) and Test Security Requirements, p. 117 • Student Responsibilities during MCAS Testing sample form and sample letter, pp. 118–119 • Materials Summary, p. 122 <p>2.5.8 Grades 3-8 Computer-Based Testing Test Administrator’s Manual, ELA and Mathematics scripts, pp.29–79</p>	<p>The evidence provided by the State was reviewed in each of the categories listed below:</p> <p>Prevention of assessment irregularities</p> <p>The State has provided considerable written materials for educators on test security requirements (see Exhibits 2.5.1, p. 1-9, and Exhibits 2.5.7 – 2.5.10), its vendors – Pearson and Measured Progress (see Exhibit 2.5.2 - 2.5.4), as well as training (see Exhibit 2.5.6).</p> <p>Detection of irregularities</p> <p>The State has described how it monitors schools in order to detect irregularities. This includes the use of Caveon (Exhibit 2.5.11), procedures for schools to report irregularities (Exhibit 2.5.12), and the development of detection criteria (see Exhibit 2.5.13). School observations were described in Exhibits 2.4.2 – 2.4.4.</p> <p>Investigations of irregularities</p> <p>Detailed instructions for the investigation by the State of potential irregularities are described in Exhibit 2.5.14. The procedures are thoroughly described for principals in Exhibit 2.5.15, p. 8-9.</p> <p>Remediation of testing irregularities and security incidents</p> <p>The State provided a list of irregularities and how they were dealt with (see Exhibit 2.5.16). The invalidation rules and precedents are thoroughly described in Exhibit 2.5.17.</p>

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>2.5.9 Grade 3 Paper-Based Testing Test Administrator's Manual: ELA and Mathematics scripts, pp. 23–63</p> <p>2.5.10 Grades 4-8 Paper-Based Testing Test Administrator's Manual: ELA, Mathematics, and Science and Technology/Engineering scripts, pp. 35–87</p> <p>Detection of irregularities</p> <p>2.5.11 Caveon Web Monitoring Log</p> <p>2.5.12 Instructions for Reporting an MCAS Irregularity</p> <p>2.5.13 Data forensics criteria</p> <p>Investigations of irregularities</p> <p>2.5.14 Recommendations for MCAS Misconduct Investigations</p> <p>2.5.15 Principal's Administration Manual for Grades 3-8 Computer-Based and Paper-Based Tests (Spring 2017), p. 9</p> <p>Remediation of testing irregularities and security incidents</p> <p>2.5.16 2017 Grades 3–8 ELA breach list</p> <p>2.5.17 Invalidation Rules and Precedents</p>	
Section 2.5 Summary Statement		
<u>X</u> No additional evidence is required.		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</p> <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 materials and related data in test development, administration, and 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>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <p>2.6.1 Principal’s Administration Manual for Grades 3-8 Computer-Based and Paper-Based Tests (Spring 2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsibilities of the Principal, pp. 3-4 • Shared Responsibilities of Principals, Test Administrators, Technology Staff, and Other School Personnel Authorized to Have Access to Secure Materials, pp. 4-5 • Responsibilities of Test Administrators, pp. 6-7 • Testing Irregularities, pp. 8-9 • Spring 2017 MCAS Administration Test Materials Internal Tracking Form, pp. 108-109, 113-114 • Principal’s Certification of Proper Test Administration Statements (PCPA), pp. 110-111 • Superintendent’s Assurance of Proper Test Administration, p. 112 • MCAS Nondisclosure Agreement, p. 115 • Request for Permission to Test a Student in an Alternate Setting, p. 116 • Confirmation of Training Participation and Receipt of Test Administrator’s Manuals (TAMs) and Test Security Requirements, p. 117 • Student Responsibilities during MCAS Testing (Grade 6–8), pp. 118-119 • Materials Summary, p. 122 <p>2.6.2 User Role Matrix (permissions granted to each user role in PearsonAccess^{next})</p> <p>2.6.3 Security Response from Measured Progress</p>	<p>The security procedures to protect data integrity and privacy are thoroughly described by the State. The State has taken steps to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results (see Exhibit 2.5.6 for how the vendor protects the integrity of the assessment materials, and Exhibit 2.5.10 for how the State does so as well). ○ Secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools (see Exhibit 2.6.1 for the instructions to school principals, as well as Exhibits 2.5.8 and 2.5.9 for the MCAS vendors will do as well). ○ Protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary (10) to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups (see Exhibits 2.6.2 – 2.6.5 for how vendors indicate that they protect the privacy of student identifiable information).

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Bid 2.6.4 Measured Progress Confidentiality Form for All Employees 2.6.5 Information Security Appendix 2.6.6 Measured Progress Non Disclosure Agreement for Employees 2.6.7 2017 Next Generation MCAS Results by Grade and Subject 2.6.8 ESE Gateway (Edwin Analytics) Security Roles, p. 4 2.6.9 Policies Relating to the Collection and Use of Student Data 2.6.10 Non-disclosure Agreement for members of the MCAS Bias and Sensitivity Committee, Assessment Development Committee, or Technical Advisory Committee	
Section 2.6 Summary Statement		
<u>X</u> No additional evidence is required.		

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. 	<p>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <p>Overall validity</p> <p>3.1.1 Draft 2017 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report, pp. 5, 71-76</p> <p>3.1.2 Draft Appendix N – Validity Evidence</p> <p>Documentation of alignment</p> <p>3.1.3 Draft 2017 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report, pp. 11-13, 16-18, 20-21</p> <p>3.1.4 MCAS Test Blueprint in ELA (2017)</p> <p>3.1.5 MCAS Mathematics Test Blueprint (2017)</p> <p>3.1.6 MCAS English Language Arts Achievement Level Descriptors</p> <p>3.1.7 MCAS Mathematics Achievement Level Descriptors</p> <p>3.1.8 American Institutes for Research Confidentiality and Data Sharing Agreement: Exhibit A - NAEP-State Assessment Study Design</p>	<p>The evidence provided by the State was reviewed in each of the categories listed below:</p> <p>Overall Validity</p> <p>Exhibit 3.1.1 provides an overview of some evidence in support of the validity of the MCAS assessments. Several aspects of evidence of validity are presented in Appendix N (Exhibit 3.1.2).</p> <p>Documentation of Alignment</p> <p>Exhibit 3.1.3 describes efforts to examine the alignment of the MCAS tests to the 2011 frameworks. This evidence is general in nature. Specific evidence of the alignment of the MCAS tests to different levels of cognitive complexity is not provided in this Exhibit.</p> <p>Exhibits 3.1.4 – 3.1.5 provide an overview of the MCAS test blueprints, but do not provide evidence in the support of the validity of the MCAS tests.</p> <p>Exhibits 3.1.6 – 3.1.7 provide the achievement level descriptors, and provide only general information in support of the validity of the MCAS items.</p> <p>Exhibit 3.1.8 describes an agreement between the State and AIR to conduct a comparative study of NAEP and MCAS student performance. While this study could contribute evidence in support of the validity of the MCAS tests, data from the study was not provided.</p> <p>Note: While evidence of a number of UMass studies of the MCAS in the past was provided, none of these studies were carried out on the current MCAS and the 2017 MA curriculum frameworks. We noted that an alignment study will need to be carried out in Fall 2018; this may meet the need for one indicated by peers.</p>

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independent information that quantitatively documents the adequate alignment between the State’s MCAS assessments and the 2011 frameworks (the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure) in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), range, balance of content, and cognitive complexity. • Results of the AIR NAEP-MCAS alignment study, when the results of that study are available, in order to demonstrate support for the cognitive complexity of the MCAS assessments. 		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <p>3.2.1 ELA Cognitive Skills 3.2.2 Mathematics Cognitive Skills 3.2.3 Draft 2017 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report: Cognitive Levels, ELA: p. 14, Math: pp. 19-20 3.2.4 Memo to the Board: Recommendation on Student Assessment for Spring 2016 and Beyond 3.2.5 PARCC Item Development Research: Cognitive Labs, 2013 (ETS) 3.2.6 HumRRO Test Administration Report, 2015 3.2.7 Draft Appendix N – Validity Evidence</p>	<p>Exhibits 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 describe the intended cognitive complexity levels of the MCAS tests in ELA and mathematics.</p> <p>Table 3.3 in Exhibit 3.2.3 describes the distribution of item types in ELA assessments (and cognitive complexity is alluded to in the text on p. 15). The same type of item type distribution for the mathematics tests is described in Tables 3.2.9 – 3.2.11, and the text alludes to the levels of cognitive complexity on p. 20-21.</p> <p>No actual data on item distribution by cognitive complexity is provided in Exhibit 3.2.3.</p> <p>Exhibit 3.2.4 provides general information on intended changes to the MCAS tests in the future.</p> <p>Exhibit 3.2.5 provides some evidence in support for the quality of the PARCC items that the State chose to use (although the extent of use of PARCC items in the MCAS was not provided). This Exhibit did not provide support for the cognitive complexity of the MCAS assessments.</p> <p>Exhibits 3.2.6 and 3.2.7 also did not add sufficient supporting information. Thus, peers were uncertain about the cognitive processes tapped by the MCAS assessments.</p>
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level, as represented in the 2011 academic frameworks (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
------------------	--	--

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</p> <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 academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <p>3.3.1 Draft 2017 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report, pp. 42-49</p>	<p>Exhibit 3.3.1 provides evidence classical item analysis information, item difficulty and discrimination data, DIF data, mode comparability, and dimensionality analysis information.</p> <p>These data do not provide “...adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent <i>with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards</i> on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based” (emphasis added).</p>
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based. 		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <p>3.4.1 Comparison between MCAS and NAEP Results, 2014 and 2017</p> <p>3.4.2 Draft Appendix N – Validity Evidence</p>	<p>Exhibit 3.4.1 provides extensive information on the performance of students in the State on the MCAS assessments, with a chart showing the performance of MA’s students on the NAEP assessments. By implication, students perform well on NAEP and MCAS; no direct comparative data are provided.</p> <p>Exhibit 3.4.2 provides some convergent validity information about MCAS and other variables such as item types used in the MCAS tests and student retention. While this data is interesting, it does not provide documentation that the MCAS scores are related as expected with other variables (e.g., student grades, teachers academic ratings, etc.)</p> <p>Note: Peers noted that a study of the relationship of the performance of students on the 2017 MCAS with student course taking and course grades in MS mathematics is planned for Winter 2018.</p>
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate validity evidence that the State’s MCAS assessment scores are related as expected with other variables especially those expected to be more directly related to student achievement. 		

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">4.1 – Reliability</p> <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 and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement. 	<p>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <p>4.1.1 2017 Draft MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report, pp. 61-68</p> <p>4.1.2 Draft Appendix K – Classical Reliability</p> <p>4.1.3 Draft Appendix N – Validity Evidence</p> <p>4.1.4 Draft Appendix P – 2016-2017 MCAS Scoring Specifications</p> <p>4.1.5 Draft 2017 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report, pp. 31-42</p> <p>4.1.6 Draft Appendix E – Interrater Consistency</p>	<p>Exhibit 4.1.1 provides a summary of the Cronbach’s <i>alpha</i> information for the MCAS assessments. The coefficients show adequate levels of reliability. Other sub-group reliabilities are provided in Appendices.</p> <p>Exhibits 4.1.2 – 4.1.4 provide the appendices for the technical report (Exhibit 4.1.1). Exhibit 4.1.2 provides total group and sub-group reliabilities. Tables J-3 and J-4 provide reliabilities by reporting category. These tend to be lower, likely due to the few items in some of the reporting categories. Likewise, the subgroup <i>alphas</i> reported in Tables J-5 and J-6 tend to be lower, perhaps due to the lower number of students in some subgroups.</p> <p>Exhibit 4.1.4 provides information on scorer inter-rater reliability procedures. Results are shown in Appendix K in this Exhibit.</p> <p>Exhibit 4.1.5 provides information on scorer training and shows how Pearson assures scorer agreement.</p> <p>Exhibit 4.1.6 provides data on the inter-rater reliabilities (i.e., exact and adjacent agreement) of the raters. Exact agreement values shown in Table 1.1 for ELA are on the low side. The values shown for mathematics in Table 1.2 are higher. In both cases, the percent of third scores is fairly high (ranging from about 20% to 70%) on many of the ELA and some of the mathematics items.</p>
<p>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<p>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <p>4.2.1 Draft 2017 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report, pp. 23-24, 26</p> <p>4.2.2 Bias and Sensitivity Orientation</p> <p>4.2.3 Accessibility and Accommodations Manual for the Spring 2017 MCAS Grades 3-8 Tests</p> <p>MCAS Accessibility Work Group</p> <p>4.2.4 Next-Gen MCAS Accessibility Work Group Members</p> <p>4.2.5 Next-Gen MCAS Accessibility Work Group Schedule</p> <p>4.2.6 January 28, 2016 Work Group Minutes</p> <p>4.2.7 February 2, 2016 Work Group Minutes</p> <p>4.2.8 February 3, 2016 Work Group Minutes</p> <p>4.2.9 MCAS Accessibility Work Group Recommendations</p> <p>4.2.10 Draft 2017 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report, pp. 45-47</p> <p>4.2.11 Draft Appendix H – DIF Results</p> <p>4.2.12 Accommodated Practice Tests</p> <p>4.2.13 Student Tutorial</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Exhibit 4.2.1 briefly describes the bias & sensitivity review processes. ○ Exhibit 4.2.2 provides the orientation provided to the bias & sensitivity review panels. ○ Exhibit 4.2.3 describes the accessibility features and accommodations provided for students with disabilities and English learners to assure fair access to the MCAS assessments to these students. ○ Exhibits 4.2.4 – 4.2.9 describe the work of the State’s MCAS Accessibility Work Group. These Exhibits document a thorough and inclusive process to review current accessibility features and accommodations, and plan for changes to them in the future. Their recommendations are summarized in Exhibit 4.2.9. ○ Exhibit 4.2.10 and 4.2.11 provide information on DIF results. Only a few items evidenced high levels of DIF for LEP/FLEP students when compared to non-LEP/FLEP students for each MCAS assessment. Comparable DIF results were not reported for students with disabilities versus students who do not have disabilities; the reason for this omission was not provided. ○ How the State has prepared students with disabilities for the use of accommodation is shown in Exhibit 4.2.12, while a student tutorial to prepare all students for online assessment is shown in Exhibit 4.2.13.
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DIF results for students with disabilities versus students who do not have disabilities on each of the MCAS tests. 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <p>4.3.1 Draft Appendix I - IRT & Mode Linking Report</p> <p>4.3.2 Draft 2017 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report, p. 62</p>	<p>Exhibit 4.3.1 provides considerable information on all of the items in the full MCAS assessments. The range of performance on the assessments is also shown. This Exhibit also provides information on the mode comparability and mode adjustments made.</p> <p>Exhibit 4.3.2 indicates, on p. 63 (Table 3-34) the standard errors of measurement of the MCAS ELA and mathematics tests. Tables 3-35 - 3-38 do show the decision accuracy and consistency (DAC) values for each of the tests at each grade level and assessment mode.</p> <p>No evidence of conditional standard errors of measurement (CSEM) is provided to show the level of precision of estimates of student performance across the full performance continuum.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of conditional standard errors of measurement (CSEM) to show the level of precision of estimates of student performance across the full MCAS performance continuum. 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <p>4.4.1 Measured Progress Response to the MA Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, pp.75-85</p> <p>4.4.2 Draft 2017 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report, pp. 31-42</p> <p>4.4.3 Draft Appendix P – 2016-2017 MCAS Scoring Specifications</p> <p>4.4.4 Draft 2017 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report, pp. 21, 34-35</p> <p>4.4.5 Draft Appendix I - IRT & Mode Linking Report, pp. 8-10</p> <p>4.4.6 ELA Benchmarking Process</p> <p>4.4.7 ELA Student Exemplars selections</p> <p>4.4.8 Math Pre-Reading for Benchmarking</p> <p>4.4.9 Math Post-Benchmarking Checklist</p> <p>4.4.10 Draft 2017 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report, pp. 25-26</p> <p>4.4.11 ELA Released Item and Student Work (Grade 8 sample)</p> <p>4.4.12 Mathematics Released Item and Student Work (Grade 8 sample)</p> <p>4.4.13 ELA Stat Review Guidelines</p> <p>4.4.14 ELA Procedures for Data Review</p> <p>4.4.15 Math Stat Review Guidelines</p> <p>4.4.16 Internal Math Staff Data Review Checklist</p> <p>Reporting results in terms of the state’s academic achievement standards</p> <p>4.4.17 Draft Appendix M – Analysis and Reporting Decision Rules</p> <p>4.4.18 Draft Appendix I - IRT & Mode Linking Report</p> <p>4.4.19 MCAS Standard Setting Meeting: English Language Arts and Mathematics (Pearson, November 2017), pp. 32-37</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Exhibit 4.4.1 provides the proposed scoring procedures and quality control procedures of Measured Progress, the State’s MCAS vendor. These planned procedures are thorough and complete. ○ Exhibit 4.4.2, Section 3.4, Exhibit 4.4.4, and Exhibit 4.4.10 describe the scoring procedures that the State’s contractor used. These provide evidence of the efforts to facilitate reliable results, thus facilitating valid score interpretations. ○ Exhibit 4.4.3 provides the scorer training and operational scoring specifications for the MCAS assessments. Appendix K provides a summary of the scoring of the MCAS assessments. ○ The benchmarking procedures used in preparation for operational scoring is outlined in Exhibits 4.4.6 – 4.4.9. ○ Student work samples in ELA and mathematics are shown in Exhibits 4.4.11 and 4.4.12. These are publicly released and intended to show examples of the assessment prompts used. ○ Data review procedures are shown in Exhibits 4.4.13 – 4.4.16. These illustrate the attention paid by the State and its vendor to quality control in scoring and subsequent statistical work. ○ The adequacy of reporting the MCAS results is documented especially in Exhibit 4.4.19, the report on standard setting for the MCAS assessments.
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <p>4.5.1 Draft Appendix I - IRT & Mode Linking Report, pp. 49-61</p> <p>4.5.2 2017 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report, pp. 14, 19, 49-61</p>	<p>Exhibit 4.5.1 describes in detail the procedures used to determine the comparability between the paper-based and online assessment modes, as well as the mode adjustments made as a result. These procedures are in line with standard practices when each type of an assessment is given to a sizeable percentage of students.</p> <p>Exhibit 4.5.2 provides information on linking in Section 3.6.3, as well as mode comparability descriptive material in Section 3.6.4, p. 57-59.</p>
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, 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>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <p>4.6.1 Guidance on Computer-Based Testing Presentation</p> <p>4.6.2 Draft 2017 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report, p. 10</p> <p>4.6.3 Draft Appendix I - IRT & Mode Linking Report</p> <p>4.6.4 Draft 2017 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report, pp. 49-61</p>	<p>Exhibit 4.6.1 describes the guidance provided to local districts for computer-based testing.</p> <p>Overall paper and online tests are described in Exhibit 4.6.2 on p. 10.</p> <p>Exhibit 4.6.3 describes in detail the procedures used to determine the comparability between the paper-based and online assessment modes, as well as the mode adjustments made as a result. These procedures are in line with standard practices when each type of an assessment is given to a sizeable percentage of students.</p> <p>Linking and mode comparability of the test forms in described in Exhibit 4.6.4.</p> <p>This evidence shows that the State has assured that the multiple versions of its assessments support comparable interpretations of results.</p>
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and 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).</p>	<p>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <p>4.7.1 Draft 2017 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report, p. 7</p> <p>4.7.2 Assessment Services RFR 2017-2018</p> <p>Agendas: Technical Advisory Committee Meetings</p> <p>4.7.3 November 2016</p> <p>4.7.4 May 2017</p> <p>4.7.5 October 2017</p> <p>4.7.6 UMass Amherst Validity Studies</p>	<p>Exhibit 4.7.1 provides an overview of the processes the State uses to carry out technical analyses of its assessments to maintain and improve the quality of its assessments.</p> <p>Exhibit 4.7.2 provides the RFR for the selection of a technical support contractor to carry out technical analyses of its assessments to maintain and improve the quality of its assessments. No reports of the work of this vendor were provided.</p> <p>Evidence for the plans of the State’s Technical Advisory Committee is provided in Exhibits 4.7.3 – 4.7.5. These plans are thorough, but without the minutes of the meetings, it is difficult to determine the nature and depth of the TAC discussions and the impacts of these discussions and decisions on the MCAS assessments.</p> <p>Exhibit 4.7.6 is an overview of the technical studies carried out by UMass Amherst on the MCAS assessments between 2003 and 2009. Only brief summary information on the implications and uses of the data from these studies was provided, however, and their pertinence to the current MCAS tests was not provided.</p>
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The implications from the deliberations of the State’s TAC, as well as the implications from any technical studies on the MCAS, such as those carried out in the past by UMass Amherst. 		

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards; • States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs; • Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment; • Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities; • Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities; • Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the 	<p>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <p>Participation Requirements for Students with Disabilities, including Accessibility Features and Selection of Appropriate Accommodations</p> <p>5.1.1 Accessibility and Accommodations Manual for the Spring 2017 MCAS Grades 3-8 Tests, pp. 1, 5-8</p> <p>5.1.2 Principal’s Administration Manual for Grades 3-8 Computer-Based and Paper-Based Tests (Spring 2017), pp. 12-13, 78-96</p> <p>Alternate Assessments and Guidelines for IEP Team Decision-making</p> <p>5.1.3 Principal’s Manual for MCAS-Alt, pp. 3-5</p> <p>5.1.4 Commissioner’s Memo: Important information about the MCAS Alternate Assessment (MCAS-Alt) and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)</p> <p>5.1.5 Decision-Making Tool for MCAS-Alt</p> <p>5.1.6 Guidance on Designating Students for the MCAS-Alt</p> <p>5.1.7 Training for District IEP Teams on designating students for alternate assessments</p> <p>5.1.8 Administrators Overview of assessment for students with disabilities, 30-34</p> <p>5.1.9 Educator’s Manual for MCAS-Alt (2017), pp. 8-12</p> <p>Parent Notification</p> <p>5.1.10 Sample Parent Notification Letter regarding possible effects of taking an alternate assessment</p> <p>Access to the General Curriculum</p> <p>Resource Guides to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks for Students with Significant Disabilities:</p>	<p>The evidence provided by the State was reviewed in each of the categories listed below:</p> <p>Participation Requirements for Students with Disabilities, including Accessibility Features and Selection of Appropriate Accommodations</p> <p>Exhibit 5.1.1 provides comprehensive instructions for the use of accessibility features and accommodations for students with disabilities.</p> <p>Exhibit 5.1.2 describes the accessibility features and accommodations for students with disabilities for use by school principals and their staffs. The procedures are thoroughly described.</p> <p>Alternate Assessments and Guidelines for IEP Team Decision-making</p> <p>Considerable information is provided to assist local educators in the State to determine which students should be alternately assessed (see Exhibits 5.1.3 – 5.1.9). MCAS-Alt has been in place for more than 15 years and the criteria for determining which students will participate have been thoroughly disseminated.</p> <p>Parent Notification</p> <p>Because MCAS is used for the Competency Determination (CD) for high school students and participation in MCAS-Alt can affect the CD, the state has taken care to explain the consequences of MCAS-Alt participation on the CD. See Exhibit 5.1.10. Peers wondered why this option is offered to students who participate in MCAS-Alt, since that is for students with significant cognitive disabilities.</p> <p>Access to the General Curriculum</p> <p>Exhibits 5.1.11 and 5.1.12 illustrate the resources the state has prepared to show how those who instruct students with significant cognitive</p>

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>disability categories listed in the IDEA;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student's achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State's general assessments); The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum. 	<p>5.1.11 ELA 5.1.12 Mathematics</p>	<p>disabilities can assist these students to access the State's ELA and mathematics content standards at instructional levels suitable for them.</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the appropriate inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State's MCAS assessment system.</p>
<p>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. 	<p>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <p>Participation Requirements for ELs</p> <p>5.2.1 Accessibility and Accommodations Manual for the Spring 2017 MCAS Grades 3-8 Tests, p. 22</p> <p>5.2.2 Principal’s Administration Manual for Grades 3-8 Computer-Based and Paper-Based Tests (Spring 2017), pp. 13, 72-76</p> <p>Accessibility Features and Selection of Appropriate Accommodations for ELs</p> <p>5.2.3 Accessibility and Accommodations Manual for the Spring 2017 MCAS Grades 3-8 Tests, pp. 23-26, 29</p> <p>5.2.4 Accessibility Features and Accommodations training module</p> <p>5.2.5 Bilingual Dictionaries and Glossaries Authorized for Use by English Language Learners on MCAS Tests</p> <p>5.2.6 Student Assessment Updates emailed regularly to principals, superintendents, administrators of special education, EL program directors, and other interested parties</p> <p>5.2.7 Web-based and conference call training sessions offered throughout the year, as publicized in Training Opportunities</p> <p>5.2.8 Refer to 4.2.4-4.2.9 for information on MCAS Accessibility Work Group members list, meeting schedule, minutes, and policy recommendations</p>	<p>The evidence provided by the State was reviewed in each of the categories listed below:</p> <p>Participation Requirements for ELs Exhibit 5.2.1 provides comprehensive instructions for the use of accessibility features and accommodations for English learners (ELs).</p> <p>Exhibit 5.2.2 describes the accessibility features and accommodations for ELs for use by school principals and their staffs. The procedures are thoroughly described.</p> <p>Accessibility Features and Selection of Appropriate Accommodations for ELs The availability and instructions for selecting and using appropriate accessibility features and accommodations for ELs is described in Exhibits 5.2.3 - 5.2.8.</p> <p>Peers were not certain what is the state’s definition of “former” ELL in Exhibit 5.2.5? Does this match the “former ELL” definition of ESSA?</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the appropriate inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school ELs in the State’s MCAS assessment system.</p>
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</p> <p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 	<p>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <p>Accommodations for Students with Disabilities and English Learners:</p> <p>Availability/Appropriateness/Selection</p> <p>5.3.1 Accessibility and Accommodations Manual for the Spring 2018 MCAS Grades 3-8 Tests, pp. 10-26; 29</p> <p>5.3.2 Principal’s Administration Manual for Grades 3-8 Computer-Based and Paper-Based Tests (Spring 2017), pp. 12-13, 72-76, 78-96</p> <p>5.3.3 Bilingual Dictionaries and Glossaries Authorized for Use by English Language Learners on MCAS Tests</p> <p>5.3.4 Accessibility Features and Accommodations training module</p> <p>5.3.5 Student Assessment Updates emailed regularly to principals, superintendents, administrators of special education, and other interested parties</p> <p>5.3.6 Training Opportunities web posting that details dates and topics of web-based and conference call training sessions, including Accessibility and Accommodations, offered throughout the year</p> <p>Process for exceptional accommodation request</p> <p>5.3.7 Accessibility and Accommodations Manual for the Spring 2018 MCAS Grades 3-8 Tests, pp. 12-13</p>	<p>The evidence provided by the State was reviewed in each of the categories listed below:</p> <p>Availability/Appropriateness/Selection</p> <p>Exhibit 5.3.1 provides comprehensive instructions for the use of accessibility features and accommodations for students with disabilities.</p> <p>Exhibit 5.3.2 describes the accessibility features and accommodations for students with disabilities for use by school principals and their staffs. The procedures are thoroughly described.</p> <p>Resources for use by students with disabilities and ELs during assessment are provided by Exhibit 5.3.3, while the training to use these is shown in Exhibit 5.3.4 – 5.3.6.</p> <p>The content of the student assessment updates and the training opportunities for local educators was not spelled out in Exhibits 5.3.5 and 5.3.6.</p> <p>Process for exceptional accommodation request</p> <p>Educators may use special access accommodations (e.g., formerly call non-standard accommodations) not routinely provided to students with disabilities using the procedures described in Exhibit 5.3.7, p. 18-21. The state will monitor how many of these are used by districts. Exhibit 5.2.3, p. 13 (section 6) describes the process for local educators to use to request approval for a unique accommodation or combination of accommodations. No data on how many requests were received, how many were granted, and whether approved requests impacted the accommodations available in subsequent years were provided.</p>
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		

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

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners 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 or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. 	<p>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <p>Instruments used to monitor compliance by districts</p> <p>5.4.1 Coordinated Program Review Procedures - School District Information Package - Special Education (2017-2018), pp. 20-21</p> <p>5.4.2 Coordinated Program Review Procedures - School District Information Package - English Learner Education (ELE) in Public Schools (2017-2018), p. 16</p> <p>Instruments used to collect data on the use of accommodations on MCAS tests</p> <p>5.4.3 Personal Needs Profile for Spring 2017 MCAS</p> <p>5.4.4 Guide to the Student Registration/Personal Needs Profile Process for the 2016-2017 MCAS Tests, pp. 12-34</p> <p>5.4.5 Instructions for Reporting an MCAS Irregularity</p> <p>5.4.6 MCAS Test Administration Observation Report</p>	<p>The evidence provided by the State was reviewed in each of the categories listed below:</p> <p>Instruments used to monitor compliance by districts</p> <p>Exhibit 5.4.1 and 5.4.2 describe in some detail how student participation in the MCAS and MCAS-Alt assessments is documented and then monitored. The criteria shown in Exhibit 5.4.1, SE-1 and SE-2, p. 17-18, describe the monitoring provided for students with disabilities. Comparable criteria for ELs is shown Exhibit 5.4.2, ELE-1 and ELE-2, p. 15-16.</p> <p>Instruments used to collect data on the use of accommodations on MCAS tests</p> <p>Exhibit 5.4.3 shows a screen shot of the PNP, the data collection form used to collect accommodations information for the MCAS. Exhibit 5.4.4 provides the instructions for collection of this information. Information on reporting test administration irregularities is given in Exhibit 5.4.5. Exhibit 5.4.6 shows the form that MCAS testing observers are to use when observing MCAS test administrations.</p> <p>Peers noted that observation forms may not be effective in monitoring since the students’ IEPs should describe the testing accommodations to be provided to students. Without checking the IEPs, peers felt it would be difficult to know just from observing students taking the MCAS whether they had received the accommodations approved for them. We saw no evidence for this sort of monitoring, nor if used, any summary data from it.</p> <p>In addition, peers noted that no summary data from special education monitoring visits was provided (see Exhibit 5.4.1, p. 20, section 5.4 for the types of information that could be requested in a site visit).</p>
Section 5.4 Summary Statement		

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"> A summary that students with disabilities or ELs received accommodations during assessment agreed to in their IEPs, 504 plan, or other planning process for an English learner, assuring that the accommodations used in assessment are consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice and that they are administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. 		

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; • The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels. 	<p>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <p>6.1.1 Development of the Next-Generation Achievement Levels</p> <p>6.1.2 Guiding Principles of Standard Setting Policy Committee</p> <p>6.1.3 Next-Gen MCAS Standard Setting Policy Committee Workgroup</p> <p>6.1.4 November 29, 2016 BESE Meeting – Update on Standard Setting Policy Committee memo</p> <p>6.1.5 February 28, 2017 BESE Meeting – New Achievement Levels and Descriptors Recommendations memo</p> <p>6.1.6 October 23, 2017 BESE Meeting – 2017 Student Performance Results memo</p> <p>6.1.7 Invitation to apply to Standard Setting panels</p> <p>6.1.8 MCAS Standard Setting Meeting: English Language Arts and Mathematics (Pearson, November 2017)</p> <p>6.1.9 Draft Appendix M – Analysis and Reporting Decision Rules, pp. 13-14</p>	<p>The development of the state’s academic achievement standards for the current MCAS tests of its 2011 content frameworks is described in these Exhibits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 6.1.1 summarizes the rationale for setting new achievement standards. ○ 6.1.2 provides guiding principles for setting the new achievement standards. ○ 6.1.3 gives the participants in the achievement standards process. ○ 6.1.4-6.1.7 provides several policy memoranda related to the need for new achievement standards ○ 6.1.8 is a complete report on the achievement levels setting process ○ 6.1.9 provides the data analysis and reporting decision rules for the MCAS assessments <p>Evidence of the potential formal adoption of the achievement standards by the MA Board of Elementary and Secondary Education BESE was shown in Exhibit 5.1.5: “Next-generation MCAS Achievement Levels and Descriptors Motion.”), but the actual document was not provided. Peers found evidence online from the March 28, 2017 BESE meeting, although this item was not provided among the evidence for peer review.</p>
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p> <p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the formal adoption of the achievement standards by the MA Board of Elementary and Secondary Education as well as the application of the achievement standards to all MA students should be provided by the State. 		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <p>6.2.1 MCAS Standard Setting Meeting: English Language Arts and Mathematics (Pearson, November 2017)</p> <p>6.2.2 Observations on the MCAS Standard Setting Panel Meetings (NCIEA, October 2017)</p>	<p>Exhibit 6.2.1 describes in considerable detail the processes and outcomes used to set achievement standards. Panelist evaluation question 5, p. 181-182 reports on panelist confidence in the standards that they had set. A substantial majority reported their levels as Successful or Very Successful.</p> <p>Exhibit 6.2.2 provides recommendations of an independent observer of the standards setting process for future such efforts. The validity of the process used is not directly described but can be inferred from the nature of the recommendations for future such efforts.</p> <p>The processes used by the State were technically sound and involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school 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 defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <p>6.3.1 MCAS Next-Generation Achievement Level Descriptors for ELA</p> <p>6.3.2 MCAS Next-Generation Achievement Level Descriptors for Mathematics</p> <p>6.3.3 MCAS Standard Setting Meeting: English Language Arts and Mathematics (Pearson, November 2017), pp. 1-9</p>	<p>The MCAS Achievement Level Descriptors for ELA and mathematics are provided in Exhibits 6.3.1 and 6.3.2 respectively. The process used to develop the State’s academic achievement standards is summarized in Exhibit 6.3.3, p. 1-9.</p> <p>The State has not provided evidence of the challenge and rigor inherent in the State’s academic achievement standards (such that students who score at the proficient or above level have mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do and are on track to succeed in college and the workforce by the time they graduate from high school).</p>
<p>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of the challenge and rigor inherent in the State’s academic achievement standards through a formal study of the challenge inherent in them. 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">6.4 – Reporting</p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration; • The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results; • The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement; ○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors); ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; ○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand; 	<p>The state provided the following evidence for this Critical Element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6.4.1 2017 Assessment and Accountability Reporting and Release schedule 6.4.2 Draft 2017 MCAS and MCAS-Alt Technical Report, pp. 68-70 6.4.3 Draft Appendix L – Sample Reports 6.4.4 Draft Appendix M – Analysis and Reporting Decision Rules 6.4.5 Next Generation MCAS Tests 2017 – Percent of Students at Each Achievement Level for Massachusetts 6.4.6 2017 MCAS Participation Report by Grade and Subject 6.4.7 2017 Item by Item Results (Grade 3 Reading Example) 6.4.8 Next-Generation MCAS Test Item Analysis for schools and districts 6.4.9 2017 MCAS Parent/Guardian Report Templates (English version) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Arabic Translated Parent/Guardian Report b. Cape Verdean Translated Parent/Guardian Report c. Chinese Translated Parent/Guardian Report d. Haitian Creole Translated Parent/Guardian Report e. Khmer Translated Parent/Guardian Report f. Korean Translated Parent/Guardian Report g. Portuguese Translated Parent/Guardian Report h. Russian Translated Parent/Guardian Report i. Spanish Translated Parent/Guardian 	<p>The evidence provided by the State was reviewed in each of the categories listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Exhibits 6.4.1 describes the score reporting/release schedule. The schedule assures that score reports are available for educators, parents, and others prior to the start of the following school year. ○ Exhibit 6.4.2 provides an overview summary of the Parent/Guardian Report. ○ Sample reports are shown in Exhibit 6.4.3. ○ The decision rules used in the State’s reports are provided in Exhibit 6.4.4. ○ Reports of results are provided in Exhibits 6.4.5 – 6.4.9a-j. Exhibit 6.4.9a-j shows the different home languages in which the MCAS results are reported. However, the availability of the MCAS results in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large-print) is not described. ○ Exhibit 6.4.10 shows the directions given to educators on the use of the Edwin Analytics system to examine MCAS assessment data. <p>Interpretive information for parents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Exhibit 6.4.12 shows the sample parent letter that districts can use to provide MCAS results to parents. ○ Exhibit 6.4.9a-j shows the different home languages in which the MCAS results are reported. ○ Exhibit 6.4.13 shows a screen shot of an online parent guide to the MCAS results. ○ Exhibit 6.4.14 shows a PPT that is annotated for parents. ○ Exhibit 6.4.15 shows FAQs about the MCAS assessment results, but where this FAQ list is available and for whom it is intended is not indicated. ○ Exhibit 6.14.16 provides a general overview of the MCAS ALDs for lay audiences.

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 follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. 	<p>Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> j. Vietnamese Translated Parent/Guardian Report <p>6.4.10 Edwin Analytics Guide and Report Sheets</p> <p>6.4.11 Item Descriptions (Grade 8 ELA and Math Examples)</p> <p>Interpretive information for parents</p> <p>6.4.12 Letter to Parents about the Next Generation MCAS Results</p> <p>6.4.13 Parent's Guide to the MCAS</p> <p>6.4.14 Annotated Parent/Guardian Reports</p> <p>6.4.15 Results Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)</p> <p>6.4.16 What are the Achievement Level Descriptors?</p> <p>Resources for educators</p> <p>6.1.17 Educator Resources Webpage</p>	<p>Resources for educators</p> <p>Exhibit 6.4.17 provides a list of educator resources for interpreting the MCAS results.</p> <p>The State reports its assessment results in a timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible manner that leads to interpretations and uses of the results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public.</p>
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the MCAS results are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print). 		